

Göttingen Studies in
Criminal Law and Criminal Justice

Marcelo F. Aebi et al.

European Sourcebook of Crime
and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2021
Sixth Edition



Göttingen University Press

Marcelo F. Aebi et al.

European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2021

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).



Published als Volume 41 of the Series „Göttingen Studies in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice“ by Göttingen University Press 2021

Marcelo F. Aebi, Stefano Caneppele,
Stefan Harrendorf, Yuji Z. Hashimoto,
Jörg-Martin Jehle, Tara S. Khan,
Olivia Kühn, Chris Lewis,
Lorena Molnar, Paul Smit,
Rannveig Þórisdóttir
and the ESB Network of National
Correspondents

European Sourcebook of
Crime and Criminal
Justice Statistics – 2021
Sixth Edition

Göttingen Studies in Criminal Law
and Criminal Justice
Volume 41



Göttingen University Press
2021

Bibliographic information

The German National Library lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

Editors of the Series

Institute of Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
Faculty of Law, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen
Prof. Drs. Kai Ambos, Gunnar Duttge, Katrin Höffler, Jörg-Martin Jehle,
Uwe Murmann

Recommended citation (APA 7th Edition):

Aebi, M.F., Caneppele, S., Hashimoto, Y. Z., Jehle, J.-M., Khan, T.S., Kühn, O., Lewis, C., Molnar, L., Smit, P., Þórisdóttir, R. and the ESB network of national correspondents (2021). *European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics 2021* (6th ed.). Göttingen University Press.

This work is protected by German Intellectual Property Right Law.
It is also available as an Open Access version through the publisher's homepage and the Göttingen University Catalogue (GUK) at the Göttingen State and University Library (<http://www.sub.uni-goettingen.de>).
The license terms of the online version apply.

Setting and layout: Yuji Z. Hashimoto, Lorena Molnar, Stefan Harrendorf

© 2021 Göttingen University Press
<https://univerlag.uni-goettingen.de>
ISBN: 978-3-86395-519-9
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17875/gup2021-1787>
ISSN: 1864-2136
eISSN: 2512-7047

National Correspondents

This report has been built upon the knowledge, commitment, and active contribution of many experts from all European countries. The questionnaire devised by the European Sourcebook group has been discussed with and answered by the following national correspondents:

- ❖ *Albania:* **Evisa Kambellari**, University of Tirana
- ❖ *Armenia:* **Anna Margaryan**, Yerevan State University
- ❖ *Austria:* **Monika Stempkowski** and **Christian Grafl**, University of Vienna
- ❖ *Azerbaijan:* **Khayyam Bayramov**, Azerbaijan Republic Ministry of Justice
- ❖ *Belgium :* **Charlotte Vanneste**, Université de Liège
- ❖ *Bulgaria:* **Dinko Kanchev**, Sofia, Bulgaria
- ❖ *Croatia:* **Anna-Maria Getos-Kalac** and **Reana Bezic**, University of Zagreb
- ❖ *Cyprus:* **Maria Konstantinou**, University of Cyprus
- ❖ *Czech Republic:* **Simona Diblikova**, Institute of Criminology and Social Prevention, Prague
- ❖ *Denmark:* **Britta Kyvsgaard**, Ministry of Justice, Copenhagen
- ❖ *Estonia:* **Andri Ahven**, Ministry of Justice, Tallinn
- ❖ *Finland:* **Tappio Lappi-Seppala**, University of Helsinki and **Anniina Jokinen**, Heuni

- ❖ *France*: **Annie Kensey** and **Nolwenn Piquet**, Ministry of Justice, Paris
- ❖ *Georgia*: **Georgi Glonti**, Grigol Robakidze University
- ❖ *Germany*: **Stefan Harrendorf**, Greifswald University (ESB group member)
- ❖ *Greece*: **Calliope Spinellis**, University of Athens and **Georgios Papanicolaou**, Teesside University
- ❖ *Hungary*: **Gábor Szászvai-Papp**, Office of the Prosecutor General
- ❖ *Iceland*: **Rannveig Thorisdottir** and **Tara Sif Khan**, Metropolitan Police, Reykjavik (ESB group members)
- ❖ *Ireland*: **Sam Scriven**, Central Statistics Office, Cork
- ❖ *Italy*: **Uberto Gatti** and **Gabrielle Rocca**, University of Genoa
- ❖ *Latvia*: **Kalvis Okmanis**, Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia
- ❖ *Lithuania*: **Aleksandras Dobryninas**, **Algimantas Čepas**, **Rimantė Gaičevskytė-Savickė** and **Evaldas Visockas**, Vilnius University
- ❖ *Luxembourg*: **Clarissa Dahmen**, Statistical National Institute
- ❖ *Malta*: **Saviour Formosa**, University of Malta
- ❖ *Moldova*: **Mihaela Vidaicu**, Moldova State University
- ❖ *Montenegro*: **Velimir Rakocevic**, University of Montenegro
- ❖ *Netherlands*: **Paul Smit**, Ministry of Justice, WODC (ESB group member)
- ❖ *North Macedonia*: **Gordana Lazetic** University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius
- ❖ *Poland*: **Beata Gruszczynska**, University of Warsaw
- ❖ *Portugal*: **Maria Joao Morgado Costa**, Direção-Geral da Política de Justiça, Lisbon
- ❖ *Romania*: **Andra-Roxana Trandafir**, University of Bucharest
- ❖ *Russian Federation*: **Artem Kulintsov**, Federal Penitentiary Service
- ❖ *Serbia*: **Sanja Copic**, Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research, Belgrade
- ❖ *Slovenia*: **Gorazd Mesko**, University of Maribor
- ❖ *Spain*: **Antonia Linde Garcia**, Open University of Catalonia (UOC), Barcelona
- ❖ *Sweden*: **Louise Ekström**, Division of Criminal Statistics, Stockholm
- ❖ *Switzerland*: **Anne-Corinne Vollenweider Wyss**, Federal Statistical Office, Neuchâtel
- ❖ *Turkey*: **Galma Akdeniz**, İstanbul Bilgi University
- ❖ *Ukraine*: **Olha Podilchak**, National Prosecution Academy of Ukraine, and **Olena Shostko**, Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University.
- ❖ *United Kingdom*: **Chris Lewis**, University of Portsmouth (ESB group member)

Acknowledgments

The following experts were involved in the discussions related to the project and gave helpful advice:

- ❖ **Claudia Campistol**, University of Lausanne
- ❖ **Anna-Maria Getos-Kalac**, University of Zagreb
- ❖ **Matti Näsi**, University of Helsinki, Finland
- ❖ **Lieven Pauwels**, University of Ghent, Belgium
- ❖ **Mélanie M. Tiago**, University of Lausanne
- ❖ **Johan Van Wilsem**, Netherlands Court of Audit
- ❖ **Nina Palmowski**, Georg-August University of Göttingen

A major contribution to the data collection wave of the sixth edition was made within the framework of the LINCS project, implemented by the Council of Europe and co-founded by the Council of Europe and the European Commission. We are especially grateful to

- ❖ **Iliana Taneva**, Council of Europe, Strasbourg

Dedication

The 6th edition of the European Sourcebook is dedicated to the memory of our colleague and friend Professor Kauko Aromaa (1943-2019) of Helsinki University. Professor Aromaa was a part of the European Sourcebook group for many years and promoted its publication.

We have lost a good friend.

Preface

This is the sixth edition of a data collection initiative that started in 1993 under the umbrella of the Council of Europe and has been continued since 2000 by an international group of experts that created the European Sourcebook of Criminal Justice e.V.¹ and is also a Working Group of the European Society of Criminology. These experts act as regional coordinators of a network of national correspondents whose contribution has been decisive in collecting and validating data on a variety of subjects from 42 countries.²

This edition of the Sourcebook is composed of six chapters. The first five cover the current main types of national crime and criminal justice statistics – police, prosecution, conviction, prison, and probation statistics – for the years 2011 to 2016, providing detailed analysis for 2015. The sixth chapter covers national victimization surveys, providing rates for the main indicators every five years from 1990 to 2015.

As with every new edition of the Sourcebook, the group has tried to improve data quality as well as comparability and, where appropriate, increase the scope of data collection. For example, offence definitions were updated to reflect the lessons learned from previous editions.

¹ A legal entity and registered association according to German law (eingetragener Verein).

² Including the constituent countries of the United Kingdom that have separate criminal justice systems, namely England and Wales, Northern Ireland, and Scotland.

Basically, all data included were originally collected by the national correspondents. The present document also includes, in chapter 4 and 5, data provided by the SPACE project of the Council of Europe.³

The European Sourcebook is also freely available for download on the website www.unil.ch/europeansourcebook. The original data used to create the European Sourcebook can also be found in a separate publication on that website. This includes the absolute crime figures and comments provided by the national correspondents when answering the European Sourcebook questionnaire.

The Sourcebook group wishes to thank all those who, in whatever capacity, have worked on the present edition. First of all, our thanks go to the national correspondents. Without them, such an endeavour as this would never be possible. We acknowledged their significant contributions by making the network of national correspondents co-author. We are also grateful to Claudia Campistol and Nina Palmowski, who, while working at the Universities of Lausanne and Göttingen, respectively, supported the project, especially by assisting the revision of the questionnaire and the data collection. Special thanks are due to the Council of Europe, particularly to Iliana Taneva, for their support in the framework of the project LINCS (Linking International Criminal Statistics). The project was co-funded by the Council of Europe and the European Commission and provided the framework for two conferences with the national correspondents and LINCS country experts on 16 to 17 April 2018 and then again on 3 and 4 June 2019. The Council of Europe also organised a virtual conference on “Three Decades of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics in Europe: Methods, Trends and the Impact on Policy Making” on 22 and 23 March 2021, at which the results of the LINCS project and of the Sourcebook data collection were presented and discussed. Special thanks are also due to the University of Lausanne and its School of Criminal Justice, who have been supporting this project since the beginning.

While all members of the Sourcebook group in principle contributed equally to the preparation and writing of this book, a special mention is due to Lorena Molnar and Yuji Zocatelli Hashimoto (both University of Lausanne) and Olivia Kühn (University of Greifswald) for their invaluable additional support. Lorena and Yuji were especially in charge of the creation, management and update of the ESB database and the copyediting of the final publication, while Olivia furthered and improved data validation significantly.

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

Lausanne, October 2021

Marcelo Aebi, Chair

³ See <https://wp.unil.ch/space>.

Contents

National Correspondents.....	V
Acknowledgments.....	VII
Dedication.....	IX
Preface.....	XI
General Introduction: The European Sourcebook Project	1
1 Background: Past and present of the European Sourcebook Group	1
2 Definitions of offences and sanctions.....	5
3 The structure of the European Sourcebook.....	5
4 Methodological issues	7
4.1 Data recording methods.....	7
4.2 Validation.....	7
5 Presentational details	8
6 Comparability	9

7 Basic rules on how to use the statistical information contained in the Sourcebook.....	11
1 Police Statistics	13
1.1 General comments	13
1.1.1 Police statistics as a measure of crime.....	13
1.1.2 Police in the criminal justice system.....	14
1.1.3 Counting offences and offenders.....	15
1.1.4 Counting police officers	15
1.1.5 Results	16
1.1.6 Comments by offences	17
1.1.7 Police staff.....	23
1.2 Tables	24
1.2.1 Offences.....	24
1.2.2 Offenders.....	50
1.2.3 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015.....	78
1.2.4 Police staff.....	100
1.3 Technical Information	103
1.4 Sources	110
2 Prosecution Statistics.....	113
2.1 General comments	113
2.1.1 Background.....	113
2.1.2 Results	117
2.2. Tables	121
2.2.1 Criminal cases handled by the prosecuting authorities 2011-2016.....	121
2.2.2 Criminal cases handled by the prosecuting authorities in 2015	124
2.2.3 Criminal cases handled by the prosecuting authorities in 2015 by offence groups	130
2.2.4 Police custody and pre-trial detention.....	137
2.2.5 Prosecution staff.....	139
2.3 Technical information.....	142
2.4 Sources	158

3 Conviction Statistics	161
3.1 General comments	161
3.1.1 Introduction	161
3.1.2 Offence definitions	162
3.1.3 Definition of a conviction.....	162
3.1.4 Minimum age of conviction.....	163
3.1.5 Validation checks.....	163
3.1.6 Methodology	163
3.1.7 Results	164
3.1.8 Total crimes.....	164
3.1.9 Major road traffic offences	165
3.1.10 Homicide	166
3.1.11 Bodily injuries	166
3.1.12 Rape.....	167
3.1.13 Sexual assaults.....	167
3.1.14 Robbery.....	168
3.1.15 Theft.....	168
3.1.16 Fraud	169
3.1.17 Money laundering.....	169
3.1.18 Corruption.....	170
3.1.19 Drug trafficking	170
3.1.20 Attrition and punitivity.....	170
3.1.21 Crime types, relative number of convicted persons	172
3.2 Tables	174
3.2.1 Total number of convictions per 100 000 population.....	174
3.2.2 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among convicted persons in 2015.....	196
3.2.3 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015.....	217
3.2.4 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015.....	236
3.2.5 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015	254
3.2.6 Persons held in pre-trial detention (at least temporarily) among persons convicted in 2015	271
3.2.7 Judges in criminal courts per 100 000 population - 2015	272
3.3 Technical information.....	273

3.3.1 Technical comments	273
3.3.2 Minors in conviction statistics.....	274
3.4 Sources	275
4 Prison Statistics	277
4.1 General Comments	277
4.1.1 Introduction	277
4.1.2 Quality of the data.....	280
4.1.3 Results	280
4.1.4 Recidivism.....	284
4.2 Tables	286
4.2.1 Prison population: Stock of inmates on 1 September.....	286
4.2.2 Convicted prison population by type of offence on 1 September 2015	292
4.2.3. Prison population: Flow of entries into penal institutions	300
4.2.4. Prison population: Flow of exits from penal institutions	304
4.2.5 Prison staff.....	314
4.3 Technical information.....	318
4.3.1 Stock.....	318
4.3.2 Flow of entries	319
4.3.3 Flow of exists	320
4.3.4 Staff.....	320
4.4 Technical information.....	321
4.4.1 Notes	321
4.4.2 Tables	327
4.5 Sources	331
5 Probation Statistics	333
5.1 General comments	333
5.1.1 Introduction	333
5.1.2 Quality of the data.....	337
5.1.3 Results	337
5.2 Tables	340
5.2.1 Probation population: Stock of probationers	340
5.2.2 Probation population: Flow of entries in probation.....	344

5.2.3 Probation population: Flow of exits from probation.....	348
5.2.4 Staff of probation agencies	349
5.3 Technical information.....	352
5.3.1 The structure and organisation of Probation Agencies.....	352
5.3.2 Description of data recording methods for Tables on probation	356
5.3.3 Electronic monitoring.....	358
5.4 Sources	360
6 National Victimization Surveys.....	361
6.1 General comments	361
6.1.1 Introduction	361
6.1.2 Data collected on Victimization Surveys for the European Sourcebook.....	363
6.1.3 Standard wording of the questions included in national victimisation surveys	368
6.1.4 Completeness and quality of the data	371
6.1.5 Main Results	371
6.1.6. Other victimisation surveys carried out by European countries.	371
6.2 Tables from household victimisation surveys.....	374
6.2.1 Bodily injury	374
6.2.2 Sexual assault.....	377
6.2.3 Robbery.....	379
6.2.4 Theft of personal property.....	382
6.2.5 Theft of a motor vehicle	386
6.2.6 Theft by means of domestic burglary	389
6.2.7 Corruption	392
6.2.8 Trust in the police	393
6.2.9 Feelings of safety	395
6.2.10 Computer/cybercrime against individuals	399
6.2.11 Computer/cybercrime against companies and charities	402
6.3 Technical information on household surveys	404
6.4 Sources of national metadata and results	411
6.5 Other topics covered by National Victimization Surveys in Europe	413

Appendix I: Definitions	417
1 Offences	417
1.1 Total criminal offences	425
1.2 Major road traffic offences	428
1.3 Intentional homicide	431
1.4 Bodily injury	433
1.5 Aggravated bodily injury.....	436
1.6 Sexual assault.....	437
1.7 Rape	439
1.8 Sexual abuse of a child.....	441
1.9 Robbery.....	444
1.10 Theft.....	445
1.11 Aggravated theft	447
1.12 Theft of a motor vehicle.....	449
1.13 Theft by means of burglary.....	451
1.14 Theft by means of domestic burglary.....	453
1.15 Fraud.....	454
1.16 Cyber fraud.....	457
1.17 Forgery of documents.....	459
1.18 Money laundering.....	461
1.19 Corruption in the public sector.....	462
1.20 Drug offences.....	464
1.21 Drug trafficking	468
1.22 Firearm involved.....	470
2 Young offenders and state reactions to their offending.....	474
2.1 Age of criminal responsibility.....	475
2.2 Age of adulthood in penal law.....	476
2.3 Treatment of young adults	476
2.4 State reactions to criminal acts of minors.....	477
Appendix II: Population	479

General Introduction: The European Sourcebook Project

1 Background: Past and present of the European Sourcebook Group

The assessment of trends in crime and criminal justice has been a permanent concern of international organisations and a major source of interest and debate for researchers and policy makers. Following the reunification of the European continent that started in 1989, the necessity of a reliable data source became evident. Against this background, the European Committee on Crime Problems (CDPC) created in 1993 a group on “*Trends in crime and criminal justice: statistics and other quantitative data on crime and criminal justice systems*” (PC-S-ST), composed of experts from France, Germany, Hungary, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.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.

⁴ The members of the group were: Martin Killias (Switzerland; chair), 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). The secretary to the Group was Wolfgang Rau, Directorate of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe.

The draft model collated crime and criminal justice data for the year 1990 on ten European countries.⁵ At its 45th plenary session in June 1996, the CDPC entrusted the expert group with the preparation of a compendium of crime and criminal justice data for the whole of Europe. This required the enlargement of the Group through the incorporation of specialists in comparative criminology and in the collection and analysis of statistical data.⁶

In its work, the group took account of the periodic surveys on crime and criminal justice statistics carried out by INTERPOL –that was eventually abandoned in 2006– and the UNODC. These surveys relied on the provision of data by official authorities of each country, which usually would transmit the figures as published in their national statistics. The group decided to follow a different approach by creating a co-ordinated network of national correspondents that would access the main statistical sources within each country, collect data and *metadata* (i.e., information on the legal definitions of offences and the statistical counting rules applied when compiling the data), and adapt as much as possible the available figures to a standard definition of each offence developed by the group.

The development of a sustainable network of national correspondents requires the identification in each country of an expert in crime and criminal justice statistics who becomes responsible for the collection and initial checking of the data. In a quarter of a century, many colleagues assumed that role, some during several sweeps of the Sourcebook and some for one or two editions. The list of the current national correspondents is provided at the beginning of this publication. The national correspondents are responsible for the accuracy of the data provided for their respective countries as well as for identifying legal and statistical changes, or factual incidents that can explain variations in the trends observed. The members of the European Sourcebook Group –whose composition has also changed throughout the years, as can be seen in the list of authors of each edition– act as *regional co-ordinators* for groups of several countries.

The methodology developed by the European Sourcebook Group proved successful, and the first edition of the Sourcebook was published in 1999. Later, that methodology inspired the collection of data started at the beginning of the 2000s by Eurostat. In the same perspective, the United Nations Survey on Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (CTS) conducted by the UNODC has also incorporated, since the mid-2000s, the questions on metadata developed by the Group.

⁵ France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom.

⁶ 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.

After the publication of the first edition in 1999,⁷ the Council of Europe was, unfortunately, no longer able to support the project financially. To maintain continuity in the data collection effort and especially to avoid dismantling the network of national correspondents from the whole of Europe, the second (2003)⁸ and the third edition (2006)⁹ were funded and supported by different institutions: the British Home Office, the Swiss Foreign Ministry (through the Federal Office of Statistics and the School of Criminal Sciences of the University of Lausanne), the Dutch Ministry of Justice, the *Centre d'Etudes Sociologiques sur le Droit et les Institutions Pénales* (CESDIP), the European Commission and the German Federal Ministry of Justice. A small group of experts was responsible for updating data and improving data quality of the European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics.¹⁰

The fourth edition of the European Sourcebook¹¹ was made possible with support from the European Commission under the AGIS programme.¹² The results of the project funded by the Commission were published independently¹³ and, although the Sourcebook itself was not a result of that project, the data collection instrument developed for it was used for collecting the data included in the fourth edition of the Sourcebook. In that context, efforts were made to extend the

⁷ *Council of Europe* (Ed.) (1999). European sourcebook of crime and criminal justice statistics. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Analysis of the results of the first edition is presented in a special issue of the European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research (8/1, 2000).

⁸ Aebi, M., Aromaa, K., Aubusson de Cavarlay, B., Barclay, G., Gruszczyńska, B., Hofer, H. v., Hysi, V., Jehle, J.-M., Killias, M., Smit, P. & Tavares, C. (2003). European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2003. 2nd edition. Den Haag: Boom. Analysis of the results of the second edition is presented in a special issue of the European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research (10/2-3, 2004).

⁹ Aebi, M., Aromaa, K., Aubusson de Cavarlay, B., Barclay, G., Gruszczyńska, B., Hofer, H. v., Hysi, V., Jehle, J.-M., Killias, M., Smit, P. & Tavares, C. (2006). European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2006. 3rd edition. Den Haag: Boom.

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 Gruszczyńska (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 Aebi, M., Aubusson de Cavarlay, B., Barclay, G., Gruszczyńska, B., Harrendorf, S., Heiskanen, M., Hysi, V., Jaquier, V., Jehle, J.-M., Killias, M., Shostko, O., Smit, P. & Þorisdóttir, R. (2010). European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2010. 4th edition. Den Haag: Boom. Analysis of the results of the first edition is presented in a special issue of the European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research (18/1, 2012).

¹² JLS/2006/AGIS/134. The members of the expert group for the fourth edition were Martin Killias (Switzerland, chair); Marcelo Aebi (Switzerland, database administrator), Bruno Aubusson de Cavarlay (France), Gordon Barclay (United Kingdom), Beata Gruszczyńska (Poland), Stefan Harrendorf (Germany), Markku Heiskanen (Finland), Vasilika Hysi (Albania), Véronique Jaquier (Switzerland), Jörg-Martin Jehle (Germany), Olena Shostko (Ukraine), Paul Smit (The Netherlands), Rannveig Þorisdóttir (Iceland).

¹³ Detailed results of the project can be found in: *Jehle/Harrendorf* (Eds.): *Defining and Registering Criminal Offences and Measures. Standards for a European Comparison*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen 2010.

Sourcebook's coverage beyond ordinary ("street level") crimes and to include offences such as fraud, offences against computer data and systems, money laundering and corruption. Other offence definitions were completed or differentiated, such as bodily injury, drug trafficking, sexual assault and sexual abuse of minors.

The fifth edition¹⁴ took advantage of a project funded by the European Commission under the ISEC 2010 programme¹⁵ and aiming at improving data collection on the tasks and work of probation agencies and on community sanctions and measures, as well as developing indicators for the attrition process within the criminal justice system.¹⁶ Experts from the CEP (Confederation of European Probation) were involved in order to improve the questionnaire and the data validation procedure in respect of probation statistics. Based on these efforts a broader range of data and information on community sanctions and measures connected with prosecutorial decisions and orders by the court and implemented by probation agencies – both for adults and for minors – could be presented in the fifth edition. Building on this experience, the current sixth edition also presents probation data in a separate chapter.

This sixth edition signs a return to the sources of the Sourcebook project, as it was developed in collaboration with the Council of Europe. An international network of experts was needed to collect the data required for the LINCSPROJECT (Linking International Criminal Statistics), implemented by the Council of Europe and co-funded by the European Commission, and the network of national correspondents developed by the European Sourcebook Group assumed that role. In that context two conferences with the national correspondents, who also became the LINCSPROJECT experts, took place (April 2018 and June 2019), where the data collection procedures were discussed, and preliminary data were evaluated. Finally, in an online conference in March 2021 the results of the sixth survey wave were presented

¹⁴ Aebi, M., F., Akdeniz, G., Barclay, G., Campistol, C., Caneppele, S., Gruszczyńska, B., Harrendorf, S., Heiskanen, M., Hysi, V., Jehle, J.-M., Jokinen, A., Kensey, A., Killias, M., Lewis, C. G., Savona, E., Smit, P. & Þórisdóttir, R. (2014). European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2014, 5th edition. HEUNI Publication Series No. 80.

¹⁵ DECODEUR (HOME/2010/ISEC/FP/C1/4000001420). The project was managed by the European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United Nations (HEUNI). The members of the expert group for the fifth edition were Jörg-Martin Jehle (Germany, chair); Marcelo Aebi (Switzerland, database administrator), Galma Akdeniz (Turkey), Gordon Barclay (United Kingdom), Claudia Campistol (Switzerland), Stefano Caneppele (Italy), Beata Gruszczyńska (Poland), Stefan Harrendorf (Germany), Markku Heiskanen (Finland), Vasilika Hysi (Albania), Annina Jokinen (Finland), Annie Kensey (France), Martin Killias (Switzerland), Chris Lewis (UK), Ernesto Savona (Italy), Paul Smit (The Netherlands), Rannveig Þórisdóttir (Iceland).

¹⁶ Detailed results of this project are publicized parallel to this book in: *Heiskanen/Aebi/van der Brugge/Jehle* (Eds.): Recording Community Sanctions and Measures and Assessing Attrition. A Methodological Study on Comparative Data in Europe. Helsinki: HEUNI 2014.

and reflected in an expanded context, also taking into account other data collection initiatives, victimisation studies and the needs of and impact on criminal policy.¹⁷

From 2001 to 2012, the Dutch Ministry of Justice provided the necessary resources to set up and maintain a website containing all the data of the 1999, 2003, 2006 and 2010 editions of the European Sourcebook under the supervision of Paul Smit (WODC, Ministry of Justice of the Netherlands). Since 2012, the University of Lausanne has taken over this function for the European Sourcebook, under the supervision of Marcelo Aebi. Results for all ESB editions, including the respective original data, are available on this ESB website (www.unil.ch/europeansourcebook).

2 Definitions of offences and sanctions

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 developed, and countries were invited to follow it whenever possible. Offence definitions and related commentaries are given in an appendix of this book, providing for each of the selected offences detailed information on which countries (among those providing numerical data) were able to fully conform to the definition and which countries deviated from it. For the latter, there is also an indication of the elements of the definition that they were unable to meet. Data on definitions are presented separately for police and convictions levels.

3 The structure of the European Sourcebook

This edition of the European Sourcebook is divided into six chapters, each of which is, in general, subdivided into four sections:

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

The six chapters are:

- A. *Police data*. Chapter 1 provides information on offences and suspected offenders known to the police in each country, as well as on police staff. Most of the data are available as time-series covering the years 2011 to 2016. Detailed information on the sex, age group, and nationality of suspects is provided for 2015. This sixth edition includes three additional offences: aggravated theft, cyberfraud, and forgery of documents. It also brings

¹⁷ Aebi, M. F. et al (2021): Three Decades of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics in Europe: Methods, Trends and the Impact on Policy Making. Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

significant improvements to the definitions or major road traffic offences, rape, and sexual abuse of a child, which are based on an analysis of the data and metadata collected in previous editions. These modifications are aiming to improve comparability across countries in this edition of the European Sourcebook, although they imply that the figures collected are not fully comparable with those included in earlier editions of it. For most of the other offences, only minor improvements and clarifications were introduced.

- B. *Prosecution statistics.* Chapter 2 covers all steps of decision-making at the prosecution level, such as initiating and ending proceedings, bringing cases to court and sanctioning offenders by summary decisions. Data on the output of the prosecution level both for all cases and cases brought before a court refer to 2011 to 2016, which is also the period covered by data on the staff of prosecution authorities. Separate data for groups of offenders and offences and the breakdown by various case-ending decisions are provided for 2015. The chapter also included data on compulsory measures during criminal proceedings, such as police custody and pre-trial detention.
- C. *Conviction statistics.* The tables in chapter 3 deal with persons who have been convicted, i.e., found guilty according to the law, of having committed a criminal offence. Information on convictions is presented by offence for the years 2011 to 2016. Detailed information on the type of sanction imposed (including community sanctions and measures), on sentence lengths of custodial sanctions and on sex, age group, nationality, and prior pre-trial detention of sentenced persons are provided for the year 2015. This edition also includes an overview of the number of judges by country in that year.
- D. *Prison statistics.* Chapter 4 includes data on ‘stock’, ‘flow of entries’ and ‘flow of exits’ of prison populations for the years 2011 to 2016, including percentages of pre-trial detainees, women, minors and foreigners. Data on exits is also breakdown by releases and deaths. The chapter also includes data on the convicted prison population by offence group in 2015, as well as on prison staff on 1 September 2016.
- E. *Probation statistics.* Chapter 5 provides information on the number of persons placed annually under the supervision of probation agencies from 2011 to 2016 (flow of entries), as well as on the number of persons under such supervision (stock) on 31st December of each of these years. The detailed information provided for the year 2015 includes the type of supervision under which probationers were placed, the percentage of women, minors and foreigners among the stock of probationers, the number of persons leaving probation (flow of exits) –including the reasons for ending supervision– as well as the staff of probation agencies, and the number of reports written by them.
- F. *National victimisation surveys.* Chapter 6 presents data on national victimisation surveys carried out by the responding countries every five years from

1990 to 2015. The chapter provides information about the methodology used in these surveys and the labelling of the questions include and presents some selected results.

4 Methodological issues

4.1 Data recording methods

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, short comments, as well as in the definitions appendix.

4.2 Validation

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. Data validation involved:

- A. *Trend checks*: Evaluation of the consistency of the trends for the years covered in this edition and also in comparison with the data provided for the previous edition of the European Sourcebook. This was mainly a check for ‘outliers’, i.e., extreme values which are difficult, if not impossible, to explain.
- B. *Internal validity checks*: Evaluation of the coherence of the results provided for different, logically connected variables was checked (for example, differences in the total provided for one item and the addition of its subcategories, or the acceptable range of certain ratios (for example, suspects by offences or convictions by suspects).
- C. *Other sources checks*: Whenever possible, results were compared to the results published in the surveys of Eurostat, UNODC and the Council of Europe (SPACE).

This procedure resulted in the need to go back to many national correspondents for clarifications and additional cross-checking. It allowed correcting some mistakes, but also revealed many differences in the national statistical systems, which are extensively documented in the metadata.

As an additional validity check, the year 2011 is covered by both the 5th and the 6th edition of the European Sourcebook. In some cases, both figures are not identical. 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

2011 of the fifth edition were provisional as the questionnaire had been sent a few months after the end of that year.

5 Presentational details

In order to increase the readability of the present report, the group took the following practical decisions:

- A. To make *all* raw data and *all* comments available in a separate publication (*Original Data of the European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics 2021-Sixth edition*) freely available for download on the website www.unil.ch/europeansourcebook. Consequently, the present document contains only a selection of all the data and comments received.
- B. To shorten, in general, tables where the number of reporting countries was small.¹⁸
- C. To use decimals sparingly so as to avoid giving a false impression of precision.
- D. To use the English notation for figures. The decimal marker is represented by a dot (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, where necessary (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 exist in the country;
 - c) ‘> 1 000’ to indicate that the percentage change between 2011 and 2016 is above one thousand per cent.
- G. To condense the vast amount of technical information on definitions, data collection methods, processing rules, and other metadata in summary tables, listings and footnotes.
- H. Whenever possible and reasonable, figures were transformed into rates per 100 000 population or indicated as percentages. In the case of minors, rates are given per 100 000 total population because information on the number of minors in the total population of each country was not available.
- I. The total population figures used are contained in Appendix II at the end of the publication.

¹⁸ Only very few tables have been totally eliminated from the publication. In such cases, the original data are available in the publication mentioned above.

- J. To use the following measures throughout the tables to provide information on the data dispersion:
- a. Mean: The (unweighted) arithmetic average; the sum of scores divided by the number of countries that provided data. The value of the mean is sensitive to the presence of very high or very low scores. For this reason, the median was also included as an indicator of the central tendency of the data.
 - b. Median: The (unweighted) median is the score that divides the distribution of scores into two exact halves.
 - c. Minimum: The lowest score in the table.
 - d. Maximum: The highest score in the table.
 - e. Percentage change 2011 to 2016 (exact calculation based on the original data with all the decimals not shown here).

6 Comparability

The basic aim of the European Sourcebook data collection is to present comparable information on crime and criminal justice statistics in Europe.¹⁹ However, the issue of whether or not it is feasible or appropriate 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 and sanctions, of common measuring instruments and of a common methodology makes comparisons between countries extremely hazardous.²⁰ This is the reason why criminologists over the last decades 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. Due to a lack of recent *international* victimisation studies, Chapter 6 includes data from *national* victimisation surveys, which can be compared only with extreme caution.

Comparative analyses generally fall into one of three categories: (A) distributive comparisons, (B) level comparisons and, (C) trend comparisons.

¹⁹ See further *Jehle, J.-M.* (2013). Crime and Criminal Justice in Europe. The Approach of the European Sourcebook. In Kuhn, A., Schwarzenegger, C., Margot, P., Donatsch, A., Aebi, M.F. & Jositsch, D. (eds.), *Criminology, Criminal Policy and Criminal Law in an International Perspective, Essays in Honour of Martin Killias on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (pp. 191-205). Zürich: Stämpfli 2013.

²⁰ Detailed: *Harrendorf, S.* (2018). Prospects, Problems, and Pitfalls in Comparative Analyses of Criminal Justice Data. *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research* 47, 159-207.

- 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. *Level* comparisons are aimed at answering questions of the following type: Which country reports the highest robbery rate? Which countries show low rates of incarcerated offenders? Which criminal justice systems have a high level of attrition, e.g., measured by the relation of convicted to suspected persons?
- C. In contrast, interpretations of *trends* deal with such questions as: Did crime increase or decrease during the period under study? Did the decrease in theft of a motor vehicle offences differ over time in various countries?

Before these and other questions can be answered, it should be noted that official crime and criminal justice statistics are fundamentally dependent upon four sets of circumstances: (a) *substantive* factors such as the propensity of individuals to commit crimes, the opportunity structure, the risk of detection, the willingness of the public to report crimes, or the efficiency of criminal justice authorities; (b) *legal* factors 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; (c) *statistical* factors such as the formal data collection and processing rules and their practical implementation and (d) criminal policy factors, which relate to the crime and crime prevention policies applied in each country that may focus the available resources on some offences (for example, drug offences or domestic violence offences).²¹

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, or in the criminal policies applied. This is, of course, a difficult task and identifying *informal* changes in criminal justice procedures and in statistical routines is especially difficult. In order to assist the reader in making

²¹ For details, see *von Hofer, H.* (2000). Crime statistics as constructs: The case of Swedish rape statistics. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 8(1), 77-89; *Aebi, M.F.* (2010). Methodological Issues in the Comparison of Police-Recorded Crime Rates. In Shoham S.G., Knepper P. & Kett M. (Eds.). *International Handbook of Criminology* (pp. 211-227). CRC Press; *Harrendorf, S.* (2012). Offence Definitions in the European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics and Their Influence on Data Quality and Comparability, *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 18(1), 23-53.

informed decisions on the validity of trend data, possible changes in the data recording methods are indicated in the technical information contained in each chapter.²²

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 were collected. This information is contained in section 3 of each chapter. However, it is not possible to easily quantify the extent to which over- or under-reporting occurs.

7 Basic rules on how to use the statistical information contained in the Sourcebook²³

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-recorded offences for 'level' comparisons between countries. Rather, they should be used for 'trend' comparisons. Victimization surveys are a more valid source for cross-national comparisons, namely when they are conducted using the same questionnaire.
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, the criminal policy, or in the underlying statistical routines/counting rules.

²² Examples of how European Sourcebook data can be analysed can especially be found in the following special issues of the European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research: 8/1 (2000), 10/2-3 (2004), 18/1 (2012). For a more detailed list of publications referring to European Sourcebook data, see <http://www3.unil.ch/wpmu/europeansourcebook/publications/>.

²³ Also see the detailed list of 16 "dos and don'ts" of comparison of international crime and criminal justice data in *Harrendorf, J. (2018). Prospects, Problems, and Pitfalls in Comparative Analyses of Criminal Justice Data. Crime and Justice: A Review of Research 47, 159-207, at 200-202.*

1 Police Statistics

1.1 General comments

1.1.1 Police statistics as a measure of crime

This chapter provides information on offences recorded by the police, the number of offences per 100 000 population, the characteristics of suspected offenders, and the number of police staff.

Police statistics are collected in every country but for several reasons they do not offer a comprehensive measure of crime. Victims may choose not to report the crime to the police (e.g., depending on how serious they view the offence, their previous experiences or trust in the police) or they 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 thinks that the police will not be able to solve the crime).

If the 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 victims of bodily injury or rape,

for example, tend to be less likely to report the offence than victims of property crimes.²⁴

Not all crimes are reported by a victim or a witness. The police themselves may report violent crimes, for example homicide and ‘victimless’ offences (such as illegal possession of arms, drink-driving and drug offences). Even when a crime is reported to the police, it may not be recorded in the official statistics. This may occur if the police believe that the event reported did not actually constitute a crime. 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 low-value items). In assessing national differences, comparisons with other data sources, such as victimization surveys (e.g., the International Crime Victims Survey, ICVS), are helpful. The last sweep of the ICVS was carried out in 2005. More information about victimization surveys is given in Chapter 6.

1.1.2 Police in the criminal justice system

In most countries the police are 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. In several countries, the prosecuting authorities may initiate criminal proceedings without receiving a police report. Also, other agencies (military police, customs, border police, and 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.

The position of the police in the criminal justice system may also directly influence the number of offences recorded and how they are classified. In some countries the police are quite independent in their activities, whilst in others they may work under the close supervision of the prosecutor or the court.

Substantial differences exist between countries in the tasks that the police carry out. For example, in most countries the police deal with traffic offences such as drink-driving, causing bodily harm or petty traffic offences (such as 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 aid). This may not apply, however, to all types of police or related agencies that 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.

²⁴ Van Dijk, J., van Kesteren, J. & Smit, P. (2007). *Criminal Victimization in International Perspective. Key Findings from the 2004-2005 ICVS and EU ICS*. 257 Onderzoek en beleid. Den Haag: WODC.

1.1.3 Counting offences and offenders

Certain classification issues need to be considered when examining police statistics:²⁵

- The point in time when the offence is recorded in the statistics: did the recording follow the initial report ('input' statistic) or the initial investigation ('output' statistic)?
- Multiple offences: One offence can consist of several offences (e.g., rape, followed by a homicide and the use of an illegal weapon). Therefore, awareness of whether the offences committed are counted separately or whether a principal offence rule is 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 report of domestic violence experienced over a period of time is counted as one or several incidents are important.

Similar issues arise in connection with the counting of offenders. Differences between countries exist and practices range from recording a person as a 'suspected offender' as soon as the police are reasonably convinced that this is the case, to recording a person as a 'suspect' only after the prosecutor has started criminal proceedings.

1.1.4 Counting police officers

European countries organise their police systems in different ways. Most of them have more than one police force, e.g., state police, communal police, municipal police, gendarmerie, or judicial police. They perform tasks in connection with the offences under consideration in this Sourcebook although some also undertake military duties (e.g., gendarmerie).

A standard definition for police officer was used. This included criminal police, traffic police, border police, gendarmerie and uniformed police but excluded customs police, tax police, military police, secret service police, part-time officers, police reservists, cadet police officers and court police (see Tables 1.3.1 - 1.3.2).

Many European countries have seen considerable increases in the private security industry over recent years and such increases can influence the counting of crime. For example, 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.

²⁵ *Aebi, M. F. (2008). Measuring the Influence of Statistical Counting Rules on Cross-National Differences in Recorded Crime. In K. Aromaa & M. Heiskanen (Eds.), Crime and Criminal Justice Systems in Europe and North America 1995-2004, 196-214. HEUNI Publication Series No. 55. Helsinki: European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control.*

1.1.5 Results

All participating countries, except from Croatia, were able to provide information on some offences reported to the police. Croatia was not able to provide any data since they only collect information regarding the offenders but not offences. Turkey was not able to provide any data for the year 2016 and Luxembourg only for homicide. Information from Russia was limited to bodily injury, robbery, and theft (total, theft of motor vehicle and burglary).

The moment at which the data is recorded varies between countries; Seventeen countries reported that offences were recorded as soon as an offence is first reported to the police and in some cases also later in the procedure. Thirteen countries reported that recording is done subsequently, and nine reported that recording occurs only after investigation. It is difficult to interpret the impact of these findings on the statistics, but it seems that 'as soon as' 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 inquiry has been completed. This might explain some of the differences in levels between countries, especially for offences such as homicide and bodily injury.

The rules for recording both multiple and serial offences vary between countries. For example, 16 countries stated that they apply a principal offence rule and 20 stated they do not. In addition, multiple offences are counted as two or more offences in 20 countries but as one offence in 15 countries. Most countries, 31, count an offence committed by more than one person as one offence.

In total 38 countries answered one or more questions regarding offenders, whilst eight countries were not able to provide any data. Not all countries providing data were able to answer questions regarding definitions of persons suspected. In general, most countries include all persons under suspicion, persons who are interrogated as suspects, persons arrested, cautioned and persons who are accused, charged, or later indicted. Sixteen of the countries also reported that they include minors in statistics regarding suspected persons. Twelve countries provided data that is collected at the same time as the data on offences is collected, indicating that the labelling of the offender is done by the police. Five countries reported that the data was collected at a later stage and one country reported mixed methods.

Whilst many countries answered the question on the number of police officers and civilians working within the police, few were able to meet the standard definition.

Trends in both recorded crime and suspected offenders over the years 2011–2016 vary from one type of offence to another. But in general, the majority of countries are reporting a decrease in number of offences per 100 000 population. This applies mostly to homicide and bodily injury and financial offences excluding fraud. Fraud and cyber fraud are the only offences that the majority of countries are reporting an increase in numbers per 100 000 population.

1.1.6 Comments by offences

Police statistics contain tables on offences and perpetrators, both on the total number of offences and offenders and information regarding 24 crime categories, including information regarding the number of homicides and robberies committed with firearms. Additionally, information on police staff is included.

Total offences

Of participating countries 80% were able to provide data on total offences. Most of the countries were able to follow the guidelines of which offences they should include or exclude. Still there are large differences between countries in the number of total criminal offences, even when traffic offences are excluded. This indicates large variations in how police data is defined e.g., in how large-scale traffic offences are included in police statistics. It also indicates variations in definitions that many of the countries with the highest number of total offences per 100 000 population do not report the highest number of suspected offenders. This for example applies to Sweden. Still there is some correlation between the number of offences per 100 000 and number of suspected offenders.

Around 54% of the countries providing data, show a decrease in the number of total offences between 2011 and 2016 and 22% show an increase in the same period. About 24% of countries show stability when the number of total offences in 2016 is compared with the number of total offences in 2011 per 100 000 population. The largest reductions are reported in countries in the Eastern part of Europe e.g., Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Estonia, and Slovenia.

The same pattern emerges when looking at changes in the number of suspected offenders since 59% of countries that could provide data are reporting a decrease between 2011 and 2016 per 100 000 population.

Major road traffic offences

More than half of the countries report a decrease in the number of major road traffic offences per 100 000 population between the years 2011 and 2016. In 2010 changes were made to a series of traffic offences in Greece downgrading them from misdemeanour to minor offences. This can possibly explain the steep decline in number of reported major road traffic offences there.

Wide variations were found in a number of reported major road traffic offences with a number of Nordic countries reporting highest values (over 700 offences per 100 000 population) as well as Belgium.

Intentional homicide (attempts and completed)

Roughly 83% of the countries asked provided data for this category in 2016. The majority of the countries reported a decrease in the number of cases per 100 000 population, both in the regard of completed cases and including attempts. About

18% of the countries show an increase in number of intentional homicides both completed and including attempts compared to 2011. The largest increase is in Ukraine but in the same period there is a decrease in the number of suspected offenders there. This increase in number of intentional homicide is due to a new Criminal Procedural Code of Ukraine that came into force in 2012.

The large decrease shown for Norway is due to the terrorist attacks of Anders Breivik in 2011 which are included in the figures for intentional homicide that year.

Bodily injury

The majority of countries report a decrease in the number of bodily injury cases and aggravated bodily injury cases registered by the police in 2016 compared to 2011. There are large differences in the number of cases per 100 000 population reported but many of the countries reporting the highest number of cases report that they cannot exclude assaults only causing pain from the number of bodily injury cases. This applies for example to Belgium, Finland, Romania, and Sweden (who report the highest number of cases per 100 000 population for bodily injury).

Sexual Assault

Most countries can provide information regarding sexual assault, the majority showing an increase in the number of reported cases to the police between 2011 and 2016. The variation in the number of cases per 100 000 population is large, ranging from less than five cases in many countries in the Eastern part of Europe such as Ukraine, Montenegro, Armenia, Albania, and Serbia to over 100 cases per 100 000 population in UK: England & Wales, UK: Scotland, Sweden, UK: Northern Ireland and in Iceland. Results for reported rape are similar, showing 44% of the countries reporting an increase in the number of registered cases but large differences in numbers per 100 000 population from less than one case in countries in Eastern Europe to more than 20 and to the maximum of 68 cases per 100 000 population in Northern parts of Europe.

Sexual abuse of a child

Thirty countries provided data on sexual abuse of a child. Most of them were not able to follow the standard definitions, for example many were not able to exclude verbal abuse i.e., via the internet and/ or include attempts. Of the countries providing data 12 reported an increase in the number of cases per 100 000 population between 2011 and 2016 and the same number of countries reported a decrease. A large increase is reported in UK: England & Wales due to changes in the legislation and new offences being added.

Robbery

Close to 96% of the countries provided data regarding reported robbery, more than 79% reporting a decrease between 2011 and 2016. As with most other types of offences the variation of the number of offences per 100 000 population is large, from under 10 cases per 100 000 in Albania, Azerbaijan, Malta, and Russia (reporting a large decrease between 2012 and 2013) to more than 100 per 100 000 population in Portugal, Spain, France, and Belgium. The mean rate is 41 robberies per 100 000 population.

Half of the countries provided data regarding robbery with firearm, most of them (89%) reporting more than 10 percent decrease between 2011 and 2016 per 100 000 population.

Theft

Here the standard definition of theft is “depriving a person or organization of property with the intent to keep it”. Included are minor thefts, thefts committed by means of burglary, theft of motor vehicles and thefts by employees. Attempts are also included here. Excluded are robberies, fraud, and handling with stolen goods.

A large majority of the countries were able to follow the definitions, with the exception of those countries that exclude either minor thefts and/or attempts. This can partly explain large variations in the number of thefts per 100 000 population, ranging from five cases per 100 000 population in Albania to 5.025 cases in Sweden. But definitions cannot fully explain these large differences since for example those both countries report that they were able to follow the definitions.

In total close to 70% of countries showed a decrease in number of cases between 2011 and 2016. Five countries report an increase in the number of thefts during the period, Armenia showing the greatest increase (45%), followed by Azerbaijan (35%) and Belgium (27%), Ukraine (20%) and Greece (17%).

Only 37% of countries were able to provide data on aggravated theft, most of them reporting a decrease (59%) in the number of cases between 2011 and 2016 per 100 000 population. Only three countries reported an increase in the period, Albania, Armenia, and Greece but in all instances the figures are very low, or the growth is not linear during the period.

When asking specifically on theft of a motor vehicle, it is obvious that number of cases is going down in most countries in Europe since 84% of those countries that could provide data reported so (87% of countries provided data). Only two countries reported an increase in the number of cases between 2011 and 2016 and four showed a stable situation. Despite clear development it is obvious that there are large deviations in how motor vehicle theft is defined, for example “joy ride” is not included in many instances as is theft of motor vehicle parts included in many countries.

Burglary and domestic burglary

Approximately 70% of the countries provided data for cases of theft by means of burglary with 77% of them reporting a decrease and only three countries reporting an increase between the years 2011 and 2016. There are large variations in the number of cases ranging from less than 100 cases per 100 000 population in Albania, Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, and Moldova to more than 600 cases per 100 000 in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Netherlands, Sweden, and UK: England & Wales. Variations in definitions can explain these differences but only partly.

The majority of countries also report a decline in the number of thefts by means of domestic burglary between 2011 and 2016, or more than 59% of countries that were able to provide data. Nine countries reported an increase and five a stable situation during this period.

Fraud

At the same time as many countries report a decline in reported theft and burglary, reported incidents of fraud are increasing. Little more than 55% of countries reported an increase in the number of frauds reported to the police between 2011 and 2016 per 100 000 population but only 24% reported a decrease. The increase might indicate a growth in cyber fraud but 79% of those countries that were able to provide data report an increase (more than 10% increase between 2011 and 2016 per 100 000 population). There are huge variations in the number of reported cases, with the lowest numbers in the Eastern part of Europe and the highest numbers in the Northern part (Sweden, Denmark, Germany, and Belgium reporting the highest numbers).

Forgery of documents

Of the countries asked, 61% provided data, the majority of them (59%) reporting a decrease in the number of cases per 100 000 population between 2011 and 2016 and seven countries reporting an increase. Fourteen countries gave information regarding suspected offenders of forgery of documents. Six of these countries reported that foreign nationals were more than 50% of those suspected of forgery of documents in 2016.

Money Laundering

Money laundering is defined as “specific financial transactions to conceal the identity, source, and/or destination of money or non-monetary property deriving from criminal activities”. Even though there has been an emphasis on harmonising criminal penalties for money laundering within the EU only little more than half of the countries were able to provide data on money laundering, 58% of them reported an increase between 2011 and 2016.

Corruption in the public sector

Of the 28 countries that provided data roughly 44% reported an increase in the number of cases per 100 000 population between 2011 and 2016. Eight countries reported a decrease of cases in the period and seven a stable situation.

Drug offences

Most countries were able to provide data on drug offences. It is very interesting to see the large differences between countries regarding trends in the number of drug offences between 2011 and 2016 per 100 000 population with 15 countries reporting an increase, 12 a decrease and 12 reporting a stable situation. There are also large differences in the number of cases per capita. Ranging from 22 cases per 100 000 population in Romania to 1000 cases in Switzerland with the mean of 230 cases in 2016.

The same picture emerges when looking at the number of drug trafficking offences. From 2011 to 2016, 42% of countries report an increase, 32% a decrease and a quarter report a stable situation.

Trends

Table 1.a summarises trends (i.e., percentage changes between 2011 and 2016 per 100 000 population) in police data by types of offences. The table shows a general trend towards a decline in the number of offences that are reported by the countries here since more than half of countries reported a decline in 15 of the offences reported here.

Table 1.a: Trends in police data (percentage change of the rates between 2011 and 2016 per 100 000 population)

	Total offences	Major traffic offences	Intentional homicide	IH with firearm	IH-completed	Bodily injury	Aggravated bodily injury	Sexual assault	Rape	Child abuse	Robbery	Robbery with firearm	Theft	Aggravated theft	Theft of a motor vehicle	Burglary	Domestic burglary	Fraud	Cyber fraud	Drug offences	Trafficking	Forgery	Money laundering	Corruption
Albania	↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Armenia	↓	↓	↓	...	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Austria	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Azerbaijan	↓	↓	↓
Belgium	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Bosnia-Herzegovina	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Bulgaria	↓	↓	↓
Croatia
Cyprus	...	↓	↓	...	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Czech Republic	↓	↓	↓
Denmark	↓	...	↓	...	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Estonia	↓	↓	↓
Finland	↓	↓	↓
France	↓	...	↓	...	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Georgia	↓	↓	↓
Germany	↓	...	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Greece	↓	↓	↓
Hungary	↓	↓	↓
Iceland	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Ireland	...	↓	↓
Italy	...	↓	↓
Kosovo
Latvia	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Lithuania	↓	...	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	↓	↓	↓
Montenegro	↓	↓	↓
Netherlands	↓	↓	↓
North Macedonia	↓	↓	↓
Norway	↓	↓	↓
Poland	↓	↓	↓
Portugal	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Romania	↓
Russian Federation	↓	↓	↓
Serbia
Slovakia	↓
Slovenia	↓
Spain	↓	↓	↓
Sweden	↓	...	↓	...	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
Switzerland	↓	↓	↓
Turkey
Ukraine
UK:England	↓	↓	↓
UK:Northern Ireland	↓	↓
UK:Scotland	↓	...	↓

- ... No data available
- ↑ More than 10% increase
- ↓ More than 10% decrease
- ↔ Between -10% and 10% change

1.1.7 Police staff

The ratio of police officers (excluding civilians) per 100 000 population is here referred to as police density. Table 1.b shows the distribution of police density in 2016. As shown most countries report between 300 and 399 police officers per 100 000 population but the rate was from 58 police officers in Romania per 100 000 population to 573 officers in Cyprus.

In total the mean police density was 337 police officers per 100 000 population. Eleven countries reported police density below 300 and eight above 399.

Table 1.b. Number of police officers excluding civilians per 100 000 population (police density) in 2016

Under 200	200-299	300-399	400-499	500 and over
Denmark	Estonia	Albania	Croatia	Cyprus
Finland	Lithuania	Belgium	Italy	Georgia
Iceland	Netherlands	Czech Republic	Latvia	Malta
Romania	Poland	France	North Macedonia	
	Sweden	Germany	Portugal	
	Switzerland	Hungary		
	Ukraine	Slovenia		
	UK: England & Wales	Spain		
		Turkey		
		UK: Northern Ireland		
		UK: Scotland		

In 2016 20 countries were able to provide information on the number of civilian employees in the police force. The share of civilians was the highest in Sweden and England & Wales but lowest in Malta and Portugal. From the countries providing data, it is most common that the percentage of civilians is between 20 and 39%.

Table 1.c. Percentage of civilian police staff (officers and civilians) in 2016

Under 10%	10%-19%	20%-29%	30%-39%	40% or more
Malta	France	Belgium	Denmark	Sweden
Portugal	Germany	Croatia	Estonia	UK: England & Wales
	Netherlands	Czech Republic	Finland	
	Slovenia	Lithuania	Hungary	
	Ukraine	Poland	Iceland	
			UK: Northern Ireland	
			Ireland	

1.2 Tables

1.2.1 Offences

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

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	606.9	712.6	787.4	1079.6	1242.8	1175.7	93.7
Armenia	507.9	481.8	633.5	603.8	566.1	625.8	23.2
Austria	6447.7	6517.8	6464.8	6202.5	6032.3	6181.2	-4.1
Azerbaijan	266.3	237.1	239.2	259.6	280.6	274.2	3.0
Belgium	9665.5	9391.9	8958.6	8742.8	8191.4	7857.2	-18.7
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1745.1	1645.3	1675.9	1573.4	1555.6	1450.6	-16.9
Croatia
Cyprus	1005.3	926.6	819.9	796.4	698.3
Czech Republic	3024.6	2898.8	3094.0	2745.9	2349.8	2067.1	-31.7
Denmark	8394.2	7898.5	7662.4	7217.8	6865.1	7033.3	-16.2
Estonia	3201.3	3079.9	3002.0	2871.7	2477.4	2202.7	-31.2
Finland	8525.2	7876.3	7827.7	7666.1	7552.1	7503.2	-12.0
France	5549.6	5479.0	5509.2	5548.9	5540.2	5504.0	-0.8
Georgia	721.8	861.3	1063.5	813.4	941.0	967.6	34.0
Germany	7467.6	7465.7	7403.6	7530.3	7796.6	7754.8	3.8
Greece	1744.4	1752.1	1815.8	1740.8	1815.0	1903.0	9.1
Hungary	4520.2	4754.7	3813.1	3336.7	2842.2	2957.9	-34.6
Iceland	17905.7	19349.8	16546.2	20277.8	21385.3	25794.1	44.1
Ireland
Italy	4654.3	4746.0	4845.7	4627.9	4420.1	4100.2	-11.9
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	2486.4	2440.6	2350.1	2422.1	2386.9	2317.9	-6.8
Lithuania	2605.1	2746.4	2850.5	2815.5	2476.4	2045.1	-21.5
Luxembourg
Malta	3443.2	3741.4	4165.1	3878.0	3897.7	3840.5	11.5
Moldova	986.5	1028.6	1072.0	1174.5	1119.0	1124.5	14.0
Montenegro	991.7	939.4	950.1	917.3	843.4	774.8	-21.9
Netherlands	7244.1	6903.3	6588.7	6094.3	5792.4	5479.1	-24.4
North Macedonia	1435.3	1453.5	1472.4	1343.5	1193.6	1195.2	-16.7
Norway	7725.0	7895.8	7691.2	7284.8	6802.7	6456.2	-16.4
Poland	3045.7	2941.9	2788.1	2282.8	2104.4	1971.3	-35.3
Portugal	3939.6	3861.0	3609.8	3386.2	3442.8	3209.4	-18.5%
Romania	3630.6	3442.7	3295.9	3225.8	3156.4	2933.5	-19.2
Russian Federation
Serbia	1397.3	1346.7	1584.3	1443.0	1389.4	1326.8	-5.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	4327.5	4448.1	4557.6	4244.1	3335.6	2983.0	-31.1
Spain	2394.2	2374.5	2260.8	2155.5	2358.9	2118.9	-11.5
Sweden	15041.9	14790.8	14671.4	14969.1	15423.7	15330.4	1.9
Switzerland	8804.9	9433.1	9027.0	8097.6	7649.0	7119.9	-19.1
Turkey	...	2083.3	2168.6
Ukraine	1131.3	976.1	1242.1	1169.5	1321.8	1391.4	23.0
UK: England & Wales	7198.0	6698.6	6517.3	6565.5	7633.2	8232.4	14.4
UK: Northern Ireland	5622.4	5404.5	5515.4	5605.9	5666.7	5263.5	-6.4
UK: Scotland	6099.1	5912.9	5125.2	5056.4	4771.1	4556.1	-25.3
<i>Mean</i>	4618	4536	4401	4414	4350	4460	
<i>Median</i>	3537	3443	3296	3281	2999	2958	
<i>Minimum</i>	266	237	239	260	281	274	
<i>Maximum</i>	17906	19350	16546	20278	21385	25794	

Table 1.2.1.2 Offences per 100 000 population – Major road traffic offences

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	26.5	28.1	17.4	21.6	23.3	25.0	-5.6
Armenia	29.2	29.3	36.3	29.1	28.1	23.3	-20.1
Austria	424.8	399.7	376.9	354.0	361.1	362.2	-14.8
Azerbaijan	31.7	31.3	30.4	27.8	23.1	20.7	-34.8
Belgium	1228.4	1036.4	1131.6	1166.6	1034.0	1049.3	-14.6
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	204.6	187.9	177.9	175.1	154.6	203.3	-0.7
Croatia
Cyprus	63.6	61.3	45.7	51.2	44.9	47.2	-25.9
Czech Republic	63.8	64.6	60.0	61.8	62.9	61.6	-3.4
Denmark
Estonia	286.8	280.2	279.1	252.8	305.2	283.9	-1.0
Finland	996.7	879.9	825.6	828.0	815.2	809.1	-18.8
France
Georgia	61.6	68.4	87.5	76.9	85.3	83.8	36.1
Germany
Greece	39.5	64.6	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.5	-96.2
Hungary	140.2	131.7	149.4	178.6	179.5	201.7	43.9
Iceland	684.6	656.8	676.7	545.9	562.1	776.8	13.5
Ireland	206.0	186.7	156.9	149.9	147.3	155.8	-24.3
Italy	2.2	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	-12.7
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	34.8	34.9	32.9	33.5	34.7	29.1	-16.4
Lithuania	46.1	45.1	43.0	44.4	40.6	36.4	-21.1
Luxembourg
Malta	374.4	418.2	389.1	411.2	...
Moldova	28.9	27.6	25.1	23.9	24.8	23.8	-17.8
Montenegro	106.6	78.5	102.6	94.9	96.0	106.1	-0.5
Netherlands	880.8	818.5	782.7	725.8	678.9	676.4	-23.2
North Macedonia	163.8	137.4	138.7	124.2	124.7	127.7	-22.0
Norway	991.1	1029.9	985.6	988.6	933.9	927.7	-6.4
Poland	432.4	386.8	370.9	229.0	201.4	194.0	-55.1
Portugal	402.7	409.5	367.4	308.4	335.7	304.8	-24.3%
Romania	206.7	171.4	210.6	185.6	206.4	197.1	-4.6
Russian Federation
Serbia	123.6	116.0	120.5	114.1	116.6	121.0	-2.1
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	144.4	127.4	118.2	110.5	99.0	94.6	-34.5
Sweden	822.4	757.8	764.8	858.8	820.8	805.0	-2.1
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine	30.3	30.6	43.5	54.6	56.2	61.4	102.6
UK: England & Wales	6.7	6.1	6.4	6.7	7.6	8.9	33.5
UK: Northern Ireland	44.1	42.9	43.7	43.7	49.3	44.0	-0.4
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	280	260	260	251	244	251	
<i>Median</i>	132	122	121	114	117	121	
<i>Minimum</i>	2	2	1	1	2	2	
<i>Maximum</i>	1228	1036	1132	1167	1034	1049	

Table 1.2.1.3 Offences per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	11.5	11.8	11.3	8.8	6.7	7.1	-38.4
Armenia	2.7	2.3	2.5	2.8	2.9	3.4	24.7
Austria	2.2	2.3	2.0	1.3	1.6	1.7	-23.0
Azerbaijan	11.9	11.9	12.2	11.2	9.1	7.9	-33.5
Belgium	9.7	9.4	9.1	9.5	9.9	9.3	-4.7
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.2	-14.4
Croatia
Cyprus	2.5	3.6	2.2	2.3	2.7	2.1	-15.2
Czech Republic	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.3	-22.0
Denmark	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.4	4.4	20.0
Estonia	7.5	6.0	4.7	4.2	3.8	3.3	-55.5
Finland	8.2	8.5	6.9	8.1	7.6	7.4	-9.2
France	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.9	4.8	5.2	43.9
Georgia	8.9	10.2	7.2	4.5	6.3	5.4	-39.5
Germany	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.7	3.0	8.7
Greece	2.0	2.1	3.3	2.7	2.6	2.1	7.4
Hungary	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.4	1.9	2.0	-26.5
Iceland	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.1	1.2	2.1	11.7
Ireland	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.8	-14.8
Italy	3.3	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.4	-25.7
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	4.4	5.6	3.7	4.2	4.4	3.4	-22.4
Lithuania	6.9	6.6	6.3	5.9	6.5	5.6	-19.4
Luxembourg	15.8	16.0	12.3	13.4	...
Malta	2.2	3.8	1.7	2.6	1.1	1.3	-38.6
Moldova	6.1	6.3	6.0	4.8	5.0	5.1	-16.4
Montenegro	3.4	2.6	1.4	3.1	2.7	3.9	13.9
Netherlands	25.4	23.3	21.0	20.0	19.2	18.4	-27.6
North Macedonia	3.4	2.3	3.5	3.6	2.9	2.2	-35.2
Norway	2.3	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.5	0.5	-77.0
Poland	2.2	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.5	1.4	-34.0
Portugal
Romania	1.8	2.1	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.3	-28.3
Russian Federation
Serbia	4.2	4.3	4.9	4.0	3.3	3.6	-12.7
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.7	1.2	0.6	-28.3
Spain	2.6	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.4	-8.1
Sweden	9.8	9.2	8.5	9.1	9.8	10.0	2.0
Switzerland	2.9	2.9	2.6	2.1	2.4	2.8	-4.7
Turkey	4.2	4.2
Ukraine	5.5	4.6	13.1	25.5	19.4	14.2	158.5
UK: England & Wales	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.9	2.2	2.5	32.6
UK: Northern Ireland	7.6	6.8	7.4	7.7	6.5	5.4	-29.4
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	4.9	4.8	5.0	5.1	4.7	4.5	
<i>Median</i>	3.3	3.3	3.1	2.9	2.8	3.2	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.5	
<i>Maximum</i>	25.4	23.3	21.0	25.5	19.4	18.4	

Table 1.2.1.4 Offences per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide: Firearm involved

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia
Austria	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	-8.3
Azerbaijan
Belgium	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.7	-27.7
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	...	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	...
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	16.1
Greece
Hungary	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-46.5
Iceland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	-100.0
Luxembourg	0.2
Malta	0.2	1.7	0.9	1.2	0.7	0.0	-100.0
Moldova	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	-15.1
Montenegro	2.3	1.5	0.8	1.9	1.6	2.6	13.9
Netherlands
North Macedonia	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.2	-70.8
Norway
Poland	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	-24.8
Portugal
Romania	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-77.3
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.9	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.3	-61.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	-75.2
Spain	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4	14.4
Sweden
Switzerland	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.6	-1.3
Turkey
Ukraine	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.5	0.2	-13.1
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	
<i>Median</i>	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	2.3	1.7	0.9	1.9	1.6	2.6	

Table 1.2.1.5 Offences per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide completed

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	4.2	4.3	3.7	3.4	1.9	2.5	-41.2
Armenia	1.8	1.5	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.2	19.7
Austria	1.0	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.6	-41.0
Azerbaijan	11.0	11.0	11.5	10.4	8.3	7.2	-34.6
Belgium	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.9	2.0	1.5	-21.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina	1.3	1.6	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.2	-2.7
Bulgaria	1.7	1.9	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.1	-34.8
Croatia
Cyprus	1.0	2.2	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.3	36.1
Czech Republic
Denmark	1.0	0.9	0.8	1.1	1.0	1.0	-0.8
Estonia	4.9	4.8	3.9	3.2	3.4	2.5	-48.7
Finland	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.1	1.8	-29.1
France	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.4
Georgia	2.3	2.4	3.0	2.4	3.0	3.1	34.3
Germany	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	5.8
Greece	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.0	0.9	0.8	-16.5
Hungary	1.4	1.1	1.4	1.3	1.0	1.0	-27.8
Iceland	0.9	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.9	0.3	-68.1
Ireland
Italy	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	-28.8
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	3.5	5.0	2.2	2.1	1.5	1.6	-52.6
Latvia
Lithuania	6.2	6.0	5.8	5.3	5.2	4.9	-20.6
Luxembourg	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.7	0.7	0.9	11.0
Malta	0.7	2.4	1.4	1.4	0.9	1.1	53.6
Moldova	4.7	4.7	4.4	3.6	3.6	3.8	-17.7
Montenegro
Netherlands	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.6	-34.6
North Macedonia	1.4	1.4	1.0	1.2	1.1	0.8	-42
Norway	2.3	0.5	0.9	0.6	0.5	0.5	-77.0
Poland	1.6	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.9	-42.8
Portugal	1.1	1.4	1.2	1.0	1.0	0.7	-33.6
Romania	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.2	-24.1
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.7	1.5	1.8	1.6	1.3	1.5	-9
Slovak Republic	1.8	1.4	1.4	1.3	0.9	1.1	-38
Slovenia	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.4	-34
Spain	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.6	-23
Sweden	0.9	0.7	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.1	25
Switzerland	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.5	-8
Turkey	1.5	1.7
Ukraine	10.9	7.5	4.3	...
UK: England & Wales	0.9	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.2	30
UK: Northern Ireland	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.4	1.1	0.9	-31
UK: Scotland	2.3	2.3	1.7	2.0	2.0	1.5	-35
<i>Mean</i>	2.0	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.6	
<i>Median</i>	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.1	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.6	0.0	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.3	
<i>Maximum</i>	11.0	11.0	11.5	10.9	8.3	7.2	

Table 1.2.1.6 Offences per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide completed: Firearm involved

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia
Austria	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	-23.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	-38.1
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.0
Croatia
Cyprus	0.4	1.4	0.7	0.3	0.7	0.7	98.0
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.3	-55.1
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	-49.2
Iceland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	-100.0
Luxembourg
Malta	0.0	1.0	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.0	...
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Poland
Portugal	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	-11.1
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	-46.7
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	-75.2
Spain	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-24.6
Sweden
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	-30.0
UK: Northern Ireland	0.2	0.3	0.1
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	...
<i>Median</i>	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	...
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
<i>Maximum</i>	0.7	1.4	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.7	...

Table 1.2.1.7 Offences per 100 000 population – Bodily injury

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	50.1	52.8	51.9	41.0	51.9	43.2	-13.8
Armenia	41.7	50.1	48.8	45.5	36.4	38.3	-8.0
Austria	482.2	491.5	467.5	442.6	440.5	462.3	-4.1
Azerbaijan
Belgium	777.1	713.1	681.6	684.0	663.3	657.8	-15.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina	17.0	16.1	16.3	17.0	28.9	29.8	75.6
Bulgaria	19.9	19.2	19.3	19.5	18.6	16.4	-17.4
Croatia
Cyprus	19.5	17.2	15.2	15.6	16.6	17.1	-12.5
Czech Republic	50.2	49.9	51.1	49.5	49.6	47.8	-4.7
Denmark	223.8	210.6	208.5	210.5	215.7	270.9	21.0
Estonia	413.6	444.7	456.5	439.0	470.5	461.0	11.5
Finland	747.3	707.8	654.5	604.0	619.1	615.4	-17.7
France	390.9	399.2	399.8	417.5	449.0	454.5	16.3
Georgia	9.1	89.1	96.0	86.8	122.5	123.6	1257.7
Germany	646.0	653.0	634.9	625.3	624.9	670.2	3.7
Greece	45.2	41.4	52.7	53.6	54.5	56.9	26.1
Hungary	142.6	140.9	135.2	136.7	127.9	118.1	-17.2
Iceland	89.2	95.8	91.3	100.1	100.0	89.6	0.5
Ireland
Italy	115.4	117.1	111.1	108.9	105.3	104.1	-9.8
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	208.6	210.8	35.8	44.9	21.8	20.5	-90.2
Latvia	58.7	59.6	58.2	60.7	45.4	60.7	3.4
Lithuania	134.5	345.7	412.8	395.3	385.2	371.1	175.8
Luxembourg
Malta	267.0	247.2	226.7	230.5	210.6	200.0	-25.1
Moldova	43.1	41.1	37.4	36.2	31.9	32.5	-24.7
Montenegro	64.9	76.9	73.3	57.0	52.6	52.2	-19.5
Netherlands	362.9	344.2	318.5	302.5	285.7	276.8	-23.7
North Macedonia	31.3	32.2	31.0	38.0	38.0	33.2	6.1
Norway	296.4	298.0	283.6	268.7	270.6	236.2	-20.3
Poland	137.9	131.5	121.5	105.4	88.9	92.6	-32.9
Portugal	565.0	529.7	521.9	517.7	505.2	507.5	-10.2%
Romania	496.3	505.3	455.0	603.3	608.5	635.7	28.1
Russian Federation	20.8	20.3	21.2	20.4	18.9	17.4	-16.0
Serbia	42.3	41.6	40.1	37.7	37.2	35.5	-16.2
Slovak Republic	41.3	40.4	37.3	36.7	35.7	30.7	-25.7
Slovenia	96.3	98.9	89.8	80.4	74.7	72.2	-25.0
Spain	39.3	37.1	35.7	36.1	41.0	37.3	-5.0
Sweden	1006.3	972.7	889.3	910.1	918.2	944.9	-6.1
Switzerland	121.0	117.2	113.1	103.1	97.1	100.4	-17.0
Turkey	323.4	351.1
Ukraine	28.7	25.1	128.8	99.7	95.2	83.4	190.7
UK: England & Wales	616.4	559.0	553.4	632.1	721.0	782.8	27.0
UK: Northern Ireland	55.0	61.9	57.1	63.8	69.9	62.9	14.3
UK: Scotland	103.6	88.3	68.4	61.1	58.9	74.1	-28.5
<i>Mean</i>	225	227	215	216	217	220	
<i>Median</i>	110	108	96	100	95	90	
<i>Minimum</i>	9	16	15	16	17	16	
<i>Maximum</i>	1006	973	889	910	918	945	

Table 1.2.1.8 Offences per 100 000 population – Aggravated bodily injury

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	5.8	5.4	5.6	4.6	5.9	4.1	-29.4
Armenia	5.2	5.2	6.4	7.4	5.7	6.7	28.0
Austria	46.5	47.9	44.2	42.8	40.3	43.6	-6.3
Azerbaijan	3.5	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.6	2.6
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.5	-4.9
Croatia
Cyprus	15.1	14.8	12.8	12.9	13.9	14.4	-4.9
Czech Republic	0.0	...
Denmark	30.5	29.7	26.8	27.2	25.8	30.4	-0.4
Estonia	7.8	7.5	7.5	5.9	7.5	7.1	-9.6
Finland	38.2	34.7	33.0	30.2	28.6	29.0	-24.0
France
Georgia	3.0	2.7	4.2	5.1	4.7	6.7	127.5
Germany	173.4	169.4	158.8	155.7	156.9	170.4	-1.7
Greece
Hungary	68.0	66.3	70.3	64.1	60.2	54.5	-19.9
Iceland	18.8	23.2	28.6	31.0	25.8	22.3	18.1
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	9.7	10.0	10.7	11.3	9.0	9.9	2.2
Lithuania	5.9	5.2	6.3	6.4	6.5	7.0	19.2
Luxembourg	132.8	132.4	108.0	97.0	...
Malta	38.8	35.2	41.4	31.7	36.6	36.4	-6.1
Moldova	36.9	34.6	29.9	28.2	25.1	24.5	-33.4
Montenegro	26.0	27.1	27.9	20.8	22.5	20.6	-20.8
Netherlands
North Macedonia	11.6	10.2	10.5	10.3	7.4	8.4	-28.1
Norway	15.2	14.3	13.1	10.4	10.6	9.6	-36.8
Poland	2.5	2.7	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.8	-28.7
Portugal	7.7	6.7	5.6	5.2	4.5	5.0	-34.4
Romania	144.9	140.8	127.6	125.7	140.2	153.7	6.1
Russian Federation
Serbia	18.2	18.2	18.1	16.1	16.1	14.9	-18.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	9.1	10.5	8.4	8.8	8.0	7.4	-18.7
Spain
Sweden	...	56.3	48.8	47.4	47.5	50.1	...
Switzerland	7.9	8.5	7.5	8.4	8.3	7.5	-5.0
Turkey
Ukraine	7.5	6.7	6.7	6.9	5.9	5.3	-29.8
UK: England & Wales	60.2	41.0	36.8	42.4	45.8	50.8	-15.7
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	88.5	68.6	61.3	59.2	74.6	77.5	-12.5
<i>Mean</i>	31	30	32	31	31	31	
<i>Median</i>	15	15	13	13	14	12	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	0	1	0	0	0	
<i>Maximum</i>	173	169	159	156	157	170	

Table 1.2.1.9 Offences per 100 000 population – Sexual assault

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	1.5	1.5	3.0	3.4	5.2	4.2	175.7
Armenia	2.2	3.2	4.0	3.3	4.0	3.9	80.8
Austria	44.8	45.1	42.2	39.7	38.0	48.3	7.8
Azerbaijan
Belgium	65.7	64.0	64.6	61.7	59.6	63.7	-3.2
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	7.5	8.0	7.6	7.6	7.0	6.1	-18.6
Croatia
Cyprus	7.9	5.6	4.0	4.7	4.6	0.0	-100.0
Czech Republic	13.9	13.5	13.6	13.7	13.9	13.2	-5.1
Denmark	25.3	25.4	23.6	24.6	28.5	43.7	72.4
Estonia	13.5	18.7	18.2	15.1	21.6	20.6	52.1
Finland	58.8	59.9	55.1	51.8	51.0	58.1	-1.1
France	64.3	65.4	65.6	69.4	73.0	75.8	17.9
Georgia	9.0	8.6	9.6	7.6	7.3	9.1	1.6
Germany	31.1	30.7	31.1	28.3	27.5	30.1	-3.3
Greece	5.2	6.6	13.3	10.7	10.4	11.1	113.8
Hungary	10.3	12.2	12.4	12.7	13.8	14.5	40.6
Iceland	89.5	85.4	140.4	98.3	108.8	102.5	14.6
Ireland	39.6	40.0	38.6	40.1	44.4	47.2	19.3
Italy	7.8	7.9	7.5	7.0	6.6	6.7	-14.2
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	17.7	14.8	11.8	13.7	12.7	10.5	-40.5
Luxembourg	66.5	65.3	58.3	72.7	...
Malta	23.4	26.6	27.0	23.1	28.2	24.9	6.4
Moldova	12.9	17.4	17.1	18.2	18.0	17.2	33.0
Montenegro	4.0	3.9	4.0	5.0	4.2	3.5	-12.3
Netherlands	39.7	39.1	36.1	35.1	33.3	37.7	-5.2
North Macedonia	6.1	5.8	7.3	6.5	5.8	5.5	-10.1
Norway	56.1	55.2	51.5	53.7	62.5	75.2	33.9
Poland	8.3	7.4	7.3	6.0	5.6	6.4	-23.4
Portugal	19.8	19.3	20.5	22.5	23.6	24	20.9
Romania	22.0	23.7	23.7	21.7	22.4	23.7	7.7
Russian Federation
Serbia	4.8	4.9	3.9	4.3	3.7	4.3	-8.8
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	16.7	14.7	15.5	10.7	8.9	11.9	-28.6
Spain	21.2	19.2	19.1	20.4	21.2	23.4	10.2
Sweden	161.4	159.2	166.1	193.5	169.3	189.1	17.1
Switzerland	49.9	46.7	47.1	46.4	46.0	47.7	-4.4
Turkey	16.1	18.1
Ukraine	...	2.7	2.5	2.0	1.8	2.1	...
UK: England & Wales	81.2	92.3	106.9	139.8	178.4	198.7	144.6
UK: Northern Ireland	87.2	106.0	122.0	148.3	163.6	169.2	94.0
UK: Scotland	126.3	138.5	144.4	160.9	177.9	190.1	50.4
<i>Mean</i>	34	35	38	39	41	45	
<i>Median</i>	20	19	20	21	22	24	
<i>Minimum</i>	2	2	2	2	2	0	
<i>Maximum</i>	161	159	166	194	178	199	

Table 1.2.1.10 Offences per 100 000 population – Rape

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.6	1517.7
Armenia	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.3	0.8	81.3
Austria	17.8	16.5	15.9	15.0	14.5	16.8	-5.2
Azerbaijan	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	14.0
Belgium	31.2	31.3	30.8	28.5	28.4	29.1	-6.7
Bosnia-Herzegovina	0.9	1.1	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.8	-12.4
Bulgaria	2.5	3.1	2.7	2.6	2.1	2.2	-14.6
Croatia
Cyprus	4.5	2.9	2.1	1.6	2.4	2.6	-42.7
Czech Republic	6.4	6.4	5.6	6.4	5.7	6.1	-4.5
Denmark	11.1	10.6	10.7	10.7	14.0	23.0	107.7
Estonia	6.8	10.8	10.2	11.2	12.2	11.6	68.8
Finland	19.3	18.7	18.0	18.5	19.2	21.1	9.4
France	17.3	17.9	18.4	19.7	20.7	22.9	32.1
Georgia	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.4	1.1	1.5	-12.2
Germany	10.2	10.7	9.6	9.8	9.2	9.7	-4.3
Greece	1.6	1.7	2.4	2.2	1.9	2.4	47.4
Hungary	2.0	1.9	5.1	4.0	4.2	4.1	109.4
Iceland	40.2	38.2	55.9	39.6	54.1	55.6	38.4
Ireland	9.8	10.0	8.5	10.3	11.1	10.9	11.7
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	1.3	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.6	18.2
Latvia	2.4	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.0	3.0	24.3
Lithuania	12.4	10.6	8.2	10.4	8.8	7.1	-43.0
Luxembourg	16.6	13.3	12.1	18.4	...
Malta	4.3	3.1	3.6	2.6	5.2	6.0	38.2
Moldova	8.2	10.1	9.8	9.9	8.5	9.1	11.9
Montenegro	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.3	-33.6
Netherlands	9.4	8.7	7.4	7.2	7.5	9.0	-4.4
North Macedonia	2.0	2.1	1.8	2.2	2.0	1.7	-12.8
Norway	35.7	35.1	33.5	33.6	38.4	45.1	26.0
Poland	4.3	3.9	3.7	3.4	3.1	3.8	-11.9
Portugal	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.6	3.2	-8.4
Romania	12.1	11.9	11.5	10.6	11.0	11.0	-9.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.9	0.9	0.7	-37.0
Slovak Republic	2.8	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.5	-45.7
Slovenia	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.1	2.0	1.6	-40.4
Spain	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.7	-17.0
Sweden	69.4	66.7	63.0	69.4	60.7	68.2	-1.7
Switzerland	7.0	7.2	7.1	6.8	6.5	7.1	0.7
Turkey
Ukraine	1.4	1.1	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.8	-40.7
UK: England & Wales	29.1	28.2	33.6	46.5	59.9	67.4	131.5
UK: Northern Ireland	30.5	29.3	30.1	40.0	42.0	44.1	44.7
UK: Scotland	21.3	24.0	27.4	33.8	35.4	33.5	56.8
<i>Mean</i>	11.0	10.8	11.3	11.7	12.4	13.5	
<i>Median</i>	4.5	3.9	5.3	5.2	5.5	6.1	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	
<i>Maximum</i>	69.4	66.7	63.0	69.4	60.7	68.2	

Table 1.2.1.11 Offences per 100 000 population – Sexual abuse of a child

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.8	0.5	51.7
Armenia
Austria	8.3	8.7	8.4	7.2	7.2	6.8	-17.6
Azerbaijan
Belgium	22.3	20.6	21.6	21.5	20.5	21.4	-4.2
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.1	-24.2
Croatia
Cyprus	...	1.2	0.6	0.8	1.3	0.0	...
Czech Republic	7.2	6.7	7.6	6.9	7.2	6.7	-7.1
Denmark	2.5	3.5	2.5	2.5	3.3	3.6	42.0
Estonia	3.4	4.4	3.9	1.9	2.4	4.3	25.7
Finland	31.3	29.0	30.5	26.0	22.4	22.6	-27.7
France	13.1	16.1	17.0	18.3	19.5	20.4	56.2
Georgia
Germany	9.2	9.3	8.5	8.3	8.1	8.2	-11.5
Greece
Hungary	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	1.1	51.7
Iceland	35.8	37.9	64.9	43.9	39.8	31.9	-11.0
Ireland	3.2	2.8	1.9	2.7	2.7	3.4	6.0
Italy	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	-8.3
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	4.3	3.8	3.3	2.8	3.7	3.3	-22.8
Luxembourg
Malta	6.7	5.7	6.4	6.8	7.3	4.4	-34.2
Moldova	5.2	7.6	7.3	8.7	9.8	8.4	60.2
Montenegro	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.2	-50.2
Netherlands
North Macedonia	1.7	1.7	2.3	2.1	1.8	1.4	-14.9
Norway	16.0	14.9	13.8	15.9	21.3	35.5	121.3
Poland	4.0	3.5	3.6	2.6	2.5	2.6	-35.7
Portugal	7.4	7.4	8.2	9.7	10.1	9.5	27.7
Romania	7.0	8.7	8.8	9.7	9.9	10.8	55.4
Russian Federation
Serbia	2.2	2.4	1.9	2.1	1.8	2.3	6.3
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	10.6	7.8	8.2	5.3	3.9	6.5	-38.9
Spain	2.1	1.8	2.0	2.4	3.1	2.9	40.6
Sweden	52.4	49.2	51.5	70.4	54.1	59.7	13.9
Switzerland	17.8	15.1	16.5	16.0	14.9	14.8	-17.1
Turkey	9.7	10.8
Ukraine	0.1	0.2
UK: England & Wales	30.0	31.5	37.1	58.1	62.2	73.5	145.0
UK: Northern Ireland	54.7	58.1	73.5	82.4	97.6	100.7	84.2
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	11.6	11.3	13.4	14.2	14.3	15.1	
<i>Median</i>	6.8	6.7	7.3	6.8	7.2	6.5	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	54.7	58.1	73.5	82.4	97.6	100.7	

Table 1.2.1.12 Offences per 100 000 population – Robbery

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	6.0	7.7	9.3	8.7	6.3	4.8	-19.3
Armenia	10.5	9.5	8.9	9.9	9.7	10.3	-2.6
Austria	48.5	48.7	44.2	40.9	39.8	35.7	-26.5
Azerbaijan	5.0	4.2	3.8	4.2	5.7	5.0	0.2
Belgium	248.6	231.2	205.6	196.1	199.3	181.1	-27.1
Bosnia-Herzegovina	25.4	26.3	31.1	29.4	0.0	30.0	18.1
Bulgaria	42.2	40.6	41.0	32.3	27.2	23.5	-44.3
Croatia
Cyprus	16.3	20.1	17.2	12.1	11.0	12.4	-24.1
Czech Republic	37.0	32.5	29.0	24.2	19.2	15.6	-57.9
Denmark	40.4	38.4	40.4	27.8	25.6	28.7	-28.8
Estonia	39.5	34.5	36.1	27.4	25.6	18.8	-52.3
Finland	30.2	29.9	28.1	31.0	28.3	30.5	1.0
France	193.8	198.4	200.0	182.9	168.2	160.6	-17.1
Georgia	16.7	18.4	26.2	16.9	21.3	15.3	-8.5
Germany	59.9	60.6	58.7	56.3	55.0	52.3	-12.6
Greece	40.9	35.2	50.1	39.5	44.0	47.6	16.5
Hungary	31.9	30.4	23.0	19.7	14.5	11.5	-63.9
Iceland	13.2	15.6	15.2	15.7	16.1	15.0	14.0
Ireland	61.9	58.3	58.7	54.6	51.8	41.4	-33.1
Italy	68.3	71.8	73.3	64.6	57.7	54.3	-20.6
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	35.1	29.2	28.0	24.5	15.8	16.3	-53.6
Latvia	51.1	47.1	45.3	40.4	39.2	33.1	-35.4
Lithuania	82.0	64.0	62.8	57.3	54.4	46.5	-43.3
Luxembourg	108.4	111.9	98.4	79.7	...
Malta	9.4	6.9	6.2	4.7	8.6	5.6	-40.9
Moldova	32.3	33.0	32.1	31.7	28.0	29.0	-10.2
Montenegro	21.0	17.7	24.6	29.0	22.7	19.3	-8.0
Netherlands	93.6	89.3	79.6	62.1	57.6	52.9	-43.4
North Macedonia	24.9	22.8	22.7	14.8	13.4	12.0	-52.0
Norway	33.0	29.8	33.0	20.8	18.0	15.5	-52.9
Poland	40.3	37.5	35.6	22.8	18.7	17.9	-55.6
Portugal	193.2	176.5	159.1	150.3	149.6	129.1	-33.2%
Romania	30.3	32.6	24.9	22.5	21.1	19.6	-35.4
Russian Federation	89.4	76.9	11.4	10.0	9.5	7.9	-91.2
Serbia	48.3	52.9	53.6	45.2	42.6	34.2	-29.1
Slovak Republic	15.8	18.0	15.4	12.6	9.9	9.7	-38.6
Slovenia	23.6	23.0	22.0	17.7	14.1	13.6	-42.3
Spain	188.0	206.3	184.1	152.3	139.0	135.6	-27.9
Sweden	103.2	97.2	87.5	86.7	86.8	86.9	-15.8
Switzerland	66.5	76.4	67.5	49.2	39.8	36.9	-44.5
Turkey	13.1	13.8
Ukraine	50.4	43.4	50.0	45.4	51.7	63.9	26.8
UK: England & Wales	137.6	119.2	104.4	89.9	87.6	95.6	-30.5
UK: Northern Ireland	67.3	55.6	52.4	47.8	39.5	35.1	-47.9
UK: Scotland	48.2	42.2	34.4	28.0	27.9	24.6	-49.1
<i>Mean</i>	58	55	53	47	44	41	
<i>Median</i>	40	36	36	30	28	29	
<i>Minimum</i>	5	4	4	4	0	5	
<i>Maximum</i>	249	231	206	196	199	181	

Table 1.2.1.13 Offences per 100 000 population – Robbery: Firearm involved

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	3.2	3.4	3.3	1.5	1.7	0.5	-84
Armenia
Austria	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.2	2.5	1.9	-24
Azerbaijan
Belgium	16.3	14.7	12.0	11.8	11.7	10.3	-37
Bosnia-Herzegovina	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Bulgaria	1.4	1.4	1.2	0.9	0.6	0.6	-58
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France	10.0	9.5	9.4	8.3	7.9	6.3	-37
Georgia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Germany	4.3	3.9	3.1	2.7	2.7	2.3	-47
Greece	0.0	...
Hungary	1.5	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.8	0.3	-78
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Latvia
Lithuania	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	217
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	-100
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Poland	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3	-49
Portugal	16.5	16.9	14.4	8.8	8.8	6.8	-59
Romania	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-57
Russian Federation
Serbia	13.5	12.1	9.7	7.2	6.7	4.4	-67
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	1.3	1.2	1.8	1.5	0.9	0.7	-43
Spain	4.3	3.6	3.5	2.7	2.7	2.9	-33
Sweden	10.8	9.1	9.0	9.0	10.2	10.0	-8
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	4.5	3.8	3.3	2.9	2.6	2.8	-37
UK: Northern Ireland	30.5	22.3	20.5	19.7	15.0	14.0	-54
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	5.5	4.8	4.3	3.6	3.4	2.8	
<i>Median</i>	2.0	2.0	2.2	1.5	1.3	0.6	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	30.5	22.3	20.5	19.7	15.0	14.0	

Table 1.2.1.14 Offences per 100 000 population – Theft

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	9.1	11.1	12.6	10.2	8.0	5.3	-41.6
Armenia	130.6	122.7	161.0	159.0	176.1	189.3	45.0
Austria	2833.5	2852.1	2913.0	2785.0	2589.1	2603.4	-8.1
Azerbaijan	55.1	45.9	55.0	61.8	66.1	74.1	34.5
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina	175.3	173.9	182.8	170.3	142.1	132.6	-24.3
Bulgaria	961.1	877.3	905.8	831.9	754.7	644.1	-33.0
Croatia
Cyprus	603.3	522.4	452.8	384.5	338.4	284.0	-52.9
Czech Republic	1754.1	1665.1	1787.3	1455.5	1131.8	942.3	-46.3
Denmark	5395.8	5087.4	4939.2	4396.9	3895.9	3815.2	-29.3
Estonia	1517.3	1405.7	1247.2	1196.1	863.5	682.6	-55.0
Finland	2813.7	2568.8	2605.6	2625.8	2532.5	2395.2	-14.9
France	2681.1	2700.3	2794.6	2824.5	2773.8	2745.5	2.4
Georgia	254.7	305.5	299.5	213.5	247.4	259.3	1.8
Germany	2991.6	2957.6	2906.3	3015.7	3053.3	2883.6	-3.6
Greece	885.7	820.6	1025.9	940.9	1008.4	1032.0	16.5
Hungary	1839.4	1875.0	1702.7	1445.2	1140.8	947.1	-48.5
Iceland	1916.5	1727.6	1613.8	1477.9	1612.0	1356.3	-29.2
Ireland	1677.3	1658.5	1701.3	1673.6	1618.9	1370.8	-18.3
Italy	2459.7	2560.2	2605.0	2588.3	2407.3	2219.8	-9.8
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	955.4	902.6	929.9	856.6	682.3	710.8	-25.6
Latvia	1258.0	1194.6	1123.9	1129.8	1097.8	1057.3	-16.0
Lithuania	1211.1	1076.8	1050.4	1061.2	882.6	783.1	-35.3
Luxembourg	2350.3	2469.4	2129.6	2111.2	...
Malta	2053.5	2081.2	2004.5	1909.1	1968.2	1958.4	-4.6
Moldova	422.9	401.6	432.0	470.2	432.1	435.6	3.0
Montenegro	307.7	361.1	305.2	296.5	283.9	217.4	-29.3
Netherlands	3976.9	3834.4	3798.1	3459.1	3191.4	2881.9	-27.5
North Macedonia	949.3	1002.4	1000.8	875.8	742.5	751.9	-20.8
Norway	3025.1	3132.5	2906.8	2603.6	2238.3	2017.8	-33.3
Poland	972.8	952.5	901.2	729.2	638.7	558.9	-42.6
Portugal	1612.4	1544.9	1420.2	1343.4	1236.0	1120.3	-30.5
Romania	1120.1	1214.6	1118.1	1042.7	964.4	833.5	-25.6
Russian Federation	727.0	693.6	558.8	558.3	771.6	510.1	-29.8
Serbia	657.9	643.2	871.3	749.2	660.4	595.1	-9.5
Slovak Republic	417.3	385.6	382.7	342.8	444.4	292.5	-29.9
Slovenia	2190.1	2362.0	2473.9	2149.4	1639.7	1555.1	-29.0
Spain	2775.7	2694.9	2678.1	2582.0	2402.3	2328.5	-16.1
Sweden	5700.6	5537.0	5490.6	5514.5	5346.1	5024.7	-11.9
Switzerland	3338.0	3551.3	3232.1	2860.4	2490.3	2254.2	-32.5
Turkey	247.4	279.6
Ukraine	608.8	530.3	535.1	501.3	640.2	733.0	20.4
UK: England & Wales	3639.9	3423.0	3286.6	3814.3	3026.3	3117.6	-14.3
UK: Northern Ireland	2054.2	1952.7	1968.8	1925.8	1843.2	1664.8	-19.0
UK: Scotland	2941.0	2904.6	2286.1	2306.5	2152.0	1931.4	-34.3
<i>Mean</i>	1724	1688	1698	1623	1494	1396	
<i>Median</i>	1517	1406	1412	1337	1132	1032	
<i>Minimum</i>	9	11	13	10	8	5	
<i>Maximum</i>	5701	5537	5491	5514	5346	5025	

Table 1.2.1.15 Offences per 100 000 population – Aggravated theft

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	102.2
Armenia	29	34	47	51	47	43	48.2
Austria	1097	1110	1151	1095	1005	988	-10.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	495	426	435	389	339	267	-46.0
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark	1921	1656	1599	1406	1277	1216	-36.7
Estonia
Finland	58	60	56	68	65	61	6.3
France
Georgia
Germany	1388	1367	1346	1384	1398	1318	-5.0
Greece	12	14	26	21	21	23	101.1
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	407	386	417	418	420	423	4.0
Montenegro	199	223	190	153	151	136	-31.6
Netherlands
North Macedonia	703	727	733	635	504	524	-25.4
Norway	985	1020	890	709	556	331	-66.4
Poland	411	389	359	314	279	240	-41.6
Portugal	681	571	512	467	401	367	-46.1
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	364	357	441	375	316	278	-23.6
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	735	760	821	719	539	560	-23.7
Spain
Sweden	1399	1323	1273	1301	1287	1238	-11.5
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	640	613	606	559	506	471	
<i>Median</i>	495	426	441	418	400	331	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	
<i>Maximum</i>	1921	1656	1599	1406	1398	1318	

Table 1.2.1.16 Offences per 100 000 population – Theft of a motor vehicle

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	21.0	23.3	19.7	13.9	9.6	10.4	-50.6
Armenia	1.6	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.6	0.6
Austria	78.1	66.7	74.5	61.0	59.0	55.0	-29.5
Azerbaijan
Belgium	176.2	155.4	141.9	141.2	133.0	117.3	-33.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina	28.4	34.6	38.8	39.1	37.3	30.4	7.0
Bulgaria	43.9	41.8	49.0	51.1	55.7	44.6	1.7
Croatia
Cyprus	...	34.7	24.5	20.0	17.6	29.2	...
Czech Republic	118.2	105.9	110.7	90.0	65.3	50.7	-57.1
Denmark	271.0	205.5	189.1	168.0	157.7	162.0	-40.2
Estonia	56.6	46.8	41.4	45.4	38.4	28.3	-49.9
Finland	222.9	163.2	146.7	142.6	135.9	122.1	-45.2
France	296.1	281.9	273.7	265.2	263.1	252.9	-14.6
Georgia	1.9	2.0	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.0	-45.5
Germany	97.9	87.8	108.9	79.6	76.5	72.6	-25.9
Greece
Hungary	88.4	92.8	73.6	60.2	41.9	30.4	-65.6
Iceland	121.8	90.7	64.6	102.6	123.4	114.9	-5.7
Ireland	229.3	184.7	159.6	167.4	138.0	102.5	-55.3
Italy	334.8	331.0	307.4	290.3	272.5	258.7	-22.7
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	24.2	17.5	21.2	12.2	15.5	16.7	-31.2
Latvia
Lithuania	64.3	62.5	55.4	47.8	43.5
Luxembourg	425.5	407.5	359.9	295.7	...
Malta	87.7	73.5	76.9	56.4	52.1	56.8	-35.2
Moldova	2.8	3.3	5.5	5.0	4.1	5.2	89.1
Montenegro	10.4	...
Netherlands	128.2	120.7	126.9	116.8	108.1	95.1	-25.9
North Macedonia	23.7	18.0	24.6	26.2	19.3	20.6	-13.1
Norway	189.4	159.5	131.3	128.9	103.8	85.7	-54.7
Poland	55.2	53.5	47.3	43.9	38.6	37.1	-32.7
Portugal	185.0	151.6	141.9	132.3	116.2	111.8	-39.5
Romania	17.3	14.7	10.9	10.4	9.9	10.3	-40.7
Russian Federation	35.2	37.0	36.0	34.9	30.9	24.1	-31.4
Serbia	41.2	33.4	33.4	29.0	26.0	23.1	-43.9
Slovak Republic	50.0	47.1	44.9	42.4	35.6	30.8	-38.4
Slovenia	44.4	47.5	54.9	48.7	38.6	35.2	-20.8
Spain	111.0	117.9	104.6	92.9	92.9	93.3	-15.9
Sweden	366.1	305.0	290.1	290.3	272.0	255.6	-30.2
Switzerland	100.3	101.0	76.5	79.2	75.2	71.3	-28.9
Turkey	37.3	41.5
Ukraine	10.3	11.4	15.0	27.9	26.8	28.7	179.1
UK: England & Wales	172.8	144.9	133.8	130.6	128.8	149.2	-13.6
UK: Northern Ireland	113.9	104.2	106.2	91.5	77.1	70.3	-38.3
UK: Scotland	343.6	302.0	223.2	227.5	209.2	179.7	-47.7
<i>Mean</i>	113	98	100	96	88	80	
<i>Median</i>	88	70	74	61	57	53	
<i>Minimum</i>	2	2	1	1	1	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	366	331	425	408	360	296	

Table 1.2.1.17 Offences per 100 000 population – Theft by means of burglary

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	35.6	44.6	38.0	32.9	27.4	21.0	-41.1
Armenia	74.2	59.0	72.6	80.4	83.6	83.8	13.0
Austria	1006.3	1013.8	1049.5	1004.8	922.0	925.3	-8.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium	887.5	925.1	897.2	862.8	789.2	670.7	-24.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina	380.4	340.7	336.1	296.5	82.5	77.9	-79.5
Bulgaria	275.1	229.0	235.6	211.5	167.1	142.0	-48.4
Croatia
Cyprus	402.4	342.6	309.1	271.9	230.0	198.9	-50.6
Czech Republic	569.0	528.8	593.2	469.0	327.2	267.4	-53.0
Denmark	1649.7	1450.2	1409.2	1237.5	1119.2	1053.7	-36.1
Estonia
Finland	480.9	450.0	422.3	453.5	450.8	448.3	-6.8
France	550.2	577.1	607.5	592.7	596.4	599.0	8.9
Georgia	30.9	35.0	38.1	32.2	36.1	41.0	32.7
Germany	525.1	535.6	543.3	552.3	571.4	526.6	0.3
Greece	500.3	453.0	211.4	229.2	231.0	230.3	-54.0
Hungary
Iceland	596.6	429.9	339.3	351.0	386.8	312.2	-47.7
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	423.8	387.2	419.7	402.6	315.3	336.1	-20.7
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg	414.9	603.1	478.9	368.4	...
Malta	410.6	333.4	316.7	291.3	313.9	252.4	-38.5
Moldova	26.5	25.2	31.1	35.0	26.4	35.3	33.5
Montenegro
Netherlands	1224.7	1205.1	1191.0	1042.2	967.5	864.8	-29.4
North Macedonia
Norway	365.5	348.8	311.6	291.5
Poland	356.3	335.5	311.4	270.4	240.3	203.3	-42.9
Portugal	494.1	418.1	368.2	333.6	284.2	254.1	-48.6
Romania
Russian Federation	220.0	193.3	174.3	166.5	181.4	165.2	-24.9
Serbia	320.7	302.1	386.5	334.6	283.2	245.6	-23.4
Slovak Republic	238.9	219.4	206.4	174.1	126.6	115.4	-51.7
Slovenia	668.0	686.3	746.5	660.0	496.9	518.7	-22.4
Spain	632.8	656.7	622.2	569.6	541.0	549.5	-13.2
Sweden	998.7	925.8	892.0	918.2	921.6	901.5	-9.7
Switzerland	665.5	768.5	708.2	643.0	514.9	444.0	-33.3
Turkey	136.5	160.0
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	912.0	827.7	785.3	730.5	691.7	692.5	-24.1
UK: Northern Ireland	583.1	525.4	495.5	485.6	473.8	382.6	-34.4
UK: Scotland	548.6	522.3	464.4	476.7	437.1	366.9	-33.1
<i>Mean</i>	521	493	483	458	416	384	
<i>Median</i>	493	430	415	403	357	324	
<i>Minimum</i>	26	25	31	32	26	21	
<i>Maximum</i>	1650	1450	1409	1237	1119	1054	

Table 1.2.1.18 Offences per 100 000 population – Theft by means of domestic burglary

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	33.7	42.6	44.0	57.3	48.1	42.3	25.6
Armenia	27.6	32.2	45.7	49.6	45.5	41.7	51.0
Austria	252.7	256.7	330.9	318.8	287.4	282.4	11.8
Azerbaijan
Belgium	636.7	683.0	677.7	650.4	597.4	499.7	-21.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina	4.1	...	34.4
Bulgaria	216.1	202.6	198.0	166.3	147.6	123.5	-42.8
Croatia
Cyprus	233.5	233.2	206.1	189.4	160.8	128.3	-45.1
Czech Republic	91.2	92.5	105.7	84.4	65.4	57.8	-36.7
Denmark	1047.9	953.8	924.2	819.0	731.9	698.8	-33.3
Estonia	210.0	205.1	161.5	157.5	126.4	100.9	-51.9
Finland	124.1	116.3	105.9	116.7	109.4	96.6	-22.2
France	349.6	376.2	393.3	367.7	365.6	378.6	8.3
Georgia	0.0	57.1	60.1	59.1	62.8	53.4	...
Germany	268.9	285.3	230.3	313.6	334.8	308.9	14.9
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	345.1	399.6	421.2	421.0	386.1	352.8	2.2
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	185.5	180.4	360.0	293.5	233.5	252.1	35.9
Latvia	108.5	116.6	106.3	108.0	...
Lithuania	133.7	117.4	109.9	113.5	102.7	92.0	-31.2
Luxembourg
Malta	229.4	240.5	183.9	217.0	161.9	171.4	-25.3
Moldova	59.3	54.8	74.2	78.5	88.0	114.9	93.9
Montenegro
Netherlands	652.4	670.6	662.1	554.8	509.7	437.3	-33.0
North Macedonia	2.1	2.0	1.9	2.4	1.6	1.9	-9.9
Norway	117.7	120.1	108.1	98.6
Poland	136.3	...	63.7	58.1	52.8	68.0	-50.1
Portugal	268.5	239.8	213.0	186.1	156.5	139.4	-48.1
Romania	68.6	77.2	69.6	69.8	60.4	54.2	-21.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	184.0	191.5	283.2	239.0	213.4	191.3	3.9
Slovak Republic	56.1	58.5	59.6	50.0	35.5	32.5	-42.0
Slovenia	141.0	157.3	218.3	197.9	168.6	171.6	21.7
Spain	216.0	270.0	272.7	259.7	248.2	244.0	13.0
Sweden	455.1	417.1	425.4	439.0	435.9	428.6	-5.8
Switzerland	158.0	158.2	146.8	139.7	123.3	114.9	-27.3
Turkey	64.5	72.5
Ukraine	54.7	47.2	38.5	42.0	50.0	63.9	16.8
UK: England & Wales	446.4	407.2	381.9	349.7	333.4	343.7	-23.0
UK: Northern Ireland	366.5	326.0	314.4	319.1	316.3	253.2	-30.9
UK: Scotland	472.0	455.8	403.8	416.5	383.5	326.3	-30.9
<i>Mean</i>	237	241	234	229	208	199	
<i>Median</i>	186	197	191	185	156	134	
<i>Minimum</i>	0	2	2	2	2	2	
<i>Maximum</i>	1048	954	924	819	732	699	

Table 1.2.1.19 Offences per 100 000 population – Fraud

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	11.6	16.0	19.4	18.9	13.6	19.8	70.7
Armenia	22.6	27.2	30.9	33.7	30.2	32.1	42.3
Austria	347.8	431.9	415.5	353.4	346.4	348.7	0.3
Azerbaijan	17.4	18.6	25.3	28.2	38.2	45.1	158.5
Belgium	134.9	200.4	193.4	199.6	211.7	210.4	56.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	34.2	31.2	40.0	44.7	56.5	50.4	47.5
Croatia
Cyprus	23.3	27.1	23.9	17.4	15.9	18.7	-19.7
Czech Republic	86.4	93.0	104.0	102.3	101.0	93.2	7.8
Denmark	179.7	168.2	214.3	282.3	534.5	665.8	270.6
Estonia	125.4	121.0	181.3	150.4	104.9	117.4	-6.4
Finland	331.0	387.8	420.8	431.4	466.5	456.8	38.0
France	315.5	254.4	281.3	284.0	303.8	319.0	1.1
Georgia	39.9	41.7	38.5	36.8	40.8	37.0	-7.3
Germany	795.3	817.4	812.7	800.4	790.8	701.3	-11.8
Greece	17.3	19.8	27.8	29.3	31.7	41.7	141.9
Hungary	279.5	371.6	376.9	337.8	324.4	441.3	57.9
Iceland	133.5	124.5	125.5	105.9	117.0	123.9	-7.2
Ireland	120.2	124.2	103.9	111.2	123.6	104.5	-13.1
Italy	178.0	196.6	235.6	219.2	238.5	249.7	40.2
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	179.5	165.8	186.4	201.6	153.6	107.7	-40.0
Luxembourg
Malta	64.8	86.0	148.2	100.1	106.9	111.0	71.3
Moldova	44.2	46.4	58.0	58.1	58.4	64.1	45.0
Montenegro	14.2	12.6	15.6	11.4	6.1	7.7	-45.7
Netherlands	153.6	165.1	130.9	117.2	221.4	266.0	73.1
North Macedonia	21.2	26.2	32.1	17.9	14.9	14.7	-30.5
Norway	269.0	285.2	287.0	279.3	339.1	409.9	52.4
Poland	261.7	242.1	264.3	288.7	316.6	269.3	2.9
Portugal	87.7	104.7	113.1	116.7	162.8	176.7	101.5
Romania	179.3	160.3	183.2	156.5	151.3	132.2	-26.3
Russian Federation
Serbia	26.0	21.3	34.5	31.9	33.6	30.6	17.7
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	161.6	202.4	214.6	186.3	141.8	136.4	-15.6
Spain	227.7	266.2	262.1	301.9	355.8	387.0	70.0
Sweden	1114.9	1243.1	1414.0	1495.1	1788.9	1976.6	77.3
Switzerland	138.7	159.2	162.2	122.1	131.2	128.4	-7.4
Turkey	4.6
Ukraine	52.8	51.3	103.9	92.7	107.4	108.0	104.8
UK: England & Wales	254.1	292.1	363.9	391.8	1066.1	1098.9	332.5
UK: Northern Ireland	152.1	200.8	199.9	206.0	120.4	170.2	11.9
UK: Scotland	169.5	167.3	167.0	151.2	128.7	136.9	-19.2
<i>Mean</i>	174	194	211	208	245	258	
<i>Median</i>	135	160	165	136	130	130	
<i>Minimum</i>	5	13	16	11	6	8	
<i>Maximum</i>	1115	1243	1414	1495	1789	1977	

Table 1.2.1.20 Offences per 100 000 population – Cyber fraud

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	2.9	2.8	3.7	6.1	4.2	6.1	110.6
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	39.2	105.7	87.1	99.0	113.6	114.7	192.7
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.7	1.5	1.6	507.2
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.3	1.7	2.9	6.4	6.7	6.0	370.9
Denmark	11.6	25.6	44.8	110.7	287.8	391.4	3264.0
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany	182.7	178.6	202.1	206.3	202.4	194.1	6.2
Greece
Hungary	2.5	14.2	22.1	34.7	...
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.1	-4.5
Montenegro	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Netherlands
North Macedonia	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.6	1091.9
Norway
Poland
Portugal	25.6	34.5	33.2	43.5	75.7	81.9	220.5
Romania	1.1	1.4	1.4	...
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.2	275.7
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	4.1	4.3	5.6	7.9	6.1	5.8	40.7
Spain	80.2	91.4	90.7	107.4	178.8	199.6	149.0
Sweden	370.5	461.0	612.3	688.6	935.7	1162.7	213.8
Switzerland	70.1	79.5	69.1	51.8	53.0	57.5	-18.0
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	52.6	65.7	72.2	79.1	111.1	132.8	
<i>Median</i>	4.1	4.3	4.7	7.9	6.7	6.1	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	370.5	461.0	612.3	688.6	935.7	1162.7	

Table 1.2.1.21 Offences per 100 000 population – Forgery of documents

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	24.2	23.5	18.4	19.1	22.3	28.1	15.9
Armenia
Austria	50.4	55.7	50.5	55.9	51.9	55.2	9.6
Azerbaijan
Belgium	10.2	15.4	13.1	12.2	10.6	8.4	-16.9
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus	81.1	68.0	43.2	32.8	41.4	27.9	-65.5
Czech Republic	6.7	7.0	6.1	7.6	7.2	9.3	39.3
Denmark	57.7	42.8	41.7	40.1	42.3	51.0	-11.6
Estonia	53.1	45.7	65.0	80.8	79.5	53.0	-0.2
Finland	90.4	73.5	69.6	60.9	50.2	47.4	-47.6
France
Georgia	27.6	24.5	41.4	29.5	39.0	36.7	33.1
Germany	58.5	56.5	56.1	56.4	56.0	60.7	3.6
Greece	8.4	8.8	12.0	13.4	11.9	10.8	29.1
Hungary	234.8	250.0	258.6	290.0	230.0	189.1	-19.5
Iceland	80.1	77.6	62.5	84.1	63.5	65.6	-18.1
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	86.1	94.0	97.2	81.4	80.1	48.2	-44.0
Luxembourg
Malta	12.8	20.6	18.7	11.2	12.3	11.1	-13.1
Moldova	32.8	27.8	33.3	28.6	25.7	25.6	-21.8
Montenegro	26.6	27.6	23.8	21.7	20.1	19.6	-26.3
Netherlands	59.6	62.0	45.0	42.8	85.8
North Macedonia	22.8	10.9	1.5	16.7	17.7	19.3	-15.5
Norway	78.3	62.8	57.1	52.4	45.8	41.2	-47.3
Poland	57.6	60.3	79.7	79.8	71.0	74.6	29.6
Portugal	18.0	22.0	21.0	22.1	24.3	21.9	22.1
Romania	73.4	35.3	36.2	32.0	30.7	28.8	-60.8
Russian Federation
Serbia	72.0	59.6	46.0	50.4	51.6	48.9	-32.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	106.0	119.4	119.9	152.6	82.5	71.6	-32.5
Spain	19.2	19.1	18.4	19.3	18.7	17.0	-11.6
Sweden	62.2	57.3	59.8	63.2	72.2	63.3	1.9
Switzerland	54.3	65.3	86.3	66.2	79.8	114.2	110.2
Turkey	5.4	3.8	4.3
Ukraine	39.3	32.8	33.3	32.8	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	54	52	51	54	50	46	
<i>Median</i>	54	46	42	40	42	39	
<i>Minimum</i>	5	4	1	8	7	8	
<i>Maximum</i>	235	250	259	290	230	189	

Table 1.2.1.22 Offences per 100 000 population – Money laundering

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	3.0	4.0	4.3	11.3	12.3	13.2	345.6
Armenia
Austria	6.4	4.9	4.0	5.0	5.3	6.5	0.7
Azerbaijan
Belgium	7.5	8.0	8.3	7.6	7.5	7.4	-1.1
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.4	145.6
Croatia
Cyprus	0.6	0.7	0.7	13.3	0.7	0.7	18.8
Czech Republic	2.4	3.8	4.1	5.5	4.5	5.4	124.2
Denmark
Estonia	6.0	3.9	2.6	3.5	2.0	5.2	-14.1
Finland	2.0	4.2	3.3	3.8	3.2	6.7	241.0
France
Georgia
Germany	10.7	9.6	10.1	10.1	11.9	14.0	31.5
Greece
Hungary	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.7	423.5
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	2.3	2.8	3.2	2.6	3.0	2.9	26.5
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	1.1	0.9	1.9	2.0	3.4	1.1	-0.5
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	0.8	0.9	1.5	1.7	1.4	1.5	98.1
Montenegro	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	-100.0
Netherlands	2.6	2.9	3.6	3.7	3.2
North Macedonia	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.2	-43.2
Norway	1.8	1.0	1.4	2.0	1.4	2.2	21.0
Poland	0.7	1.0	0.7	0.5	1.1	0.8	9.7
Portugal	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	104.5
Romania	2.1	1.9	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.0	-5.8
Russian Federation
Serbia	2.5	1.7	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.2	-93.2
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	2.3	6.9	4.7	3.7	3.0	2.5	5.5
Spain	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	54.0
Sweden	5.4	5.7	7.4	4.5	20.2	20.0	271.6
Switzerland	3.7	4.4	4.4	4.7	4.5	8.0	116.1
Turkey
Ukraine	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.4	-50.5
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	2.6	2.7	2.8	3.5	3.6	4.1	
<i>Median</i>	2.1	1.8	2.2	2.5	2.2	2.0	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	10.7	9.6	10.1	13.3	20.2	20.0	

Table 1.2.1.23 Offences per 100 000 population – Corruption in the public sector

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	9.9	11.3	11.7	18.6	21.9	22.3	124.2
Armenia	3.9	4.9	6.3	7.5	8.8	6.9	78.8
Austria	8.0	6.3	6.4	4.9	4.1	4.3	-45.8
Azerbaijan
Belgium	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.6	-30.1
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	2.1	1.9	1.3	1.4	1.2	2.0	-4.3
Croatia
Cyprus	1.2	0.6	1.4	1.5	3.2	4.8	305.9
Czech Republic	2.5	2.8	2.7	1.8	1.8	0.9	-63.5
Denmark	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.9	637.7
Estonia	8.1	8.5	19.5	19.8	24.6	27.1	234.0
Finland	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	-2.0
France
Georgia	11.4	8.8	15.9	8.5	13.9	13.5	18.2
Germany	1.4	1.6	1.4	2.6	1.3	1.4	-1.0
Greece	1.0	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.1	3.1
Hungary	7.4	8.3	11.2	33.1	7.7	10.0	35.4
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	17.5	30.2	37.0	44.2	36.3	22.4	28.3
Luxembourg	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.0	...
Malta
Moldova	25.4	31.6	28.3	27.9	26.9	30.1	18.5
Montenegro	19.5	15.5	15.0	13.5	11.1	12.9	-34.1
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway	2.5	1.2	0.9	0.5	0.9	0.9	-65.3
Poland	23.4	17.5	18.0	16.0	11.2	17.3	-26.0
Portugal	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.7	8.5
Romania	76.6	66.1	63.6	70.7	80.2	74.0	-3.4
Russian Federation
Serbia	3.0	3.6	2.9	2.1	6.5	2.1	-31.2
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	3.4	3.2	1.4	0.9	3.4	7.1	110.2
Spain	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.4	40.2
Sweden	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.7	2.5	90.4
Switzerland	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.6	0.2	-5.5
Turkey
Ukraine	6.3	3.2	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.7	-41.2
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	8.8	8.6	9.1	10.2	9.8	9.7	
<i>Median</i>	3.0	3.2	2.0	1.9	3.3	3.1	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	76.6	66.1	63.6	70.7	80.2	74.0	

Table 1.2.1.24 Offences per 100 000 population – Drug offences: Total

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	25.5	38.1	46.0	61.4	80.9	113.9	347.3
Armenia	46.7	34.8	42.2	36.0	31.0	33.6	-28.1
Austria	309.2	283.0	334.0	355.6	383.3	416.5	34.7
Azerbaijan	29.1	26.1	26.9	31.8	30.7	31.8	9.4
Belgium	437.6	399.7	435.0	493.1	466.7	484.8	10.8
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	38.7	40.4	41.9	44.7	55.7	66.2	70.9
Croatia
Cyprus	111.9	119.5	115.0	125.9	111.5	105.3	-6.0
Czech Republic	36.6	38.4	48.7	53.2	52.7	52.7	44.3
Denmark	385.2	389.7	434.5	475.8	415.0	394.6	2.4
Estonia	68.7	65.3	77.2	90.4	102.6	98.9	44.0
Finland	379.4	372.2	417.5	399.6	427.7	457.1	20.5
France	298.0	302.4	317.6	326.6	327.1	328.4	10.2
Georgia	84.5	70.4	262.9	162.8	137.4	128.0	51.5
Germany	294.8	295.2	314.8	342.6	348.0	368.2	24.9
Greece	71.6	68.8	103.8	108.3	111.2	113.7	58.9
Hungary	60.0	52.5	56.0	65.9	67.2	65.8	9.8
Iceland	571.2	641.2	678.3	729.3	580.7	563.3	-1.4
Ireland	384.4	356.9	332.4	342.0	321.8	339.4	-11.7
Italy	57.3	57.0	56.3	54.7	53.6	59.6	3.9
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	94.8	134.5	80.9	138.1	177.7	60.7	-36.0
Lithuania	72.8	98.4	75.8	85.2	84.2	78.6	8.1
Luxembourg	600.0	762.3	830.4	690.8	...
Malta	42.9	48.6	49.2	44.7	35.7	48.2	12.3
Moldova	46.6	44.3	32.8	36.2	33.5	30.9	-33.6
Montenegro	49.5	30.1	27.7	28.8	29.6	33.1	-33.2
Netherlands	102.8	105.1	101.5	96.9	87.4	78.3	-23.8
North Macedonia	29.0	29.3	26.1	34.7	29.5	29.4	1.5
Norway	406.2	433.3	457.7	432.9	384.6	316.6	-22.0
Poland	195.8	200.6	189.0	130.4	121.9	135.0	-31.1
Portugal	53.2	56.1	53.8	56.2	64.2	70.4	32.4
Romania	21.5	27.7	15.2	16.3	23.1	22.3	3.6
Russian Federation
Serbia	68.1	66.2	78.6	87.0	80.2	99.2	45.6
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	82.3	94.4	91.5	90.1	90.7	76.6	-7.0
Spain	32.6	31.0	30.6	28.8	26.0	26.8	-17.8
Sweden	977.1	1026.9	1037.8	1018.4	990.6	949.6	-2.8
Switzerland	1159.0	1167.4	1210.2	995.0	1045.5	1000.0	-13.7
Turkey
Ukraine	116.7	99.7	74.9	67.4	60.6	54.1	-53.7
UK: England & Wales	416.1	375.1	352.6	311.3	262.1	238.6	-42.7
UK: Northern Ireland	208.3	240.1	258.6	274.3	299.7	290.8	39.6
UK: Scotland	648.1	661.6	651.1	666.0	685.6	656.4	1.3
<i>Mean</i>	218	221	241	243	239	230	
<i>Median</i>	84	98	96	103	107	102	
<i>Minimum</i>	21	26	15	16	23	22	
<i>Maximum</i>	1159	1167	1210	1018	1046	1000	

Table 1.2.1.25 Offences per 100 000 population – Drug trafficking

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	2.2	3.7	5.3	4.1	2.4	4.3	92.9
Armenia	23.1	15.7	18.2	19.6	15.9	17.6	-24.0
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	139.2	116.0	116.4	126.9	122.2	122.8	-11.8
Bosnia-Herzegovina	1.4	1.1	0.6	2.0	2.4	22.1	1470.0
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus	15.4	19.0	18.6	16.1	15.6	16.6	8.2
Czech Republic	29.5	31.0	37.5	42.0	42.8	42.8	44.8
Denmark	64.3	65.5	73.9	89.5	77.6	74.8	16.3
Estonia	68.7	65.3	77.2	90.4	102.6	98.9	44.0
Finland	154.4	163.1	182.0	148.6	150.4	170.8	10.6
France	9.9	9.8	10.6	11.0	12.1	14.1	42.8
Georgia	24.6	27.1	87.4	61.0	56.6	66.5	170.3
Germany	77.7	74.1	73.1	76.3	77.8	80.2	3.2
Greece
Hungary	7.1	5.6	4.9	4.4	4.6	4.8	-32.9
Iceland	26.1	28.8	54.7	71.5	57.7	67.4	158.5
Ireland	83.5	75.4	70.3	76.8	72.0	76.8	-8.1
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	29.8	30.7	29.2	35.6	22.3	33.1	10.9
Latvia
Lithuania	32.0	56.4	28.2	32.6	26.5	23.4	-26.7
Luxembourg	29.8	38.0	36.1	47.5	...
Malta	2.7	4.8	3.1	2.6	1.6	2.9	8.9
Moldova	1.2	1.9	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	-18.5
Montenegro	41.0	23.7	24.0	24.1	25.1	28.8	-29.8
Netherlands
North Macedonia	28.6	22.7	19.6	27.9	24.9	23.6	-17.6
Norway
Poland	11.4	11.4	11.2	11.1	7.4	7.0	-39.2
Portugal	40.0	44.2	42.0	43.5	49.1	54.2	35.7
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	19.9	19.2	21.1	17.7	16.9	19.3	-2.6
Slovak Republic	14.1	14.0	35.7	29.7	32.3	27.5	94.7
Slovenia	73.4	85.6	83.2	80.6	84.2	69.6	-5.2
Spain
Sweden	117.7	154.1	151.9	132.2	123.8	107.6	-8.5
Switzerland	80.0	91.7	96.0	106.0	100.0	101.4	26.8
Turkey
Ukraine	35.8	31.6	20.8	18.6	15.5	5.4	-85.0
UK: England & Wales	57.5	52.6	51.7	48.8	45.4	42.2	-26.6
UK: Northern Ireland	46.6	48.8	52.9	47.3	47.1	44.5	-4.6
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	44	45	48	48	46	47	
<i>Median</i>	30	31	33	37	34	38	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	154	163	182	149	150	171	

Notes on tables 1.2.1.1-1.2.25

Albania	Forced intra-marital intercourse was introduced in the Criminal Code in May 2013. Under such a provision constitutes a criminal act to engage in sexual activity by use of force w spouses or cohabitants.
Denmark	Drug offences include both some according to the penal code and some according to a special law on (less severe) drug offences. Part of the increase in both fraud and cyber fraud is caused by changes in the police registration practice in these types of cases. Cyber fraud includes violations of § 279a in the Penal Code exclusively, as this is currently the best approximation available of cyber fraud in a Danish context. As a result, some types of cyber fraud are not encompassed by the definition, and the definition may encompass offences, which are not 'cyber' fraud per se.
Finland	There is no clear crime category for sexual assault in Finland. If it includes violence it can be classified as an assault.
Germany	Police statistics do not include traffic offences.
Greece	The police data system was redesigned in 2013 causing possible breaks in the data series.
Hungary	Changes were made to the Criminal code in 2013 causing e.g., changes in number of rapes. The so-called "foreign language examination scandal" contributed to the figure for corruption to be remarkably higher in 2014.
Iceland	Changes were made to the working procedure in cases of domestic violence in 2014 causing increase in registered violence.
Lithuania	The statistics for the year of 2016 cover only thefts of automobiles, because thefts of motor vehicles are not criminalized separately in the Criminal Code of Lithuania, while had been counted separately by the police till 2015.
Norway	The figures for homicide in 2011 include the terrorist attacks of Andrew Breivik.
Poland	From November 2013 - driving under the influence of alcohol other than motor vehicle (e.g., bicycle) is not a crime but misdemeanour (wykroczenie) and it is not included in the crime statistics.
Romania	Data reported by the police only refer to offences perpetrated until February 1, 2014 (under the Criminal Code of 1969).
Spain	In 2015 a modification of the penal code, raised the age of sexual consent from 13 to 16.
Slovenia	In the revision of police statistical data, it appears that intentional murders prior to 2011 also contains manslaughters, which are unintentional murders. The data from 2011 contains only murders that were intentional, for mentioned reason data prior of 2011 is incomparable.
Turkey	In cases where UNODC data was used there are no information regarding definitions.
Ukraine	At the end of 2012 the new Criminal Procedural Code of Ukraine came into force and as a consequence, new methods of data collection were adopted. The substantive increase of the intentional homicide rate in 2014-2015 is due to these changes.
UK: England and Wales	From 2014 onwards, following inspections of the accuracy of crime recording, police forces improved the recording of all offence types leading to increased numbers being recorded. There were also many definitional changes in the types of offences which comprise aggravated bodily injury and sexual offences between 2011 and 2012, leading to a break in the series. The recording of fraud offences gradually became a centralized one between 2012 and 2014. Police forces no longer record such data. Much of the recorded increase since 2012 in this table is due to better procedures for recording.
UK: Northern Ireland	In April 2008 the Home Office issued clarification to police forces on how to record offences of wounding with intent/Grievous bodily harm (GBH) with intent for those assaults resulting in minor or no injury to a victim, but where the intent was to cause serious injury. The effect of this clarification was that some offences that would previously have been recorded as other types of assault are now recorded as GBH with intent. The number of robberies with firearms for 2011-2016 is the sum of 'armed robberies business' and 'armed robberies personal' in the published statistics. This causes a break in the series. The reason is unknown as the source of the pre-2011 figures for robberies with firearms was not recorded.

Table 1.2.2.1 Offenders per 100 000 population – Total

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	463.2	542.4	999.0	1023.1	1178.6	1086.1	134.5
Armenia	364.5	357.9	395.5	376.6	364.4	373.3	2.4
Austria	3092.8	3091.3	3105.1	3006.8	2918.8	3105.1	0.4
Azerbaijan	204.3	184.4	158.6	164.2	170.1	171.8	-15.9
Belgium	2507.5	2265.8	2278.4	2351.4	2382.4	2618.4	4.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina	757.5	761.9	776.4	742.5	646.9	637.5	-15.8
Bulgaria	695.8	628.8	612.1	570.0	566.8	620.4	-10.8
Croatia	1672.7	1569.7	1390.3	1267.0	1425.7	1497.5	-10.5
Cyprus	...	558.1	512.8	508.0	573.7	593.3	...
Czech Republic	1096.4	1075.9	1118.9	1090.2	966.1	884.8	-19.3
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	5632.5	5240.5	5092.6	4830.1	4788.1	4708.4	-16.4
France	1955.9	1909.9	1794.6	1786.8	1748.4	1697.9	-13.2
Georgia	391.3	331.8	591.7	493.7	567.8	570.9	45.9
Germany	2633.7	2607.0	2801.3	2661.3	2917.6	2872.9	9.1
Greece	1214.4	1138.9	1086.5	1004.2	1022.5	1138.1	-6.3
Hungary	1130.6	1009.3	1046.3	1069.0	1004.4	998.3	-11.7
Iceland	1223.1	1161.2	...	1131.2	1176.8	1155.7	-5.5
Ireland
Italy	1518.1	1572.8	1639.9	1616.1	1586.3	1474.5	-2.9
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	1182.3	1202.5	1093.6	1097.2	1169.9	761.7	-35.6
Lithuania	797.1	968.4	1035.9	1042.5	919.5	731.3	-8.3
Luxembourg	5087.0	5357.7	5051.2	4820.3	...
Malta
Moldova	535.1	582.7	448.7	496.3	482.7	471.5	-11.9
Montenegro	817.5	703.0	772.8	833.6	619.2	579.5	-29.1
Netherlands	2388.3	2232.4	2088.3	1944.9	1784.3	1641.4	-31.3
North Macedonia	993.0	853.3	887.9	831.7	769.4	768.3	-22.6
Norway	753.0	724.6	1629.5	1589.6	1555.0	1535.3	103.9
Poland	1370.9	1315.0	1152.1	908.9	804.7	788.5	-42.5
Portugal	2037.0	2015.1	1906.5	1774.8	1803.1	1704.4	-16.3
Romania
Russian Federation	728.9	706.7	705.6	700.2	746.2	704.0	-3.4
Serbia	719.5	693.4	723.0	680.2	694.5	696.6	-3.2
Slovak Republic	983.3	990.1	995.3	942.6	856.4	800.3	-18.6
Slovenia	2626.1	2621.4	2722.2	2960.4	2191.9	1973.7	-24.8
Spain	835.1	808.9	802.1	748.8	684.9	645.0	-22.8
Sweden	2034.5	1970.5	1842.9	1811.5	1796.5	1763.2	-13.3
Switzerland	1708.5	1795.8	1813.0	1663.3	1670.5	1660.3	-2.8
Turkey
Ukraine	494.6	429.0	359.7	315.4	313.1	262.5	-46.9
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	1399	1332	1470	1427	1386	1347	
<i>Median</i>	1113	1009	1087	1056	1013	942	
<i>Minimum</i>	204	184	159	164	170	172	
<i>Maximum</i>	5632	5240	5093	5358	5051	4820	

Table 1.2.2.2 Offenders per 100 000 population – Major road traffic offences

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	75.9	82.5	82.2	147.9	177.0	177.2	133.3
Armenia
Austria	461.0	439.6	418.8	397.9	405.3	411.9	-10.7
Azerbaijan	17.3	19.8	22.3	20.9	18.2	16.5	-4.6
Belgium	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.8	1.9	4.5	716.9
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	167.8	141.0	134.2	131.5	142.6	170.9	1.9
Croatia	38.7	36.5	30.9	29.4	31.3	35.0	-9.6
Cyprus
Czech Republic	58.6	59.5	54.3	57.7	56.4	57.2	-2.3
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	984.6	882.9	811.7	806.7	799.3	785.2	-20.3
France
Georgia	18.1	14.1	14.5	16.6	19.9	21.6	19.7
Germany
Greece	37.4	51.8	1.3	1.7	2.2	1.9	-94.9
Hungary	111.5	102.6	121.1	160.1	163.6	186.3	67.2
Iceland
Ireland	204.1	179.6	151.1	145.3	142.0	149.4	-26.8
Italy	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	-10.8
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	32.1	34.8	33.1	32.8	34.1	21.7	-32.3
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	20.3	20.4	12.3	11.8	10.6	12.6	-38.0
Montenegro	100.3	71.9	95.7	84.0	88.2	99.3	-1.0
Netherlands	382.4	346.9	310.0	293.4	254.4	248.8	-34.9
North Macedonia	155.2	133.0	136.1	119.6	121.0	125.0	-19.5
Norway
Poland	415.8	372.1	353.5	216.7	190.0	181.8	-56.3
Portugal	401.9	407.7	366.7	306.2	333.7	302.9	-24.6
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	120.6	113.2	117.0	109.2	111.2	115.5	-4.2
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	112.4	102.8	95.5	88.5	76.1	69.8	-37.9
Sweden	389.0	365.2	335.5	337.2	335.9	333.6	-14.3
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine	21.4	21.8	17.2	16.4	15.3	14.9	-30.6
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	180	167	155	147	147	148	
<i>Median</i>	106	93	96	99	100	107	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	1	1	1	2	2	
<i>Maximum</i>	985	883	812	807	799	785	

Table 1.2.2.3 Offenders per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	12.7	13.5	7.9	10.6	9.4	8.5	-33.1
Armenia
Austria	2.2	2.3	2.1	1.3	1.9	2.0	-9.4
Azerbaijan	10.2	10.9	11.0	10.0	9.4	7.6	-25.5
Belgium	6.7	6.1	6.0	5.8	5.7	5.5	-17.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.6	1.5	1.2	1.6	1.7	1.7	12.0
Croatia	4.5	3.6	3.1	3.9	2.9	3.5	-21.9
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.6	1.9	1.8	1.4	1.5	1.4	-9.1
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	8.6	8.8	7.1	8.4	7.2	7.7	-10.9
France	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.8	4.0	9.9
Georgia	7.1	6.8	6.6	5.2	6.0	5.7	-19.8
Germany	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.5	1.8
Greece	2.2	2.6	4.5	2.9	3.6	2.4	11.6
Hungary	2.9	2.5	2.9	2.4	2.0	2.1	-28.5
Iceland
Ireland	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.4	0.7	0.7	-39.6
Italy	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.3	-6.6
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	8.3	8.1	8.2	7.2	...
Lithuania	8.6	7.1	6.9	7.3	5.3	5.6	-35.3
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	5.8	5.6	5.3	3.8	4.1	4.2	-28.0
Montenegro	3.1	3.2	1.6	2.4	2.7	3.5	15.3
Netherlands	25.9	23.8	21.2	19.7	19.2	18.0	-30.6
North Macedonia	1.6	1.2	0.9	1.2	1.1	1.0	-39.8
Norway
Poland	2.3	2.2	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.3	-42.7
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	4.9	4.5	5.2	4.3	3.9	4.2	-13.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	1.1	1.2	1.0	0.8	1.2	0.8	-23.3
Spain	3.0	2.8	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.7	-10.9
Sweden	8.3	8.3	8.3	9.2	9.1	10.4	24.4
Switzerland	3.2	3.3	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.6	-19.3
Turkey
Ukraine	5.7	4.8	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.4	-39.7
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	5	5	5	5	5	4	
<i>Median</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	26	24	21	20	19	18	

Table 1.2.2.4 Offenders per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide: Firearm involved

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	2.8	1.6	1.9	1.5	1.5	0.9	-67
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	...	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	...
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	-1
Greece
Hungary	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	-52
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	-43
Montenegro	1.9	2.1	8
Netherlands
North Macedonia	1.1	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.3	-73
Norway	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Serbia	1.1	0.5	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.6	-50
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	-40
Spain	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.5	6
Sweden	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.9	2.9	3.1	32
Switzerland
Turkey	5.1	5.4
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<i>Median</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Maximum</i>	5	5	3	3	3	3	

Table 1.2.2.5 Offenders per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide completed

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	4.8	5.4	4.2	3.8	2.8	2.8	-42.2
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan	7.1	7.5	7.8	7.2	5.8	4.6	-35.1
Belgium	1.4	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0	-24.8
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	2.4	1.9	2.2	2.0	1.9	1.8	-25.0
France
Georgia	5.2	4.6	3.9	2.7	3.2	3.0	-43.0
Germany	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0	...
Greece
Hungary	1.6	1.3	1.7	1.3	1.1	1.1	-32.1
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	1.6	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.7	6.7
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg	0.5	0.5	...
Malta
Moldova	4.4	4.5	4.1	2.8	3.1	3.2	-27.5
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland
Portugal	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	-9.5
Romania
Russian Federation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Serbia	1.9	1.6	2.2	1.8	1.5	1.8	-7.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	0.7	0.8	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.5	-33.8
Spain	1.2	1.1	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	-24.2
Sweden	2.6	2.3	2.3	2.7	2.8	3.3	27.8
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	3	2	2	2	2	2	
<i>Median</i>	2	2	2	2	1	1	
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Maximum</i>	7	8	8	7	6	5	

Table 1.2.2.6 Offenders per 100 000 population – Intentional homicide completed: Firearm involved

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.9	0.5	172.0
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	1.2	0.2	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.1	-90.9
Bosnia-Herzegovina	...	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.6	...
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia	0.9	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.8
Germany
Greece
Hungary	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	-60.9
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	-64.2
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway	1.4	0.1	0.1	0.1
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.4	-16.2
Slovak Republic	...	0.2	0.3	0.3
Slovenia	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	-40.4
Spain	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-25.0
Sweden	0.8	0.8	0.7	1.1	1.1	1.0	20.7
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.3	
<i>Median</i>	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	
<i>Maximum</i>	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	

Table 1.2.2.7 Offenders per 100 000 population – Bodily injury

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	50.1	55.1	55.2	68.1	67.5	57.5	14.6
Armenia
Austria	452.0	464.2	444.6	441.7	446.7	464.2	2.7
Azerbaijan
Belgium	349.9	281.2	268.2	265.6	269.2	271.1	-22.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	9.3	8.3	7.9	7.9	6.9	9.1	-2.3
Croatia	41.4	39.8	42.6	38.0	39.7	41.6	0.5
Cyprus
Czech Republic	41.2	44.4	43.0	42.1	41.1	44.4	7.7
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	617.2	596.8	553.8	499.6	472.9	451.6	-26.8
France	299.3	300.9	303.1	307.2	314.3	316.3	5.7
Georgia	...	111.4	121.0	109.1	142.7	146.6	...
Germany	552.9	552.2	537.7	529.1	526.7	564.8	2.2
Greece	50.5	47.0	56.4	56.7	57.4	56.7	-12.3
Hungary	56.7	52.4	55.2	52.7	50.1	46.9	-17.2
Iceland	302.1	304.5	...	327.9	408.4	436.4	44.4
Ireland
Italy	105.3	108.8	107.2	105.7	103.4	102.5	-2.6
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	79.7	256.9	318.0	316.4	310.7	233.8	193.4
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	31.1	32.0	19.9	20.8	17.4	18.1	-41.8
Montenegro	80.0	90.9	82.8	61.9	57.1	54.0	-32.5
Netherlands	307.5	289.4	262.8	242.2	227.5	211.4	-31.2
North Macedonia	34.9	34.9	33.2	40.6	40.9	36.4	4.2
Norway
Poland	131.8	123.9	105.6	92.7	77.2	81.3	-38.3
Portugal	605.4	576.9	565.2	560.2	543.9	543.7	-10.2
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	46.7	45.7	43.9	40.1	41.2	38.4	-17.7
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	95.2	98.6	88.4	79.0	73.4	70.7	-25.7
Spain	34.9	32.2	31.1	31.5	35.5	27.1	-22.5
Sweden	512.1	475.0	435.0	420.2	426.1	417.8	-18.4
Switzerland	109.8	108.4	102.5	95.3	88.7	92.7	-15.6
Turkey
Ukraine	20.0	18.3
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	193	191	187	187	188	186	
<i>Median</i>	88	108	103	94	83	87	
<i>Minimum</i>	9	8	8	8	7	9	
<i>Maximum</i>	617	597	562	557	542	565	

Table 1.2.2.8 Offenders per 100 000 population – Aggravated bodily injury

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia
Austria	44.2	45.8	42.6	45.0	42.8	45.9	3.8
Azerbaijan	2.5	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.2	3.0	19.9
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	-22.7
Croatia	23.4	23.3	21.6	18.6	21.9	25.1	7.4
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	41.2	35.8	36.5	31.2	29.6	29.3	-28.8
France
Georgia	2.3	2.7	4.2	5.1	5.3	5.0	112.8
Germany	191.1	183.2	171.6	166.0	165.7	182.0	-4.8
Greece
Hungary	45.9	42.9	45.7	42.8	40.2	36.7	-20.2
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	88.6	91.2	89.8	88.4	86.2	86.5	-2.4
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	8.5	7.7	8.4	8.0	5.7	6.1	-27.9
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	27.3	27.4	16.2	16.2	13.7	13.9	-49.0
Montenegro	33.1	34.0	31.7	22.0	24.4	21.5	-34.9
Netherlands
North Macedonia	14.2	12.2	11.7	11.8	9.2	10.1	-29.2
Norway
Poland	2.8	3.1	2.2	2.2	1.9	1.9	-34.1
Portugal	7.0	6.8	5.1	4.4	4.7	4.6	-34.3
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	21.2	20.8	20.3	17.8	18.3	16.7	-21.2
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	10.0	9.3	8.2	8.5	7.6	6.8	-31.7
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland	12.4	13.0	11.3	12.8	12.2	11.8	-4.2
Turkey
Ukraine	7.6	7.0	5.8	5.3	4.8	4.5	-41.4
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	30.7	30.0	28.2	26.8	26.2	26.9	
<i>Median</i>	14.2	13.0	11.7	12.8	12.2	11.8	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	
<i>Maximum</i>	191.1	183.2	171.6	166.0	165.7	182.0	

Table 1.2.2.9 Offenders per 100 000 population – Sexual assault

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	1.4	1.6	3.0	3.5	5.5	4.1	186.5
Armenia
Austria	34.7	35.1	33.1	32.8	31.1	40.6	16.8
Azerbaijan
Belgium	13.3	11.7	11.4	11.2	10.3	10.0	-25.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	4.8	4.9	4.5	4.6	4.0	3.9	-19.6
Croatia	8.9	8.2	8.3	9.0	9.0	9.9	11.5
Cyprus
Czech Republic	8.7	9.1	9.1	8.9	8.9	10.1	15.3
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	39.3	53.5	45.1	41.3	41.2	40.1	1.9
France	43.6	44.9	43.9	45.0	45.9	45.8	5.1
Georgia	2.8	9.4	9.0	7.1	8.3	8.0	182.8
Germany	25.7	24.9	24.0	23.2	22.3	24.2	-5.9
Greece	6.0	9.8	16.0	12.7	11.4	11.9	97.2
Hungary	5.2	5.6	5.9	6.2	6.8	7.1	37.1
Iceland
Ireland	25.9	23.9	21.5	20.1	20.2	19.0	-26.5
Italy	9.0	8.5	8.4	7.8	7.6	7.4	-17.3
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	9.9	11.0	10.7	9.4	...
Lithuania	12.3	8.5	7.4	8.7	8.0	7.1	-42.7
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	9.8	11.3	7.8	8.7	9.6	7.7	-21.4
Montenegro	5.0	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.5	3.9	-22.9
Netherlands	22.2	19.8	18.1	16.2	15.7	14.4	-35.0
North Macedonia	6.7	5.3	7.1	7.2	5.5	4.9	-26.8
Norway
Poland	4.7	4.4	3.9	3.4	3.1	3.3	-30.3
Portugal	10.5	10.1	10.9	10.7	11.0	11.5	9.7
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	4.7	4.4	4.0	3.8	3.6	4.1	-13.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	15.6	14.2	14.6	9.8	8.0	10.6	-32.3
Spain	14.4	13.3	12.5	13.3	13.0	13.7	-4.5
Sweden	57.2	55.3	52.9	53.0	55.6	60.0	4.9
Switzerland	30.9	30.6	30.5	32.5	30.3	32.3	4.7
Turkey
Ukraine	...	1.8	1.2	0.9	0.7	0.8	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	16	16	15	15	15	15	
<i>Median</i>	10	10	10	9	9	10	
<i>Minimum</i>	1	2	1	1	1	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	57	55	53	53	56	60	

Table 1.2.2.10 Offenders per 100 000 population – Rape

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia
Austria	14.3	13.6	12.8	13.0	12.4	14.9	3.7
Azerbaijan	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.2	25.2
Belgium	5.7	5.2	4.8	4.3	4.2	3.7	-34.9
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.3	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.3	-1.4
Croatia	4.8	4.3	4.7	5.8	5.8	5.5	15.8
Cyprus
Czech Republic	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.7	4.4	13.6
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	12.0	14.3	14.7	13.2	14.8	15.1	25.6
France	12.1	12.4	13.0	13.5	14.2	14.8	22.3
Georgia	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	-57.8
Germany	8.6	8.9	8.4	7.2	7.7	8.2	-4.3
Greece	1.5	1.4	1.9	1.8	1.7	2.2	42.0
Hungary	2.3	2.6	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.6	13.2
Iceland
Ireland	6.5	5.8	4.9	5.8	5.3	4.5	-31.4
Italy	7.8	7.5	7.4	6.8	6.6	6.5	-17.3
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	4.2	4.8	3.9	6.1	...
Lithuania	10.1	6.7	6.0	7.0	5.7	5.2	-48.2
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	5.9	7.1	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.3	-26.8
Montenegro	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.3	-33.6
Netherlands	5.7	4.9	4.2	3.8	3.7	3.4	-40.8
North Macedonia	1.9	1.7	1.7	2.3	1.6	1.6	-16.0
Norway
Poland	2.5	2.1	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.8	-27.9
Portugal	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.4	2.2
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.2	1.3	1.2	0.8	0.9	0.7	-39.7
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	2.5	2.9	2.3	2.1	2.0	1.5	-41.6
Spain	2.4	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.9	-20.5
Sweden	30.6	30.2	29.1	29.2	29.2	29.8	-2.8
Switzerland	5.8	5.8	5.4	5.7	5.1	5.9	3.0
Turkey
Ukraine	1.2	1.0	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.5	-56.8
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	5.7	5.6	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.3	
<i>Median</i>	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.5	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.2	
<i>Maximum</i>	30.6	30.2	29.1	29.2	29.2	29.8	

Table 1.2.2.11 Offenders per 100 000 population – Sexual abuse of a child

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia
Austria	8.2	8.8	8.5	8.2	7.7	7.3	-10.5
Azerbaijan
Belgium	5.0	4.3	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.0	-19.2
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	-13.9
Croatia	2.4	2.2	0.8	1.1	1.5	1.0	-55.4
Cyprus
Czech Republic	4.7	5.2	5.5	5.0	5.1	5.4	15.5
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	20.1	26.3	19.8	21.3	18.8	16.3	-19.1
France	8.3	10.7	11.0	11.8	12.5	12.7	51.8
Georgia
Germany	8.2	7.9	7.9	7.3	7.2	7.2	-11.6
Greece
Hungary	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	89.3
Iceland
Ireland	2.3	1.9	1.0	1.7	1.3	1.5	-34.9
Italy	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	-16.9
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	1.9	1.7	1.2	1.3	2.1	1.8	-3.6
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	3.8	4.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	3.4	-10.8
Montenegro	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.2	-50.2
Netherlands
North Macedonia	1.8	1.7	2.5	2.6	1.8	1.4	-24.8
Norway
Poland	2.3	2.3	2.1	1.7	1.5	1.5	-32.9
Portugal	3.1	3.0	3.3	3.9	3.5	3.3	4.1
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	2.2	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.7	2.1	-2.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	10.4	7.3	7.7	4.9	3.6	5.7	-45.0
Spain	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.7	1.6	13.4
Sweden	19.1	17.4	18.2	19.4	19.0	19.2	0.4
Switzerland	9.3	9.0	9.8	10.2	9.3	8.9	-4.2
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	5.3	5.4	5.1	5.2	5.0	4.9	
<i>Median</i>	2.7	2.7	2.7	3.1	2.8	2.7	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	
<i>Maximum</i>	20.1	26.3	19.8	21.3	19.0	19.2	

Table 1.2.2.12 Offenders per 100 000 population – Robbery

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	9	12	13	9	8	7	-28.3
Armenia
Austria	25	27	24	26	28	24	-4.9
Azerbaijan	4	3	3	3	4	5	27.2
Belgium	68	60	55	52	51	49	-28.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	17	15	15	13	11	12	-29.0
Croatia	26	31	30	31	37	30	15.1
Cyprus
Czech Republic	21	18	19	16	14	14	-31.8
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	26	27	25	29	29	27	3.0
France	35	34	34	31	28	27	-22.9
Georgia	12	12	18	19	22	21	72.1
Germany	40	39	38	36	35	34	-14.8
Greece	12	12	27	13	22	33	175.5
Hungary	16	14	16	14	11	10	-37.1
Iceland
Ireland	44	38	34	31	29	23	-46.4
Italy	34	35	39	37	36	35	4.5
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	49	41	34	35	31	25	-48.6
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	24	24	19	19	17	17	-29.8
Montenegro	13	8	11	10	7	8	-42.9
Netherlands	54	51	45	35	32	30	-45.1
North Macedonia	17	17	17	12	14	8	-54.6
Norway
Poland	28	26	20	16	13	14	-50.8
Portugal	120	103	91	82	78	62	-48.8
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	22	23	23	20	21	17	-22.6
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	18	15	16	11	8	9	-46.9
Spain	49	50	47	39	33	33	-32.9
Sweden	31	29	26	26	25	26	-15.3
Switzerland	21	24	21	18	14	14	-31.5
Turkey
Ukraine	28	24	17	15	16	5	-80.2
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	31	29	28	25	24	22	
<i>Median</i>	25	25	24	20	22	22	
<i>Minimum</i>	4	3	3	3	4	5	
<i>Maximum</i>	120	102	91	82	78	62	

Table 1.2.2.13 Offenders per 100 000 population – Robbery: Firearm involved

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	3.2	3.9	3.8	1.9	2.4	0.7	-78.3
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	8.6	8.9	7.1	8.9	7.8	6.1	-28.7
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France	5.1	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.4	3.4	-34.1
Georgia	7.1	7.2	10.0	6.4	9.8	10.7	49.9
Germany	2.4	2.4	2.1	1.7	1.7	1.6	-32.8
Greece
Hungary	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	-25.3
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	4.9	3.6	3.0	2.2	2.1	1.7	-65.1
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	2.0	0.6	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.4	-81.1
Spain	2.3	1.8	1.9	1.5	1.0	1.0	-56.9
Sweden	7.1	6.6	5.9	5.5	5.8	6.2	-12.9
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.1	3.3	2.9	
<i>Median</i>	3.2	3.6	3.0	1.9	2.1	1.6	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	8.6	8.9	10.0	8.9	9.8	10.7	

Table 1.2.2.14 Offenders per 100 000 population – Theft

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia
Austria	614.3	608.3	644.6	607.9	572.9	734.0	19.5
Azerbaijan	19.7	17.1	17.7	19.7	22.8	27.7	40.3
Belgium	485.6	429.3	410.2	407.9	379.0	360.6	-25.7
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	316.1	271.3	253.5	219.9	198.1	191.8	-39.3
Croatia	693.2	771.7	778.4	668.0	698.3	691.5	-0.2
Cyprus
Czech Republic	283.6	287.6	293.3	276.4	210.1	202.2	-28.7
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	1253.6	1112.9	1114.1	1074.8	1014.1	967.3	-22.8
France	351.1	346.2	346.0	333.7	322.4	309.2	-11.9
Georgia	90.7	56.6	76.9	73.6	80.8	78.6	-13.4
Germany	628.5	598.8	576.0	565.9	565.3	538.5	-14.3
Greece	117.0	117.9	245.1	173.8	186.6	244.0	108.5
Hungary	283.3	252.1	261.7	234.7	198.9	180.5	-36.3
Iceland
Ireland	720.4	679.1	673.2	641.7	636.0	604.0	-16.2
Italy	169.1	191.5	207.2	205.7	201.1	191.2	13.1
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	272.5	251.1	239.9	242.7	169.1	120.0	-56.0
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	181.2	194.5	152.1	155.4	151.6	144.7	-20.1
Montenegro	172.1	155.2	162.5	136.8	111.4	97.1	-43.6
Netherlands	639.3	613.3	619.9	567.9	527.1	473.0	-26.0
North Macedonia	103.4	91.1	91.1	95.6	103.5	103.4	0.0
Norway
Poland	213.8	219.6	189.7	140.8	120.9	110.0	-48.6
Portugal	229.3	234.5	221.2	205.1	196.8	180.8	-21.1
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	214.9	214.8	243.8	206.6	189.6	170.9	-20.5
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	481.0	524.7	605.4	693.4	425.7	402.2	-16.4
Spain	122.1	118.5	120.3	97.3	78.4	71.2	-41.6
Sweden	442.2	433.0	387.5	386.1	389.1	359.0	-18.8
Switzerland	359.4	389.8	361.3	335.1	292.5	286.5	-20.3
Turkey	42.1
Ukraine	191.1	168.0	116.3	106.7	122.8	106.8	-44.1
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	346	346	348	329	302	291	
<i>Median</i>	278	252	253	235	199	191	
<i>Minimum</i>	20	17	18	20	23	28	
<i>Maximum</i>	1254	1113	1114	1075	1014	967	

Table 1.2.2.15 Offenders per 100 000 population – Aggravated theft

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.8	0.3	237.0
Armenia
Austria	236.5	213.0	232.9	211.9	192.0	282.5	19.4
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	410.0	433.7	436.5	380.4	339.4	312.1	-23.9
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	36.3	42.0	46.5	36.4	35.6	34.7	-4.3
France
Georgia
Germany	133.0	129.8	125.3	124.4	122.2	117.8	-11.4
Greece	5.8	7.3	56.5	39.0	36.9	39.2	580.5
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	406.9	385.6	416.6	455.6	419.7	423.2	4.0
Montenegro	102.1	77.1	81.3	62.1	50.6	48.4	-52.6
Netherlands
North Macedonia	337.8	264.4	266.4	217.4	172.4	198.5	-41.2
Norway
Poland	73.5	71.4	52.7	43.7	37.1	31.5	-57.2
Portugal	92.8	69.9	63.4	55.9	47.0	43.4	-53.2
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	103.0	101.8	107.6	86.0	75.8	67.3	-34.7
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	174.9	189.2	227.3	355.1	141.1	116.4	-33.4
Spain
Sweden	71.5	70.5	62.8	62.6	63.1	56.1	-21.6
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	156.0	146.8	155.4	152.2	123.8	126.5	
<i>Median</i>	102.5	89.4	94.5	74.3	69.5	61.7	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.8	0.3	
<i>Maximum</i>	410.0	433.7	436.5	455.6	419.7	423.2	

Table 1.2.2.16 Offenders per 100 000 population – Theft of a motor vehicle

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	21.0	19.7	23.4	3.8	4.5	4.3	-79.6
Armenia
Austria	27.8	21.2	28.0	23.2	22.3	23.3	-16.1
Azerbaijan
Belgium	30.1	22.6	21.6	20.7	21.4	18.9	-37.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	5.0	4.2	5.0	3.9	4.8	5.7	15.1
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic	16.7	15.3	15.1	13.6	11.2	13.5	-19.5
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	92.8	79.9	61.8	61.2	61.9	53.5	-42.3
France	27.4	27.1	23.7	21.9	21.1	20.7	-24.6
Georgia
Germany	24.8	22.2	19.8	19.0	18.0	17.1	-30.8
Greece
Hungary	10.6	8.2	8.3	8.2	7.1	6.0	-43.0
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	8.4	7.9	7.2	8.1	7.7	7.9	-6.3
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	5.3	6.1	6.1	5.2	5.1
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	1.6	1.9	2.6	2.7	2.1	2.5	53.1
Montenegro
Netherlands	16.6	14.7	15.1	13.6	9.8
North Macedonia	18.9	16.2	16.6	12.7	10.0	10.0	-47.1
Norway
Poland	8.2	8.3
Portugal	16.6	12.1	11.4	11.4	8.7	8.9	-46.0
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	11.0	10.5	10.8	8.6	8.7	7.0	-36.5
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	16.3	14.5	13.3	11.6	10.6	10.4	-36.2
Sweden	38.5	33.3	30.8	30.5	29.8	27.2	-29.5
Switzerland	19.0	19.2	17.1	18.1	18.6	15.1	-20.5
Turkey	1.7
Ukraine	6.5	7.3	6.9	7.2	7.2	6.7	3.3
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	19	18	17	15	15	14	
<i>Median</i>	17	15	15	12	10	10	
<i>Minimum</i>	2	2	3	3	2	2	
<i>Maximum</i>	93	80	62	61	62	54	

Table 1.2.2.17 Offenders per 100 000 population – Theft by means of burglary

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	34.1	38.0	45.2	17.5	18.2	12.2	-64.1
Armenia
Austria	163.4	134.8	150.8	140.2	125.6	226.0	38.3
Azerbaijan
Belgium	93.3	87.9	77.8	82.3	71.2	61.9	-33.6
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	381.9	403.0	402.7	360.0	326.5	294.4	-22.9
Cyprus
Czech Republic	95.9	91.5	97.0	86.0	58.8	53.6	-44.2
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	172.3	169.8	163.8	154.3	134.0	128.3	-25.5
France	69.9	69.8	72.0	71.0	70.9	65.9	-5.8
Georgia
Germany	88.1	85.8	84.0	82.4	82.5	79.4	-9.8
Greece	56.0	58.8	57.4	43.5	48.2	71.2	27.2
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	17.5	14.5	14.0	11.5	11.4
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	8.6	10.3	8.7	10.2	7.4	11.1	29.0
Montenegro
Netherlands	387.3	381.1	388.2	352.5	328.7
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	65.3	63.1	50.5	41.8	35.4	29.8	-54.3
Portugal	76.0	57.6	51.8	44.4	38.2	34.3	-54.8
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	90.9	87.5	95.9	76.2	67.5	59.6	-34.4
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	136.1	140.2	182.6	303.0	111.3	91.2	-33.0
Spain	52.1	58.2	62.8	52.2	43.4	41.7	-20.0
Sweden	69.4	64.8	57.8	57.2	57.7	51.5	-25.8
Switzerland	47.9	55.0	56.5	52.5	42.0	40.8	-14.7
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	111	109	112	107	88	80	
<i>Median</i>	76	70	72	71	59	60	
<i>Minimum</i>	9	10	9	10	7	11	
<i>Maximum</i>	387	403	403	360	329	294	

Table 1.2.2.18 Offenders per 100 000 population – Theft by means of domestic burglary

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	33.7	44.1	43.0	20.5	27.9	28.7	-14.9
Armenia
Austria	28.2	26.7	33.2	35.6	31.1	53.1	88.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium	50.7	48.7	44.9	46.9	38.4	33.7	-33.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic	16.6	17.0	17.7	17.4	13.7	14.9	-10.1
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	47.9	60.2	61.1	48.2	42.9	40.3	-16.0
France	35.6	36.6	38.0	36.8	35.9	34.0	-4.7
Georgia
Germany	28.5	28.4	28.1	26.9	27.7	26.6	-6.8
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	18.5	24.0	25.7	25.8	24.6	24.2	31.0
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	12.8	10.8	8.8	8.5	7.7
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	59.5	55.0	31.0	33.2	32.5	41.8	-29.8
Montenegro
Netherlands	79.8	81.8	82.5	63.0	53.6
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland
Portugal	38.7	29.8	28.4	23.6	20.6	17.6	-54.6
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	79.4	85.7	104.3	83.0	74.6	68.3	-14.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	23.3	21.0	41.1	27.1	23.5	15.8	-32.1
Spain	23.7	31.0	35.2	29.1	23.2	22.1	-7.0
Sweden	27.3	25.9	25.3	25.3	25.2	22.2	-18.7
Switzerland	18.6	20.1	19.3	19.1	16.9	16.5	-11.3
Turkey
Ukraine	11.9	11.6	5.6	5.4	5.3	6.0	-49.6
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	35	37	37	32	29	29	
<i>Median</i>	28	29	32	27	26	25	
<i>Minimum</i>	12	11	6	5	5	6	
<i>Maximum</i>	80	86	104	83	75	68	

Table 1.2.2.19 Offenders per 100 000 population – Fraud

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	13.0	15.4	19.2	20.4	15.8	22.6	73.9
Armenia
Austria	240.3	237.4	267.0	239.8	221.8	263.3	9.6
Azerbaijan	4.8	6.4	8.3	9.7	11.4	14.2	195.7
Belgium	43.4	37.8	41.7	36.2	35.2	33.8	-22.3
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	7.2	5.7	5.4	6.0	5.5	6.7	-6.5
Croatia	131.8	92.2	76.7	71.2	109.2	141.2	7.1
Cyprus
Czech Republic	44.9	46.9	51.9	50.1	45.5	49.6	10.5
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	312.9	316.6	363.7	331.4	404.6	419.6	34.1
France	82.9	83.5	80.2	81.9	87.0	89.2	7.6
Georgia	...	29.4	38.2	39.8	41.7	48.0	...
Germany	330.2	326.1	332.2	327.3	321.8	290.4	-12.1
Greece	6.9	7.0	20.7	21.3	14.7	20.1	191.5
Hungary	60.7	48.8	50.3	42.3	42.0	36.6	-39.7
Iceland
Ireland	61.8	58.4	48.6	48.4	56.9	45.6	-26.1
Italy	87.3	94.9	109.7	111.0	110.3	111.2	27.3
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	58.1	48.6	62.9	68.9	55.1	40.4	-30.5
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	17.8	15.4	11.9	13.7	13.1	16.1	-9.5
Montenegro	12.1	11.0	14.3	10.8	2.7	7.6	-37.6
Netherlands	56.1	56.8	51.7	43.0	25.1	15.7	-72.1
North Macedonia	24.0	25.1	8.6	18.3	14.0	13.3	-44.5
Norway
Poland	89.3	85.5	76.0	80.1	68.6	66.2	-25.9
Portugal	32.5	36.8	38.6	35.3	41.4	39.9	22.9
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	11.7	9.8	14.4	13.7	12.2	13.6	16.3
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	156.0	207.7	238.8	188.4	145.1	143.6	-7.9
Spain	19.6	20.3	20.2	21.4	18.4	17.0	-13.4
Sweden	100.7	98.5	88.9	88.6	88.5	76.5	-24.1
Switzerland	93.1	97.5	105.1	101.2	106.3	109.2	17.3
Turkey	3.9
Ukraine	17.5	16.9	12.6	10.8	9.4	8.0	-54.1
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	76	76	81	76	76	77	
<i>Median</i>	51	48	49	43	42	40	
<i>Minimum</i>	4	6	5	6	3	7	
<i>Maximum</i>	330	326	364	331	405	420	

Table 1.2.2.20 Offenders per 100 000 population – Cyber fraud

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	4.8	6.5	7.8	6.0	7.5	8.0	67.7
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	415.1
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.8	1.2	1.8	303.7
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary	0.3	2.1	3.3	5.3	...
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	...
Montenegro	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Netherlands
North Macedonia	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	49.0
Norway
Poland
Portugal	2.1	2.7	3.2	3.4	3.7	3.2	51.1
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	309.9
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	2.2	1.9	3.6	5.5	5.5	1.6	-27.2
Spain	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.4	3.6	3.9	27.5
Sweden	33.8	31.9	31.5	33.3	31.9	28.2	-16.7
Switzerland	14.3	13.8	13.7	12.9	13.1	13.0	-8.6
Turkey	3.3	...
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	5	5	5	5	5	5	
<i>Median</i>	1	1	1	2	3	3	
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Maximum</i>	34	32	31	33	32	28	

Table 1.2.2.21 Offenders per 100 000 population – Forgery of documents

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	25.0	24.2	19.4	19.8	24.2	32.9	31.7
Armenia
Austria	46.5	51.5	47.1	51.7	49.9	54.8	18.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium	5.3	5.7	4.7	3.8	3.8	4.0	-25.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	42.9	32.4	28.2	28.5	34.8	40.4	-5.9
Cyprus
Czech Republic	4.2	4.1	2.9	4.1	5.2	8.0	92.4
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	96.7	74.1	71.6	55.7	56.8	51.8	-46.4
France
Georgia	...	27.4	35.4	29.9	41.4	33.1	...
Germany	48.3	47.5	46.3	44.3	44.7	48.2	-0.1
Greece	9.8	11.3	15.1	17.2	14.9	14.4	46.7
Hungary	88.6	77.6	74.0	76.1	70.9	68.5	-22.7
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	40.8	38.8	38.7	36.9	33.2	29.0	-28.7
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	17.3	13.5	7.4	6.8	6.8	5.4	-68.8
Montenegro	23.7	24.0	22.2	20.3	20.1	19.0	-20.0
Netherlands	20.4	18.7	15.7	16.6	27.2
North Macedonia	28.8	13.2	14.9	22.8	19.4	21.2	-26.3
Norway
Poland	19.9	20.0	21.9	20.3	16.7	16.6	-16.7
Portugal	9.1	10.6	11.2	14.4	11.3	9.8	7.3
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	59.2	47.4	37.7	37.7	36.3	36.4	-38.5
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	120.2	141.5	129.1	160.4	85.9	77.9	-35.2
Spain	18.2	19.3	25.2	20.4	20.5	17.1	-6.3
Sweden	27.4	26.1	25.6	26.0	27.5	26.3	-3.8
Switzerland	47.2	51.4	60.3	57.1	59.3	58.7	24.6
Turkey
Ukraine	...	9.1	6.5	6.4	3.9	3.3	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	38	34	33	34	31	31	
<i>Median</i>	27	24	25	23	27	28	
<i>Minimum</i>	4	4	3	4	4	3	
<i>Maximum</i>	120	141	129	160	86	78	

Table 1.2.2.22 Offenders per 100 000 population – Money laundering

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	4.5	4.2	3.7	9.1	12.8	13.9	208.7
Armenia
Austria	7.2	5.6	5.1	6.1	6.2	8.1	13.1
Azerbaijan
Belgium	4.5	5.3	6.2	6.3	6.4	5.6	23.6
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Croatia	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.4	1.0	230.7
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.0	1.2	1.7	2.0	2.2	2.1	114.5
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany	8.8	8.1	9.2	9.8	11.6	13.0	47.5
Greece
Hungary	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.5	547.6
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	5.5	5.7	6.4	6.5	7.0	6.7	22.8
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	0.9	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8	-17.0
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	-100.0
Montenegro	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	-100.0
Netherlands	3.8	4.3	5.2	5.4	4.5
North Macedonia	0.7	2.3	2.2	1.5	1.2	1.5	127.0
Norway
Poland	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	9.1
Portugal	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	206.7
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	2.9	2.0	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.2	-93.1
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	4.5	11.9	10.4	8.1	5.4	5.4	18.5
Spain	0.9	1.2	1.3	1.7	1.4	1.1	26.4
Sweden	2.6	2.9	5.6	1.2	8.0	9.8	278.0
Switzerland	4.2	4.5	4.4	5.0	4.2	7.0	69.7
Turkey
Ukraine	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-81.8
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.3	3.7	...
<i>Median</i>	0.9	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.1	...
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
<i>Maximum</i>	8.8	11.9	10.4	9.8	12.8	13.9	...

Table 1.2.2.23 Offenders per 100 000 population – Corruption in the public sector

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	13.5	16.2	17.1	8.3	11.4	15.6	16.1
Armenia
Austria	7.9	6.0	6.3	4.3	4.7	5.0	-35.9
Azerbaijan	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.4	19.8
Belgium	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3	-43.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.5	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.9	26.9
Croatia	38.8	31.1	32.7	23.4	33.4	33.1	-14.8
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.9	2.0	1.5	1.2	1.6	0.9	-49.6
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia	...	6.4	8.5	6.7	8.6	9.3	...
Germany	1.4	1.7	1.5	2.0	1.4	1.1	-20.9
Greece	1.4	1.9	1.2	1.9	1.3	1.2	-13.2
Hungary	2.5	2.9	4.4	17.5	3.3	2.5	-0.4
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	14.5	22.8	30.2	36.3	33.0	17.8	22.1
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	9.5	11.5	5.8	6.0	6.4	4.7	-49.8
Montenegro	19.2	14.8	14.7	11.1	15.1	13.7	-28.8
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	7.4	6.1	4.8	4.5	3.9	3.2	-56.0
Portugal	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	31.4
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	2.5	2.4	1.9	1.4	4.0	2.1	-16.3
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	4.2	3.8	1.7	1.1	3.4	7.1	67.8
Spain	1.3	1.0	1.2	1.5	2.2	2.0	48.7
Sweden	1.7	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.8	1.8	4.9
Switzerland	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.9	0.6	0.2	-5.5
Turkey
Ukraine	4.1	2.7	2.2	1.6	2.1	2.0	-52.2
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	6.4	6.2	6.3	6.0	6.3	5.7	
<i>Median</i>	2.5	2.6	1.8	1.8	2.7	2.0	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	
<i>Maximum</i>	38.8	31.1	32.7	36.3	33.4	33.1	

Table 1.2.2.24 Offenders per 100 000 population – Drug offences: Total

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	32.5	43.4	45.7	53.0	49.0	47.4	45.8
Armenia
Austria	299.4	271.0	315.5	333.1	358.8	384.5	28.4
Azerbaijan	25.7	23.6	24.0	26.4	26.3	26.5	3.2
Belgium	398.7	361.8	398.1	457.0	431.6	457.9	14.9
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	27.1	27.7	31.5	34.2	40.1	53.0	95.5
Croatia	33.8	25.7	25.8	27.5	27.1	33.2	-1.8
Cyprus
Czech Republic	26.5	26.9	33.9	37.9	36.2	40.2	51.7
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	358.9	354.0	381.5	378.1	402.4	420.6	17.2
France	304.1	302.7	316.0	323.4	304.0	288.4	-5.1
Georgia	41.4	27.1	88.0	61.3	53.9	47.3	14.3
Germany	244.7	246.6	261.8	282.4	285.4	299.0	22.2
Greece	88.8	88.4	130.4	141.6	143.4	149.6	68.4
Hungary	55.3	47.9	51.4	60.7	60.5	62.1	12.3
Iceland	429.9	440.9	...	490.7	470.4	366.9	-14.7
Ireland	401.0	373.9	347.8	356.4	335.9	352.9	-12.0
Italy	110.5	111.7	112.8	105.6	101.3	106.7	-3.4
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	110.3	...
Lithuania	50.2	52.6	51.8	63.4	61.4	52.8	5.1
Luxembourg	923.6	...
Malta
Moldova	35.0	31.7	19.0	22.7	21.0	19.7	-43.8
Montenegro	50.5	32.4	28.3	31.9	29.6	34.1	-32.5
Netherlands	144.6	144.6	142.4	134.2	122.2	109.0	-24.6
North Macedonia	34.9	35.7	30.1	42.2	34.7	34.3	-1.8
Norway
Poland	76.6	77.1	74.2	67.2	64.9	71.8	-6.2
Portugal	59.6	63.6	60.4	60.2	68.8	75.1	25.9
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	71.4	67.3	79.8	87.5	80.5	98.1	37.4
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	94.8	109.7	98.3	101.4	103.1	89.0	-6.1
Spain	50.6	48.2	47.7	44.5	39.3	40.0	-21.0
Sweden	423.0	436.5	422.8	434.1	427.0	420.7	-0.5
Switzerland	481.8	501.8	518.5	416.3	432.3	417.3	-13.4
Turkey
Ukraine	81.1	69.1	45.4	39.6	32.4	27.9	-65.6
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	156	153	149	163	160	183	
<i>Median</i>	77	69	77	67	69	89	
<i>Minimum</i>	26	24	19	23	21	20	
<i>Maximum</i>	482	502	518	491	470	924	

Table 1.2.2.25 Offenders per 100 000 population – Drug trafficking

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	2.9	5.3	6.6	6.9	4.0	5.4	86.6
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	112.8	93.3	96.6	107.7	104.5	108.1	-4.2
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	33.8	25.7	25.8	27.5	27.1	33.2	-1.8
Cyprus
Czech Republic	21.2	21.7	25.6	29.8	28.7	31.2	47.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	139.2	143.6	155.3	140.5	136.9	151.6	8.9
France	19.0	18.1	19.5	19.3	18.9	20.3	6.9
Georgia	...	2.5	4.1	4.2	5.3	5.7	...
Germany	75.8	72.4	71.6	74.5	75.0	77.1	1.7
Greece
Hungary	5.0	4.2	3.1	3.5	3.9	4.5	-9.9
Iceland
Ireland	93.3	85.2	78.8	84.7	79.7	84.2	-9.8
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	35.2	...
Lithuania	16.2	19.4	17.3	20.4	15.3	16.1	-1.1
Luxembourg	96.3	...
Malta
Moldova	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	-36.3
Montenegro	41.0	23.7	24.0	27.4	25.1	28.8	-29.8
Netherlands
North Macedonia	28.6	28.4	22.6	34.6	29.7	27.6	-3.4
Norway
Poland	5.3	5.1	4.2	4.4	3.9	3.9	-27.4
Portugal	44.2	49.3	46.3	46.7	52.6	58.1	31.4
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	24.4	21.4	24.4	20.6	19.4	22.0	-9.5
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	85.9	101.5	90.6	92.3	96.8	82.3	-4.2
Spain
Sweden	68.1	65.9	68.5	67.6	61.3	57.2	-16.0
Switzerland	69.2	79.0	82.9	91.1	84.9	86.4	25.0
Turkey
Ukraine	16.3	14.3	7.1	6.3	5.0	1.3	-92.1
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	45.1	41.9	41.7	43.3	41.8	45.1	
<i>Median</i>	31.2	23.7	24.4	27.5	27.1	31.2	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	
<i>Maximum</i>	139.2	143.6	155.3	140.5	136.9	151.6	

Notes on tables 1.2.2.1 – 1.2.2.25

Germany	Data on suspects for completed intentional homicide only available since 2013
Greece	There might be breaks in the data series due to changes made to the police data system in 2013
Sweden	Changes were made to the registration of offenders in 2017, now all suspects are counted. The data here has been updated based on these changes and is therefore not comparable with the previous statistics.

1.2.3 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015

Table 1.2.3.1 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Criminal offences: Total

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	1178.6	7.9	6.9	1.0	...
Armenia	364.4	12.2	3.0	1.3	...
Austria	2918.8	20.8	12.0	37.0	...
Azerbaijan	170.1	6.9	2.9
Belgium	0.0	44.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina	646.9	...	3.8	0.4	...
Bulgaria	566.8	13.4	8.1	7.0	...
Croatia	1425.7	7.9	2.9
Cyprus	698.3	8.7	2.3	18.3	44.3
Czech Republic	966.1	15.6	3.4	7.1	62.4
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	4788.1	18.6	8.7	12.1	42.3
France	1748.4	17.9	17.2	16.2	...
Georgia	567.8	4.5	1.4	4.5	2.7
Germany	2917.6	24.8	12.6	38.5	23.9
Greece	1022.5	26.2	4.1	24.1	...
Hungary	1004.4	16.3	7.9	5.1	41.0
Iceland	1176.8	23.0
Ireland
Italy	1586.3	18.5	3.7	32.1	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	1169.9	12.5	5.8	4.1	...
Lithuania	919.5	10.5	7.5	2.0	...
Luxembourg	5051.2	23.7	8.4	59.2	...
Malta
Moldova	482.7	7.7	7.7	1.2	20.4
Montenegro	579.7	7.1	8.1	13.1	...
Netherlands	1784.3	16.3	12.4
North Macedonia	1193.6	...	5.9	1.2	...
Norway	1555.0	...	7.4	22.5	...
Poland	840.4	11.3	8.1	1.1	37.8
Portugal	1803.1	20.2
Romania
Russian Federation	746.2	...	5.2	3.9	...
Serbia	694.5	10.9	7.5	3.0	...
Slovak Republic	856.4	...	6.0	0.7	...
Slovenia	2191.9	18.6	3.5	11.1	42.1
Spain	684.9	13.9	5.1	33.4	30.6
Sweden	1796.5	20.9	9.2
Switzerland	1670.5	20.2	9.9	57.3	...
Turkey
Ukraine	313.1	11.7	4.4	0.8	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	1335	15.0	6.8	14.5	35.6
<i>Median</i>	1013	14.8	6.9	7.0	41.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0	4.5	1.4	0.4	2.7
<i>Maximum</i>	5051	26	17.2	59	62.4

Table 1.2.3.2 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Major road traffic offences

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	177	0.1
Armenia
Austria	405	29	3.6	19.7	59.7
Azerbaijan	18	1.7	0.7
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus	106
Czech Republic	56	19.4	0.4	7.1	62.8
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	65.5
France
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary	164	8.3	0.9	3.5	79.3
Iceland	170
Ireland
Italy	2	13.4	0.9	18.0	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	11	5.1	1.3	0.5	100.0
Montenegro	0.0
Netherlands
North Macedonia	125	...	1.6	1.0	...
Norway
Poland	191	7.6	0.8	1.6	39.4
Portugal	334	8.2
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	111	12.9	0.7	3.5	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	76	8.6	1.9	21.6	42.2
Sweden	413	10.5	6.0
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine	15	3.4	8.0	1.0	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	148	9.9	2.2	7.8	56.1
<i>Median</i>	118	8.3	1.1	3.5	61.2
<i>Minimum</i>	2	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	413	28.9	8.0	21.6	100.0

Table 1.2.3.3 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Intentional homicide

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	9	1.5	1.8	0.0	...
Armenia
Austria	2	15.4	6.2	48.8	32.9
Azerbaijan	9	1.9	1.7
Belgium	0	40.2
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	2	11.9	4.8	4.8	...
Croatia	3	9.8	1.6
Cyprus	1	14.3	0.0
Czech Republic	1	3.8	3.2	10.3	43.8
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	7	12.9	2.8	7.9	29.0
France	4	11.0	7.2	17.2	...
Georgia	2	3.3	7.7	1.1	...
Germany	3	12.1	5.3	35.3	27.8
Greece	4	27.6	0.0	29.8	...
Hungary	2	15.0	4.1	7.3	92.9
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	4	9.0	4.1	45.5	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	5	9.7	8.4
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	4	10.4	4.2	0.7	0.0
Montenegro	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	...
Netherlands	19	...	6.2
North Macedonia	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Norway
Poland	1	15.5	2.4	0.9	40.0
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	4	8.4	8.0	2.9	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.0
Spain	2	12.5	3.3	36.4	21.4
Sweden	9	8.8	8.9
Switzerland	2	13.3	1.0	55.1	...
Turkey
Ukraine	4	8.9	2.4	1.7	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	4	9.8	3.8	15.5	29.8
<i>Median</i>	3	9.8	3.7	6.0	29.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	19	27.6	8.9	55.1	92.9

Table 1.2.3.4 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Intentional homicide: Completed

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	2.8	0.0	...
Armenia	0.0
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	0.0	50.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	1.9	15.5	4.9	7.8	12.5
France	1.3	13.9	5.7	16.6	...
Georgia	2.7	3.0	6.9	1.0	...
Germany	0.9	16.5	3.8
Greece
Hungary	1.1	12.6	4.5	8.1	100.0
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	1.8	6.8	3.1	25.0	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg	0.5	0.0
Malta
Moldova	3.1	12.6	6.3	1.8	0.0
Montenegro	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland
Portugal	0.5	5.6
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.5	9.1	3.6	5.5	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	0.7	0.0	6.7	0.0	...
Spain	0.9	14.2	3.5	25.2	35.6
Sweden	2.8	7.6	7.6
Switzerland	0.7
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	1	7.8	4.3	7.6	39.6
<i>Median</i>	1	7.6	4.5	3.6	35.6
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	3	16.5	7.6	25.2	100.0

Table 1.2.3.5 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Bodily injury

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	127.0
Armenia
Austria	446.7	15.6	12.2	33.4	34.5
Azerbaijan	5.8	2.3
Belgium	48.3
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	6.9	4.0	9.9	0.8	...
Croatia	39.7	7.9	12.3
Cyprus	3.3	3.6	3.6
Czech Republic	41.1	7.8	6.5	7.9	66.7
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	472.9	18.1	9.3	11.3	30.0
France	314.3	17.4	16.0	13.6	...
Georgia	142.7	2.3	0.1	0.2	...
Germany	526.7	18.5	11.6	27.5	29.2
Greece	57.4	27.9	3.0	14.6	...
Hungary	50.1	10.7	11.6	1.9	74.7
Iceland	408.4	16.6
Ireland
Italy	103.4	18.1	4.5	30.6	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	310.7	7.4	2.6
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	17.4	6.5	5.2	0.2	0.0
Montenegro	54.0	2.7	11.3	3.6	...
Netherlands	227.5	15.2	11.1
North Macedonia	40.9	...	3.8	0.1	...
Norway
Poland	84.6	7.0	14.8	0.5	31.4
Portugal	543.9	22.4
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	41.2	6.5	12.4	0.9	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	73.4	11.0	6.5	4.7	15.5
Spain	35.5	13.0	6.8	31.2	31.3
Sweden	426.1	20.6	9.3
Switzerland	88.7	14.8	9.7	50.2	...
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	174	11.9	8.4	13.0	36.2
<i>Median</i>	85	11.0	9.3	6.3	31.4
<i>Minimum</i>	3	2.3	0.1	0.1	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	544	27.9	16.0	50.2	74.7

Table 1.2.3.6 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Aggravated bodily injury

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania
Armenia
Austria	42.8	10.0	12.8	39.8	34.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.1	25.0	0.0	0.0	...
Croatia	21.9	5.1	5.7
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	29.6	17.7	5.5	8.3	29.9
France
Georgia	5.3	1.0	0.5
Germany	165.7	15.6	15.8	27.4	31.3
Greece
Hungary	40.2	7.4	8.7	1.7	79.1
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	86.2	16.8	4.5	31.8	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	5.7	12.0	9.0
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	13.7	8.0	7.0	0.2	0.0
Montenegro	21.5	0.7	11.2	0.0	...
Netherlands
North Macedonia	9.2	...	13.6	0.5	...
Norway
Poland	2.0	9.3	3.0	1.5	9.1
Portugal	4.7	12.2
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	18.3	2.7	13.3	0.8	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	7.6	6.4	8.3	3.2	0.0
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland	6.6	8.6	13.0	53.2	...
Turkey
Ukraine	4.8	11.6	2.2	0.9	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	27	10.0	7.9	12.1	26.2
<i>Median</i>	11	9.3	8.3	1.6	29.9
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	166	25.0	15.8	53.2	79.1

Table 1.2.3.7 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Sexual assault

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	5.6
Armenia
Austria	31.1	3.1	15.0	29.2	35.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium	39.3
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	4.0	2.8	21.3	1.7	...
Croatia	9.0	0.5	5.8
Cyprus
Czech Republic	9.0	6.5	26.1	9.2	67.8
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	41.2	1.9	9.3	18.3	14.5
France	45.9	6.6	24.2	14.0	...
Georgia	8.3
Germany	22.3	2.6	16.7	24.0	29.2
Greece	11.4	26.4	3.8	36.9	...
Hungary	6.8	6.8	10.5	3.0	85.0
Iceland	96.0	3.5
Ireland
Italy	7.6	2.8	5.8	38.9	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	8.0	1.7	12.9
Luxembourg	61.1	32.8
Malta
Moldova	9.6	0.3	9.1	(0.3)	...
Montenegro	3.9	4.2	8.3	8.3	0.0
Netherlands	15.7	1.9	12.1
North Macedonia	5.5	...	12.4	0.9	...
Norway
Poland	3.5	1.0	15.6	0.7	55.6
Portugal	11.0	5.0
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	3.6	0.4	15.2	1.9	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	8.0	0.6	10.4	9.1	26.7
Spain	13.0	4.5	6.9	37.1	22.6
Sweden	55.6	2.3	12.5
Switzerland	30.3	2.8	16.4	46.8	...
Turkey
Ukraine	0.7	0.6	4.5	2.5	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	20	5.1	12.5	16.6	37.6
<i>Median</i>	9	2.8	12.2	9.2	32.1
<i>Minimum</i>	1	0.3	3.8	0.7	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	96	32.8	26.1	46.8	85.0

Table 1.2.3.8 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Rape

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania
Armenia
Austria	12.4	3.7	13.3	44.8	20.7
Azerbaijan	0.3	...	0.0
Belgium	31.6
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.0	2.7	16.0	1.3	...
Croatia	5.8	0.4	4.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	3.7	0.5	11.1	16.3	61.9
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	14.8	0.4	6.7	24.2	17.9
France	14.2	1.6	28.5	13.9	...
Georgia	0.3	...	9.1
Germany	7.7	1.5	8.8	29.9	24.7
Greece	1.7	22.7	5.0	37.0	...
Hungary	2.6	2.0	19.0	2.0	80.0
Iceland
Ireland	0.0
Italy	6.6	2.5	5.6	41.6	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	5.7	0.0	15.7
Luxembourg	9.1	5.9
Malta
Moldova	4.6	0.0	9.9	0.6	0.0
Montenegro	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Netherlands	3.7	...	12.8
North Macedonia	1.6	...	42.4	0.0	...
Norway
Poland	1.6	0.3	10.6	1.0	33.3
Portugal	1.4	4.7
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.9	0.0	21.0	4.8	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	2.0	0.0	9.8	14.6	16.7
Spain	1.8	2.0	10.2	55.5	20.2
Sweden	29.2	1.4	12.9
Switzerland	5.1	0.2	6.7	59.1	...
Turkey
Ukraine	0.4	0.5	5.9	3.2	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	5	2.4	11.9	19.4	30.7
<i>Median</i>	3	1.0	10.0	14.3	22.7
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	29	22.7	42.4	59.1	80.0

Table 1.2.3.9 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Sexual abuse of a child

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania
Armenia
Austria	7.7	3.5	25.0	15.7	43.3
Azerbaijan
Belgium	44.3
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.0	2.9	36.2	0.0	...
Croatia	1.5	1.6	6.3
Cyprus
Czech Republic	5.1	10.7	37.2	4.5	83.3
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	18.8	2.7	12.5	14.8	8.5
France	12.5	3.9	41.9	8.1	...
Georgia
Germany	7.2	4.5	29.8	14.2	26.2
Greece
Hungary	0.3	3.6	10.7	0.0	...
Iceland
Ireland	0.0
Italy	1.0	5.1	7.0	22.1	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	2.1	6.5	4.8
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	5.0	0.6	6.7	1.1	100.0
Montenegro	0.2	100.0	100.0	0.0	...
Netherlands
North Macedonia	1.8	...	23.7	0.0	...
Norway
Poland	1.9	1.5	19.7	0.4	100.0
Portugal	3.5	5.2
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.7	0.0	15.7	0.0	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	3.6	0.0	10.8	6.8	40.0
Spain	1.7	5.5	10.7	13.4	33.0
Sweden	19.0	3.1	20.6
Switzerland	9.3	3.1	24.4	40.0	...
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	5	8.8	23.4	8.8	53.2
<i>Median</i>	2	3.3	19.7	5.6	43.3
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0.0	4.8	0.0	8.5
<i>Maximum</i>	19	100.0	100.0	40.0	100.0

Table 1.2.3.10 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Robbery

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	21.0	0.8
Armenia
Austria	27.9	8.9	31.3	58.6	32.1
Azerbaijan	3.9	2.7	5.9
Belgium	45.1
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	11.2	3.6	17.9	1.2	...
Croatia	36.8	2.2	2.8
Cyprus	7.0	0.0	15.3
Czech Republic	14.1	8.2	16.2	9.4	72.9
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	28.5	13.1	15.9	12.2	37.9
France	28.0	8.1	40.9	17.6	...
Georgia	22.8	1.1	0.2	0.5	...
Germany	35.3	9.9	21.4	38.4	29.2
Greece	22.1	36.4	14.9	29.2	...
Hungary	10.9	10.3	22.9	3.0	75.0
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	35.8	7.6	9.3	41.1	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	31.2	6.4	36.0
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	16.8	3.5	17.5	0.7	0.0
Montenegro	7.6	0.0	12.8	10.6	...
Netherlands	31.8	...	27.3
North Macedonia	14.0	...	21.0	1.0	...
Norway
Poland	14.5	5.6	19.2	0.7	52.8
Portugal	78.1	6.7
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	20.5	5.4	23.2	2.1	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	8.0	9.0	27.1	17.5	34.5
Spain	33.2	11.3	16.7	45.9	19.3
Sweden	24.6	7.4	21.6
Switzerland	13.7	9.3	23.3	60.5	...
Turkey
Ukraine	15.8	4.3	8.1	1.3	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	23	7.3	18.8	18.5	39.9
<i>Median</i>	21	6.7	17.9	10.6	36.2
<i>Minimum</i>	4	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	78	36.4	40.9	60.5	75.0

Table 1.2.3.11 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Theft: Total

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania
Armenia
Austria	572.9	27.2	18.9	57.1	54.0
Azerbaijan	22.8	6.3	10.6
Belgium	53.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	198.1	19.5	14.4	0.9	...
Croatia	698.3	2.5	3.2
Cyprus	69.7	28.6	2.5
Czech Republic	210.1	14.6	5.4	5.9	81.2
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	1014.1	25.5	12.3	13.4	53.7
France	322.4	20.8	27.5	19.9	...
Georgia	80.8	2.6	4.7	2.2	...
Germany	565.3	29.0	18.8	38.5	43.1
Greece	186.6	28.1	10.9	25.2	...
Hungary	198.9	17.4	15.8	1.6	78.0
Iceland
Ireland	0.0
Italy	201.1	20.8	8.3	48.3	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	169.1	8.4	1.1	0.8	...
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	151.6	9.9	16.1	0.6	18.2
Montenegro	97.1	5.5	35.3	22.2	...
Netherlands	527.1	22.9	16.1
North Macedonia	103.5	...	6.9	1.2	...
Norway
Poland	130.5	12.2	14.3	0.9	48.0
Portugal	196.8	31.7
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	189.6	10.6	17.8	2.0	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	425.7	22.4	9.9	14.4	52.3
Spain	78.4	7.0	10.6	34.5	32.4
Sweden	389.1	28.1	13.3
Switzerland	292.6	25.1	16.9	63.2	...
Turkey
Ukraine	122.8	11.4	6.6	0.7	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	267	17.5	12.7	17.7	51.4
<i>Median</i>	197	19.5	12.3	9.6	52.9
<i>Minimum</i>	0	2.5	1.1	0.6	18.2
<i>Maximum</i>	1014	31.7	35.3	63.2	81.2

Table 1.2.3.12 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Aggravated theft

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania
Armenia
Austria	192.0	14.0	18.4	64.1	56.4
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	339.4	1.3	3.8
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	35.6	11.1	5.8	32.9	62.0
France
Georgia
Germany	122.2	12.7	16.1	43.3	45.8
Greece	36.9	28.5	8.0	34.4	...
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	419.7	3.3	5.4	0.2	18.8
Montenegro	48.4	1.0	41.2	22.3	0.0
Netherlands
North Macedonia	172.4	...	25.3	0.5	...
Norway
Poland	40.4	4.2	16.2	0.6	60.0
Portugal	47.0	12.5
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	75.8	5.0	19.4	1.7	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	141.1	16.7	14.4	22.0	61.7
Spain
Sweden	63.1	16.9	18.1
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	133	10.6	16.0	22.2	38.1
<i>Median</i>	76	11.8	16.2	22.1	51.1
<i>Minimum</i>	36	1.0	3.8	0.2	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	420	28.5	41.2	64.1	62.0

Table 1.2.3.13 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Theft of a motor vehicle

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania
Armenia
Austria	22.3	6.6	33.3	33.4	81.6
Azerbaijan
Belgium	53.8
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	4.8	1.7	22.1	0.9	...
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic	11.2	6.9	9.4	6.8	73.8
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	61.9	10.2	17.0	3.3	75.9
France	21.1	5.0	41.8	7.6	...
Georgia
Germany	18.0	6.5	22.6	30.5	65.5
Greece
Hungary	7.1	4.0	12.4	2.0	78.6
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	7.7	3.6	10.7	32.1	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	5.1	...	28.4	0.7	...
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	2.1	0.0	25.3	0.0	...
Montenegro	10.4
Netherlands	9.8	5.8	10.9
North Macedonia	10.0	...	33.8	3.4	...
Norway
Poland	1.6	3.4	12.4	0.8	40.0
Portugal	8.7	8.2
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	8.7	1.8	25.9	1.0	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	10.6	6.0	14.4	30.0	41.2
Sweden	29.8	10.1	18.2
Switzerland	18.6	6.9	33.8	53.3	...
Turkey
Ukraine	7.2	0.8	15.7	0.9	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	14	5.2	21.6	12.9	63.8
<i>Median</i>	10	5.8	20.1	3.3	69.6
<i>Minimum</i>	2	0.0	9.4	0.0	40.0
<i>Maximum</i>	62	10.2	41.8	53.3	81.6

Table 1.2.3.14 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Theft by means of burglary

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania
Armenia
Austria	125.6	7.3	21.5	59.3	52.4
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	326.5	1.1	3.8
Cyprus	134.8	2.8	6.6	0.0	...
Czech Republic	58.8	7.4	8.6	7.9	51.2
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	134.0	11.2	11.8
France	70.9	6.2	30.7	17.0	...
Georgia
Germany	82.5	12.9	13.9	44.0	41.9
Greece	48.2	22.5	8.5	28.0	...
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	11.4
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	7.4	4.2	31.3	0.4	0.0
Montenegro
Netherlands	328.7	32.0	16.3
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	38.8	4.2	16.4	0.5	61.3
Portugal	38.2	13.5
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	67.5	4.1	19.7	1.6	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	111.3	14.0	15.9	21.0	62.7
Spain	43.4	3.0	4.6	12.5	45.2
Sweden	57.7	9.8	9.9
Switzerland	42.0	8.7	18.5	71.1	...
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	96	9.7	14.9	21.9	45.0
<i>Median</i>	63	7.4	14.9	14.7	51.2
<i>Minimum</i>	7	1.1	3.8	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	329	32.0	31.3	71.1	62.7

Table 1.2.3.15 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Theft by means of domestic burglary

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania
Armenia
Austria	31.1	10.8	12.4	75.1	53.1
Azerbaijan
Belgium	0.0	32.2
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic	13.7	12.0	8.2	4.0	77.6
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	42.9	13.7	10.1
France	35.9	7.0	31.1	18.4	...
Georgia
Germany	27.7	14.1	12.2	35.6	37.2
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	24.6	15.9	7.5	54.6	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	7.7
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	32.5	13.4	16.1	1.0	18.2
Montenegro
Netherlands	53.6	10.8	17.3
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland
Portugal	20.6	17.5
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	74.6	8.1	16.1	1.4	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	23.5	11.6	14.0	16.3	65.8
Spain	23.2	11.8	13.6	33.4	35.6
Sweden	25.2	10.3	8.5
Switzerland	16.9	12.6	23.2	56.4	...
Turkey
Ukraine	5.3	16.6	5.7	1.6	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	27	12.4	14.0	27.1	45.7
<i>Median</i>	25	12.0	13.0	18.4	37.2
<i>Minimum</i>	0	7.0	5.7	1.0	18.2
<i>Maximum</i>	75	17.5	31.1	75.1	77.6

Table 1.2.3.16 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Fraud

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	29.6
Armenia
Austria	221.8	25.0	2.7	38.5	61.7
Azerbaijan	11.4	11.5	0.5
Belgium	69.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	5.5	15.3	3.5	1.3	...
Croatia	109.2	14.4	0.6
Cyprus	25.9	10.0	3.2
Czech Republic	45.5	28.2	0.6	5.3	82.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	404.6	27.0	3.2	5.2	43.6
France	87.0	32.0	3.9	13.7	...
Georgia	41.7	0.8	...	0.1	...
Germany	321.8	34.3	3.6	25.9	44.3
Greece	14.7	23.0	1.5	19.0	...
Hungary	42.0	24.9	1.4	1.7	72.5
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	110.3	24.0	0.5	14.7	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	55.1	20.0	3.9	0.9	...
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	13.1	16.3	2.8	0.9	75.0
Montenegro	7.6	12.8	0.0	36.2	0.0
Netherlands	25.1	...	6.4
North Macedonia	14.0	...	0.3	1.0	...
Norway
Poland	69.2	27.6	1.0	0.5	66.2
Portugal	41.3	30.9
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	12.2	15.9	1.8	2.6	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	145.0	24.7	0.6	17.3	49.2
Spain	18.4	25.4	1.0	28.3	36.0
Sweden	88.5	29.3	18.0
Switzerland	108.1	26.7	4.5	55.1	...
Turkey
Ukraine	9.4	20.7	3.3	0.3	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	77	21.7	2.9	13.4	54.5
<i>Median</i>	42	24.4	2.3	5.3	61.7
<i>Minimum</i>	6	0.8	0.0	0.1	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	405	34.3	18.0	55.1	82.0

Table 1.2.3.17 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Cyber fraud

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	66.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	...
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.2	28.3	22.0	1.6	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary	3.3	29.6	6.8	3.1	100.0
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	0.1	50.0	0.0	0.0	...
Montenegro	0.0
Netherlands
North Macedonia	0.1	...	0.0	0.0	...
Norway
Poland
Portugal	3.7	37.3
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.1	14.3	0.0	71.4	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	5.5	41.2	2.6	67.5	98.7
Spain	3.6	27.7	0.9	24.2	41.9
Sweden	31.9	32.2	3.2
Switzerland	13.2	28.6	8.1	62.5	...
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	5	32.3	4.4	25.6	61.4
<i>Median</i>	2	30.9	1.8	3.1	66.5
<i>Minimum</i>	0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	32	50.0	22.0	71.4	100.0

Table 1.2.3.18 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Forgery of documents

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	24.2	8.5	...	0.1	...
Armenia
Austria	49.9	17.3	6.6	64.5	21.9
Azerbaijan
Belgium	42.7
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	34.8	14.2	0.7
Cyprus	30.2	9.0	1.6
Czech Republic	5.2	20.6	0.9	51.7	9.2
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	56.8	22.2	5.3	19.5	26.6
France
Georgia	41.4
Germany	44.7	18.5	4.6	41.7	35.5
Greece	14.9	21.1	1.2	64.9	...
Hungary	70.9	32.6	2.6	14.4	18.2
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	33.2	17.7	2.7
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	6.8	32.6	0.0	9.9	8.3
Montenegro	19.0	5.1	0.0	51.7	...
Netherlands	27.2	...	11.1
North Macedonia	17.7	...	0.0	23.8	...
Norway
Poland	17.3	35.0	4.6	6.1	12.1
Portugal	11.3	23.5
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	36.3	12.5	2.0	6.4	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	85.9	19.9	0.3	45.1	28.4
Spain	20.5	20.5	1.0	62.6	11.7
Sweden	27.5	20.8	3.2
Switzerland	59.6	25.0	8.4	67.9	...
Turkey
Ukraine	3.9	36.0	0.4	6.7	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	32	20.6	2.9	33.6	21.5
<i>Median</i>	27	20.5	1.8	32.7	20.1
<i>Minimum</i>	4	5.1	0.0	0.1	8.3
<i>Maximum</i>	86	36.0	11.1	67.9	42.7

Table 1.2.3.19 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Money laundering

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	12.8	11.9	0.3	1.6	...
Armenia
Austria	6.2	24.9	0.0	52.5	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	45.1
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.0
Croatia	0.4	20.0	0.0
Cyprus	2.1	0.0	0.0
Czech Republic	2.2	27.7	0.4	15.6	69.4
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany	11.6	29.7	1.0	39.0	39.5
Greece
Hungary	0.1	30.0	0.0	10.0	100.0
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	7.0	16.4	1.0	27.3	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	0.8	29.2	0.0
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Montenegro	0.0
Netherlands	4.5	...	0.7
North Macedonia	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Norway
Poland	0.6	15.0	0.0	1.3	33.3
Portugal	0.0	50.0
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.2	0.0	0.0	18.2	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	5.4	16.1	0.0	11.6	15.4
Spain	1.4	27.8	0.2	35.2	20.5
Sweden	8.0	22.0	1.9
Switzerland	4.3	25.4	0.6	61.5	...
Turkey
Ukraine	0.1	12.0	0.0	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	3	18.8	0.3	19.6	46.2
<i>Median</i>	1	20.0	0.0	13.6	39.5
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4
<i>Maximum</i>	13	50.0	1.9	61.5	100.0

Table 1.2.3.20 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Corruption in the public sector

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	11.4	1.2	...	0.3	...
Armenia
Austria	4.7	20.4	0.0	2.7	54.5
Azerbaijan	0.3	20.8
Belgium	0.0	50.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.0	5.7	2.9	14.3	...
Croatia	33.4	29.6	0.0
Cyprus	10.5	4.5	5.6
Czech Republic	1.6	16.9	0.0	13.4	30.4
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia	8.6	1.3
Germany	1.4	21.5	0.2	18.4	30.4
Greece	1.3	31.5	4.2	5.6	...
Hungary	3.3	14.9	0.0	5.2	70.6
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	33.0	7.1
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	6.4	40.7	0.0	4.9	18.2
Montenegro	13.7	20.0	0.0	7.1	0.0
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	3.9	16.8	0.1	4.3	28.1
Portugal	0.2	11.1
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	4.0	17.8	1.4	0.0	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	3.4	14.1	0.0	9.9	0.0
Spain	2.2	17.3	0.0	4.8	50.0
Sweden	0.8	19.5	0.0
Switzerland	0.6	23.5	0.0	47.1	...
Turkey
Ukraine	2.1	12.3	0.0	0.3	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	6	16.7	0.8	9.2	33.2
<i>Median</i>	3	17.1	0.0	5.2	30.4
<i>Minimum</i>	0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	33	40.7	5.6	47.1	70.6

Table 1.2.3.21 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Drug offences: Total

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	49.0	0.1	0.0	0.8	...
Armenia
Austria	25.9
Azerbaijan	26.3	2.1	0.3
Belgium	56.9
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	40.1	8.2	15.2	1.5	...
Croatia	27.1	7.0	6.9
Cyprus	120.3	8.1	11.9
Czech Republic	36.2	15.9	4.4	9.4	34.7
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	402.4	14.0	5.0	9.0	44.3
France	304.0	9.3	17.1	8.8	...
Georgia	53.9	3.8	0.5	4.6	...
Germany	285.4	12.9	8.9	22.3	38.7
Greece	143.4	22.4	1.8	17.8	...
Hungary	60.5	9.8	5.8	5.4	72.0
Iceland	470.4	13.7
Ireland
Italy	101.3	7.4	5.1	39.0	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	61.4	9.5	5.0
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	21.0	11.1	3.2	0.5	50.0
Montenegro	34.1	7.5	3.8	18.9	...
Netherlands	122.2	11.6	5.4
North Macedonia	34.7	...	2.6	1.0	...
Norway
Poland	70.4	5.8	13.6	0.9	44.9
Portugal	68.8	8.5
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	80.5	6.4	6.1	5.8	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	103.1	11.5	5.0	5.8	70.2
Spain	39.3	15.4	1.8	37.0	21.3
Sweden	427.0	14.1	9.3
Switzerland	432.3	12.5	15.7	42.6	...
Turkey
Ukraine	32.4	12.2	1.4	0.7	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	135	10.0	6.2	12.2	45.9
<i>Median</i>	69	9.7	5.0	5.8	44.6
<i>Minimum</i>	21	0.1	0.0	0.5	21.3
<i>Maximum</i>	470	22.4	17.1	42.6	72.0

Table 1.2.3.22 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among offenders in 2015 – Drug trafficking

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	27.1	7.0	6.9
Cyprus
Czech Republic	28.7	16.9	5.1	10.0	30.8
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	136.9	13.5	3.1	11.1	42.0
France	18.9	9.7	13.2	19.2	...
Georgia	5.3	3.0	...	41.2	...
Germany	75.0	10.6	0.9	28.4	34.1
Greece
Hungary	3.9	10.6	1.3	6.7	34.6
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	15.3	16.1	4.7
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	0.5	6.3	0.0	0.0	...
Montenegro	28.8	...	3.4	20.7	...
Netherlands
North Macedonia	29.7	...	2.3	1.1	...
Norway
Poland	3.9	6.5	19.5	0.1	100.0
Portugal	52.6	8.9
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	19.4	6.8	3.1	3.0	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	96.8	11.4	4.0	6.2	70.2
Spain
Sweden	61.3	13.4	4.9
Switzerland	88.0	8.0	7.8	61.2	...
Turkey
Ukraine	5.0	12.0	1.7	0.7	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	39	10.0	5.1	15.0	51.9
<i>Median</i>	28	10.1	3.7	8.4	38.3
<i>Minimum</i>	0	3.0	0.0	0.0	30.8
<i>Maximum</i>	137	16.9	19.5	61.2	100.0

1.2.4 Police staff

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

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	309.5	306.9	307.8	308.4	345.2	346.0	11.8
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	344.7	339.8	339.1	338.7	336.1	332.7	-3.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	381.3
Croatia	492.7	499.0	486.8	484.2	489.6	487.6	-1.0
Cyprus	630.4	610.5	579.6	578.9	581.1	572.9	-9.1
Czech Republic	393.1	371.6	364.8	368.6	374.8	379.5	-3.5
Denmark	196.3	192.6	191.2	190.0	186.3	184.1	-6.2
Estonia	337.2	330.4	319.7	310.8	297.8	298.6	-11.5
Finland	148.5	146.0	140.8	138.6	136.9	134.5	-9.4
France	367.9	...
Georgia	448.4	506.4	513.4	...
Germany	319.1	320.6	321.5	321.1	320.5	319.1	0.0
Greece
Hungary	345.3	367.5	367.6	368.9	374.3	378.8	9.7
Iceland	204.7	205.3	203.2	200.5	198.4	194.3	-5.1
Ireland
Italy	457.3	460.8	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	...	420.3	405.1	458.5	458.2	460.9	...
Lithuania	325.2	317.8	317.1	323.5	311.7	287.8	-11.5
Luxembourg
Malta	...	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	510.6	...
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	303.7	308.1	307.5	305.7	298.9	298.9	-1.6
North Macedonia	449.8	450.5	467.5	463.1	...
Norway
Poland	256.1	256.2	253.0	255.0	260.0	260.4	1.7
Portugal	451.8	438.6	436.2	439.6	441.5	447.6	-0.9
Romania	64.3	58.0	...
Russian Federation
Serbia
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	372.2	358.6	350.3	340.3	345.5	346.8	-6.8
Spain	387.9	382.8	376.3	371.3	365.4	361.3	-6.9
Sweden	216.6	209.7	208.4	207.9	204.2	203.3	-6.2
Switzerland	290.8	...
Turkey	315.6	324.2	331.3	335.1	335.5	320.0	1.4
Ukraine	256.8	333.3	334.1	338.6	304.1	268.5	4.6
UK: England & Wales	247.7	237.1	227.5	222.8	219.1	212.5	-14.2
UK: Northern Ireland	392.4	384.1	372.5	371.7	368.7	363.2	-7.5
UK: Scotland	325.7	328.1	328.4	322.5	321.9	320.4	-1.6
<i>Mean</i>	329	319.5	319.9	325.8	325.0	336.9	
<i>Median</i>	325	328.1	329.9	335.1	335.8	332.7	
<i>Minimum</i>	148	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	58.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	630	610.5	579.6	578.9	581.1	572.9	

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

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	82.8	83.9	83.4	82.2	81.1	80.4	-2.9
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	74.4
Croatia	126.3	126.1	123.1	120.5	118.0	116.1	-8.1
Cyprus
Czech Republic	91.2	87.5	87.9	88.5	88.8	91.2	0.0
Denmark	67.5	64.7	62.6	63.9	66.1	71.7	6.3
Estonia	130.0	119.5	120.7	117.6	100.4	96.6	-25.7
Finland	48.4	47.7	47.5	44.5	44.3	42.8	-11.5
France	50.9	...
Georgia
Germany	50.5	50.2	49.5	49.3	48.5	48.4	-4.1
Greece
Hungary	104.5	106.0	107.2	118.8	120.5	124.6	19.2
Iceland	84.4	74.7	64.7	...
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	78.1	75.5	78.3	80.6	78.2	79.0	1.2
Luxembourg
Malta	22.2	...
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	75.9	73.1	61.5	56.1	53.0	52.9	-30.4
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	65.5	65.4	65.1	66.1	66.0	66.1	0.9
Portugal	27.6	24.2	18.1	20.7	28.6	22.3	-19.4
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	57.4	54.3	52.8	51.4	50.6	51.3	-10.6
Spain
Sweden	84.8	89.2	89.8	89.6	85.8	96.4	13.6
Switzerland
Turkey	17.9	17.4	17.4	...	16.2
Ukraine	105.9	100.3	82.7	81.9	73.5	44.0	-58.4
UK: England & Wales	131.8	119.3	115.1	111.7	110.1	105.6	-19.8
UK: Northern Ireland	137.9	119.6	-13.3
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	82	76.7	74.3	78.1	72.6	72.3	
<i>Median</i>	80	75.5	78.3	81.9	74.4	68.9	
<i>Minimum</i>	18	17.4	17.4	20.6	16.2	22.2	
<i>Maximum</i>	138	126.1	123.1	120.5	120.5	124.6	

Table 1.2.4.3 Police staff: Percentage of women and officers among the staff

	Women	Officers at criminal investigation departments
Albania	9.5	15.6
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	21.6	10.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	...	6.0
Croatia	17.6	...
Cyprus	24.7	...
Czech Republic	15.1	22.7
Denmark
Estonia	34.7	19.5
Finland
France
Georgia	15.8	...
Germany	19.7	...
Greece
Hungary	22.4	21.4
Iceland	15.5	17.0
Ireland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	35.6	...
Lithuania	34.5	...
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia	11.9	...
Norway
Poland
Portugal	7.5	10.5
Romania	18.6	76.6
Russian Federation
Serbia
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	16.9	13.6
Spain	10.9	10.7
Sweden	31.4	44.9
Switzerland
Turkey	55.0	...
Ukraine	15.6	10.9
UK: England & Wales	28.2	...
UK: Northern Ireland	28.0	...
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	22	21
<i>Median</i>	19	16
<i>Minimum</i>	8	6
<i>Maximum</i>	55	77

1.3 Technical Information

Table 1.3.1 Data recording methods relating to Tables 1.2.1 – 1.2.1.6 and 1.2.1.8 – 1.2.1.23 (offences) (1/2)

	Are there written rules regulating the way in which data is recorded?	When is 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 described above been substantially modified between 2011 and 2016?
	1: Yes 2: No	1: When reported to the police 2: Subseq. 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	...	2	1	2	2	1	...
Armenia	1	2	1	2	1	1	2
Austria	1	3	1	2	2	1	2
Azerbaijan	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
Belgium	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	2	2	1	2	2	1	2
Croatia	1	2
Cyprus	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
Czech Republic	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Denmark	2	1	1	2	2	1	2
Estonia	1	1	1	2	...	1	...
Finland	2	1	1	2	2	1	2
France	1	3	3	2	2	1	2
Georgia	2	2	1	...	1	1	...
Germany	1	3	1	1	...	1	2
Greece	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
Hungary	1	3	1	2	2	1	2
Iceland	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
Ireland
Italy	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	2	2	1	1	2	1	2
Lithuania	1	2	1	1	2	1	2
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova	1	2	1	2	1	1	2
Montenegro	2	3	1	2	1	1	2
Netherlands	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
North Macedonia	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
Norway
Poland	1	3	1	1	1	1	1
Portugal	1	2	3	1	1	1	2

Table 1.3.1 Data recording methods relating to Tables 1.2.1 – 1.2.1.6 and 1.2.1.8 – 1.2.1.23 (offences) (2/2)

	Are there written rules regulating the way in which data is recorded?	When is 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 described above been substantially modified between 2011 and 2016?
	1: Yes 2: No	1: When reported to the police 2: Subseq. 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
Romania	...	1	1	1	2	2	...
Russian Federation
Serbia	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	1	3	1	2	1	1	2
Spain	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
Sweden	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Switzerland	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Turkey	2	...	1	2	2	1	2
Ukraine	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
UK: England & Wales	1	1	1	1	1	...	2
UK: Northern Ireland	1	1	1	1	1	...	2
UK: Scotland	1	1	1	1	2	1	2

Are there written rules regulating the way in which data is recorded?

Of the countries that gave information 23 said they had written rules regulating the way in which the data is recorded. Seven countries said they did not have written rules. As pointed out in previous editions of the Sourcebook, it is most likely that those countries have instructions to guide how to count offences although they may not be considered as written rules.

When are the data collected for the statistics?

In 15 countries data is collected when the offence was reported to the police. Additional two countries report mixed counting rules. In the Czech Republic the data is based on the tactical-statistical classification but not on the criminal code. The classification is independent of the qualification according to the Criminal Code since if the paragraphs change, the TSC remains the same. In Spain most offences are initially recorded when the offence is reported to the police but in serious cases

definitions of offence type can change in the course of the investigation. Seven countries report that offences are counted after an investigation is completed.

What is the counting unit used in this table?

Altogether 34 countries report the offence to be the counting unit in the data. Only one country used the case, and two countries used the decision as a counting unit.

Is a principal offence rule applied?

Fifteen countries reported that they applied a principal offence rule and 20 that they did not. In Greece the principal offence rule applied until 2012. after that all concurrent offences are recorded.

How are multiple offences counted?

13 counties counted multiple offences as one offence, whereas 20 countries reported that they count such an offence as two or more. Two countries reported mixed methods. In Montenegro multiple offences are counted as one unless they meet the conditions of being defined as an Extended Criminal Offence and in Slovenia, the general rule is to count multiple offences as one but, in some cases, they are counted as many.

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

Offences committed by more than one person are generally counted as one offence as 30 countries report. Montenegro reported mixed counting rules.

Have the data recording methods described above been substantially modified between 2011 and 2016?

Six countries reported changes in data recording methods.

Belgium

In the end of 2015 changes were made to the national database and persons could be registered for minor offences, but before they could only be registered for serious offences.

Greece

The informational system generating the statistics for the Hellenic Police was redesigned in 2013.

Iceland

Changes in working procedures regarding domestic violence has led to more cases being registered as violence.

Poland

Data changes and system changes were made in 2012 and 2013 causing breaks in the data series.

Sweden

The statistics of persons suspected of offences were revised in 2017 leading to all persons suspected of offences to be included instead of only including persons still suspected of an offence after a crime investigation. Comparative data is available from 2007.

Ukraine

A new Criminal Procedural Code came into force in the end of 2012.

Definition of foreigner

Generally speaking, foreigners are persons who do not have the nationality of the country in which they commit an offence.

Age Brackets used in Tables 1.2.3.1 to 1.2.3.22

Most countries count minors as persons who are not yet 18 years old. In Austria, Azerbaijan, Poland, Slovenia, and Ukraine the maximum age for a minor was reported to be 17 years.

The lower age limit for treating a person as a minor varies among different countries. Many countries report the minimum age to be 14 but, however, it is possible that persons below the age of criminal responsibility are included in police statistics.

Table 1.3.3 Minimum age for inclusion in Tables 1.2.3.1 to 1.2.3.22

Albania	...
Armenia	...
Austria	1
Azerbaijan	14
Belgium	0
Bosnia-Herzegovina	...
Bulgaria	14
Croatia	14
Cyprus	14
Czech Republic	0
Denmark	...
Estonia	14
Finland	0
France	0
Georgia	14
Germany	0
Greece	8
Hungary	12
Iceland	...
Ireland	...
Italy	0
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	...
Latvia	14
Lithuania	14
Luxembourg	...
Malta	...
Moldova	14
Montenegro	...
Netherlands	0
North Macedonia	14
Norway	...
Poland	13
Portugal	...
Romania	...
Russia	...
Serbia	14
Slovak Republic	...
Slovenia	14
Spain	14
Sweden	15
Switzerland	10
Turkey	...
Ukraine	14
UK: England & Wales	...
UK: Northern Ireland	...
UK: Scotland	...

Notes on table 1.3.3

France	No legal minimum age and in police statistics all age groups are included.
Germany	Police statistics include all age groups, but offences committed by very young children are not likely to be recorded.
Hungary	The age of criminal responsibility is 12 years.
Lithuania	Age of criminal liability is 16 in most cases but can be 14 in some cases.
Turkey	Definition not clear. Age of criminal liability is 12 but the database includes younger suspects.

Table 1.3.5 Technical information on Table 1.2.4.1 – Police staff: Civilians

	Cadet police officers	Clerical staff	Technical staff	Maintenance staff (cars)	Traffic wardens	Domestic staff	volunteers
Albania	2	1	1	1	2	2	2
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	2	2	1	1	2	2	2
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1	2	2	2	1	2	1
Croatia	2	1	1	1	2	2	2
Cyprus	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
Czech Republic	2	1	1	1	2	1	2
Denmark	1	1	1	1	2	...	2
Estonia	2	2	2	2	...	2	...
Finland	2	1	1	1	2	2	2
France	1	1	1	1	2	1	...
Georgia	2	2	2	2	...	2	...
Germany	2	1	1	1	2	2	...
Greece
Hungary	2	1	1	1.2	2	1	2
Iceland	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
Ireland
Italy	2	2	2	2	2	2	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	2	1	1	1	2	1	2
Luxembourg
Malta
Moldova
Montenegro	2	2	2	...	2	2	...
Netherlands	2	1	1	1	2	2	2
North Macedonia	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
Norway
Poland	2	1	2	1	2	2	2
Portugal	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
Romania
Russia
Serbia	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	2	1	1	1	2	1	2
Spain
Sweden	2	1	1	1	2	2	2
Switzerland
Turkey	2	1	1	1	2	2	2
Ukraine	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
UK: England & Wales	2	1	1	2	2	1	...
UK: Northern Ireland	2	1	1	1	2	2	...
UK: Scotland	2	1	1	1	2	2	...

1.4 Sources

Albania	The General Directorate of State Police.
Armenia	Information Center. RA Police (non-published data). Publication – Social-economical Situation in Armenia. January-December 2017. https://www.armstat.am/file/article/sv_12_16a_540.pdf . Publication – Social-economical Situation in Armenia. January-December 2015. https://www.armstat.am/file/article/sv_12_14a_550.pdf . Publication – Social-economical Situation in Armenia. January-December 2013. https://www.armstat.am/file/article/sv_12_12a_570.pdf
Austria	Statistics of Crime Reports in Austria 2011 – 2016 by Criminal Intelligence Service. Ministry of the Interior; "Report on the drug situation" (Bericht zur Drogensituation – Gesundheit Österreich GmbH)
Azerbaijan	Information about crimes 2013-2016 is available on the official website of the State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan https://www.stat.gov.az/source/crimes/ and Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Azerbaijan https://mia.gov.az/?/az/content/29993/
Belgium Bosnia-Herzegovina	Data taken from "Annual Bulletins of Police Statistics 2011 – 2016". Ministry of Interior. Please go to: https://www.mvr.bg/министерството/programni-dokumenti-otcheti-analizi/statistika/godisen-buletin-policejska-statistika (in Bulgarian only). Source regarding "Intentional homicide where firearm has been involved": Letter from the Ministry of Interior. National Police General Directorate. to the Bulgarian Association of Criminology. dated 08 August 2018. not published.
Bulgaria	Croatian Bureau of Statistics. which collected the data from the prosecution office.
Croatia Cyprus Czech Republic Denmark	Statistical Reports of the Crime. The Police of the Czech Republic. published. www.mvcr.cz Ministry of Justice - special data files bought from Statistics Denmark http://www.kriminaalpoliitika.ee/et/statistika-ja-uuringud/kuritegevus-eestis - Ministry of Justice.
Estonia	"Completed intentional homicide" – http://www.tai.ee/en/r-and-d/health-statistics - National Institute for Health Development. "Theft of a motor vehicle" and "Domestic burglary" – Police and Border Guard Board - not published.
Finland	Statistics Finland. Rikos- ja pakkokeinotilasto 1.7.2018 http://pxnet2.stat.fi/PXWeb/pxweb/fi/StatFin/StatFin_oik_rpk/ In order to produce statistics in accordance with the standards of official statistics based on the European Statistics Code of Practice. it was decided to set up a ministerial statistical service within the Ministry of the Interior. Thus. the Ministerial Statistical Service for Internal Security (SSMSI) was created in 2014: it is placed under the joint functional authority of the Directors-General of the National Police (DGPN) and the National Gendarmerie (DGGN) and is organically attached to the Central Directorate of the Judicial Police of the DGPN. Since 06 October 2015. the Interstats website presents reference data. analyses. studies and series of figures on insecurity and delinquency. These data are put online by the ministerial statistical service for internal security (SSMSI). service statistique ministériel de la sécurité intérieure (SSMSI)
France	Ministry of Internal Affairs Unify Statistical Report
Georgia	Bundeskriminalamt: Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik Bundesrepublik Deutschland. 2011 - 2016. Wiesbaden 2012 - 2017
Germany	Statistical Yearbook of the Hellenic Police (2011-2016)
Greece	Standard Criminal Statistics of Investigation Authorities and Prosecutors
Hungary	National commissioner of the Icelandic police – annual report
Iceland	Italian Institute of statistics - http://www.istat.it - Ministry of Justice. Department of Statistics
Ireland	Information Centre of the Ministry of Interior
Italy	Ministry of Internal Affairs - Department of Informatics and Communication - Section of Statistics: Departmental Register of Crimes. A number of various reports were used for the collection of relevant data. Published: Department of Informatics and Communication. website:
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	
Latvia	
Lithuania	

	https://www.ird.lt/lt/paslaugos/nusikalstamu-veiku-zinybinio-registro-nvzr-paslaugos/ataskaitos-1/nusikalstamumo-ir-ikiteisminiu-tyrimu-statistika-1
Luxembourg	
Malta	
Moldova	The data have been provided by the Ministry of Internal Affairs
Montenegro	
Netherlands	Statistics Netherlands
North Macedonia	Police Statistics
Norway	https://www.ssb.no/en/sosiale-forhold-og-kriminalitet/statistikker/lovbrudda
Poland	Police Headquarter Statistical Information Bureau – not published (by type of offences defined in European Sourcebook)
Portugal	Directorate-General for Justice Policy – Ministry of Justice
Romania	General Inspectorate of the Romanian Police – Center for Information and Public Relations (Inspectoratul General al Poliției Române - Centrul de Informare și Relații Publice)
Russian Federation	
Serbia	The source of all the data is the Unique information system of the Ministry of Interior in which there is an electronic application Criminal offences and offenders in which all the police reports on the basis of all the law. all NN offenders. clearing up of the offences and rejection of the report and prequalification of the criminal offence are entered.
Slovak Republic	
Slovenia	Yearly Statistical Database of Criminal Offences
Spain	National Police. Civil Guard. Basque Country Police (Ertzaintza). Catalanian Police (Mossos d'Esquadra) and Police from the region of Navarre. From year 2013 on several Local Police bodies are considered as well.
Sweden	Swedish National Council of Crime Prevention. Reported Offences Sweden. https://www.bra.se/statistik/kriminalstatistik/anmalda-brott.html
Switzerland	Total Offences (CP + LStup+ LEtr. lois annexes > 2015) H (111-116 CP include attempts) BI (122-123 CP > 129 CP) SA (187 à 193 CP + 198 CP. Rape 190 CP). SA of a child (187 CP) R (140 + 139 CP – Bag snatching) T (139 CP) F (137 + 138 + 146 à 148 + 150 + 150bis + 151 CP) CF (147 CP) FD (251 + 252 CP) ML (305bis CP) C (all chapter 19) DO (LStup) 1) "total criminal offences" data for 2012 and 2013: General Directorate of Security – Activity Report 2013. Link: https://www.egm.gov.tr/SiteAssets/Sayfalar/StratejiGelistirmeFaaliyetleri/EGM_2013_Yili_FAALIYET_RAPORU.pdf 2) "forgery of documents" data for 2013: General Directorate of Security – Activity Report 2013. Link: https://www.egm.gov.tr/SiteAssets/Sayfalar/StratejiGelistirmeFaaliyetleri/EGM_2013_Yili_FAALIYET_RAPORU.pdf 3) "completed intentional homicide" for 2012: General Directorate of Security – Activity Report 2012. Link: https://www.egm.gov.tr/SiteAssets/Sayfalar/StratejiGelistirmeFaaliyetleri/2012_yili_faaliyet_raporu.pdf 4) "forgery of documents" for 2011: General Directorate of Security – Activity Report 2012. Link: https://www.egm.gov.tr/SiteAssets/Sayfalar/StratejiGelistirmeFaaliyetleri/2012_yili_faaliyet_raporu.pdf 5) "completed intentional homicide" for 2011: General Directorate of Security – Activity Report 2012. https://www.egm.gov.tr/SiteAssets/Sayfalar/StratejiGelistirmeFaaliyetleri/2012_yili_faaliyet_raporu.pdf 6) All the other data is from UNODC online database: https://data.unodc.org Information about crimes 2013-2016 is available on the official website of the General Prosecutor's Office of Ukraine since 2013 year https://www.gp.gov.ua/ua/statinfo.html/ . For example: official website of the General Prosecutor's Office of Ukraine: «Статистична інформація про стан злочинності та результати прокурорсько-слідчої діяльності» (Statistical information about crime and the results of prosecutorial and investigative activities) / Статистична інформація 2015 рік (Statistical information 2015 year) / Про зареєстровані кримінальні правопорушення та результати їх досудового розслідування (registered criminal offenses and the results of their pre-trial investigation) / Єдиний звіт про кримінальні правопорушення по державі за січень-грудень 2015 року (united report about criminal offenses in the country for January-December 2015) / file «forma_1_gruden 2015 (1).xlsx». Information is available only in Ukrainian.
Turkey	
Ukraine	

UK: England & Wales	Based on Reference table A4 which accompanied 'Crime in England and Wales, year ending June 2016'. with the exception of firearm offences which is taken from a separate collection of police recorded crime and excludes air weapons.
UK: Northern Ireland	Statistics Branch, Police Service of Northern Ireland Disclosive
UK: Scotland	Based on data taken from 'Recorded Crime in Scotland, 2011-12' and 'Homicide in Scotland, 2011-12' http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Crime- Justice/PubRecorded-Crime http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Crime-Justice/PubHomicide

2 Prosecution Statistics

2.1 General comments

2.1.1 Background

Object of data collection

This chapter describes the outcome of procedures at the prosecutorial stage (prosecutors and examining judges) for the years 2011 – 2016. Taking into account the discretion at the prosecutor's level, various forms of disposals are differentiated for the year 2015 with a special focus on bringing a case to the court. Also restricted to 2015, data on the breakdown by minors, women, foreigners and by offences are represented.

Concerning the variety of disposals at the prosecution stage data have been collected but only for the year 2015. Within the present category of a conditional disposal differentiations were made in terms of specific conditions imposed on the offender: this includes community-based measures as well as fines. Only a minority of countries have both this concept of and data on conditional disposals by the prosecution authority. More often, community sanctions and measures may result from a court sentence (see chapter 3) or be connected with the execution of a prison sentence (see chapter 5).

The chapter also provides data on the staff of prosecuting authorities in the same years. In addition, data on the most important compulsory measures at this stage, police custody and pre-trial detention are presented. Pre-trial detention is also covered in chapter 4.

36 countries were able to provide any data for this chapter (and will be presented in the tables) and only 23 on the number of prosecutors / employees of the prosecuting authority.

Definitions of the prosecution stage

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

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

The term *prosecuting authority* refers to the legal body which has as its main task to institute criminal proceedings, i.e. to decide, 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.

There are many differences and many variations in the form this prosecutorial level takes within the different European countries. For the purpose of this 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)

In some countries, the input into the prosecutorial level is identical to 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 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).

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. The following countries said that they included cases disposed of or sanctioned by the police or other law enforcement authorities: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Estonia, Hungary, Sweden, UK: Scotland. However, the powers of the police are always limited to minor cases, in some countries concerning only petty traffic offences.

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?

According to the standard definition, in principle, *all offences defined as criminal* by the law should be included. But there are some countries which follow a minor offence concept either excluding them from the criminal code (e.g. the *nykroczenia* in Poland in cases of minor thefts etc.) or making them subject to special proceedings (e.g. most *contraventions* in France which are handled by the police only) outside the criminal justice system. Included are major road traffic offences (e.g. drunk driving) and all other criminal offences subject to criminal proceedings. Excluded are minor traffic offences (e.g. parking offences), breaches of public order regulations and all other minor offences subject to proceedings outside the criminal justice system, even if defined as criminal by the law (i.e. misdemeanours, contraventions, *nykroczenia*, *faltas*). Less than half of the countries were able to follow this definition in all respects, but deviations usually only refer to one or two items of the above-mentioned include/exclude-categories. For details see Appendix I: Definitions.

A special problem refers to recording unknown offender cases. In some countries these are handled by police only, which means that they are not recorded at the prosecution level. If they are part of the input into prosecution statistics there are different modes of recording: In some countries they are not counted at all, in some countries they are included in the output, i.e. the total of cases disposed of. Dependent on these different modes of recording the amount of prosecutorial disposals varies strongly (see technical table 2.3.2).

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 as well technical table 2.3.7).

Discretion at prosecutor's level (output)

The data provided for the cases disposed of by the prosecuting authority (table 2.2.1.1) refer to the output at public prosecutor's level (tables 2.2.1.1 to 2.2.3.5), i.e. the type of decision taken. This means that pending cases are not included in the total of disposals.

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 imposed by the prosecutor that lead to a formal verdict and count as a conviction, number of conditional disposals, number of proceedings dropped in combination with a cautioning of the suspect, number of proceedings dropped unconditionally due to lack of public interest or for efficiency reasons, number of proceedings dropped for legal or factual reasons, number of proceedings dropped because offender remained unknown, number of other disposals*. Some of these categories may not apply to every country considered.

Three *basic structures* are possible:

- There are 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 dealt with in this chapter the prosecuting authority has the power to decide whether or not to prosecute (i.e. to drop a case completely). In some 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), usually to pay an amount of money.
- There are a few countries where the prosecutor can impose penal sanctions, that lead to a formal verdict and count as convictions.

The differentiation between “cases brought before a court”, “sanctions imposed by the prosecutor that lead to a formal verdict and count as a conviction” and “conditional disposals” 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.

Sanctions imposed by the prosecutor (or by the court but on application of the prosecutor and without a formal court hearing) that lead to a formal verdict include the penal order (*Strafbefehl*) known in some countries, where the defendant is considered as convicted (and should be counted as such in chapter 3). Conditional disposals are usually administered in a rather informal way. The defendant agrees to pay a fine or to accept any restrictions or conditions in exchange to ending prosecution, implying that s/he will not be considered as formally convicted. Here, a breakdown by various forms of conditions is made.

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. For more explanations on other disposals see technical table 2.3.3.

Exclusion of tables; statistical rules

No separate input statistics are published in this chapter. Only for countries where output data were not available, data on the input total of proceedings or persons were used instead. See notes on table 2.2.1.1 to find out which countries are concerned. Data on the input total and on pending cases can, however, be found on the internet (<https://wp.unil.ch/europeansourcebook/>)

Most of the countries reporting data on prosecution level apply written rules on recording. The majority of countries count proceedings if more than one person is involved as one case. Most countries do the same if multiple offences occurred. However, most countries record two (or more) cases if a person is subject to more than one 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; see technical table 2.3.7 for more detailed information.

2.1.2 Results

Trends

Wide variations can be seen in the total rates of cases disposed of by the prosecution authorities from 477 disposals per 100 000 population in Georgia to 6 466 in France for 2015 (see table 2.2.1.1). Similar differences can be found on the police level. According to the different workload of the national prosecution authorities, different modes of handling the cases can be seen (see table 2.1.1).

Concerning the development of figures between 2011 and 2016 the picture is diverse. Only in a few countries the rates of all cases disposed of by prosecution authorities appear to be stable between 2011 and 2016, i.e. to show an increase or decrease in case numbers of less than ten percent. Other countries present a strong increase (between ten and 50 %), on the one hand: Balkan and South-Eastern countries like Kosovo, Montenegro, Serbia and Georgia, but Denmark as well; Albania and Armenia show an even higher increase (more than 50 %). On the other hand, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic and the UK demonstrate a strong decrease of between minus ten and -50 % (see table 2.2.1.1). These trends on prosecution level are only partly compatible to those on police level.

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

Table 2.1.1 demonstrates the rate of all cases disposed of and the percentage of cases brought before a court in 2015. Due to the unavailability of data, several countries had to be excluded. The idea behind table 2.1.1 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 should be high, e.g. in Hungary, and that where the total of cases is high the percentage tends to be low, e.g. in Germany. There are only two countries which clearly deviate from this trend; in Turkey the percentage of cases brought before a court remains relatively high although the number of cases disposed of is also high, and in Armenia both the caseload and the percentage of cases brought before a court are low.

Table 2.1.1 Percentage of cases brought before a court by rate of all cases disposed of

		Cases brought before a court per 100.000 population in 2015		
		low: up to 25% of total cases disposed of	middle: more than 25% up to 50% of total cases disposed of	high: more than 50% of total cases disposed of
Cases disposed of per 100.000 population in 2015	low: up to 1500	Armenia*	Albania* Serbia*	Czech Republic Denmark Georgia* Hungary* Latvia* Lithuania Luxembourg Montenegro* Netherlands
	middle: more than 1500 up to 5000	Austria* Estonia* Portugal* Romania*	Bulgaria* Finland Poland* Slovenia* UK: Scotland	UK: England & Wales Iceland* Lithuania*
	high: more than 5000	Belgium* France* Germany	Sweden	Turkey*

* Cases disposed of include proceedings against unknown offenders.

One indicator for attrition between the police and court level can be seen in the percentage of cases brought before a court by the public prosecutor. One might assume that this percentage not only depends on the workload of the public prosecution but differs in terms of the offences concerned. The public prosecutor has broader possibilities to drop cases of minor offences because of a lack of public interest or to discontinue criminal proceedings after the defendant has voluntarily fulfilled a condition, such as community service. On the other hand, these possibilities shrink for serious offences. Table 2.1.2 demonstrates the percentage of cases

brought before a court broken down by some offences: Most serious ones, i.e. intentional homicide, seriousness of middle range, robbery, and lower level range, theft. As only a minority of countries could provide data on that the results cannot be generalized but show some evidence for the assumption made: The percentage of homicide cases brought before a court is much higher than that of theft cases. On the other hand, the minimum and maximum value show a huge range.

Table 2.1.2 Percentage of cases brought before a court by offence groups in 2015*

	Homicide	Robbery	Bodily Injury	Theft	Drug Trafficking
Mean	76%	71%	55%	46%	54%
Minimum	22	10	6	3	14
Maximum	100	97	88	99	93

* Mean of 17 countries (robbery), 18 countries (homicide, drug offences), 19 countries (bodily injury, theft); see tables 2.2.3.2, 2.2.3.4 and 2.2.3.5

Conditional disposals and community measures

A conditional disposal at the prosecution stage means that the defendant agrees to pay a fine or accepts conditions in exchange to ending prosecution. 16 countries could provide some data on conditional disposals, but only eleven could provide a breakdown by various forms of conditions. There is less data on minors, not because such concepts do not exist but because the statistics often do not count minors separately.

Minors, women and foreigners

Statistical data on the breakdown by minors, women and foreigners is poor (see table 2.2.2.1). Only eleven countries could provide separate data on minors. In contrast to the suspects recorded at police level the percentage of minors handled by the public prosecution is very low. This is due to the fact that in some countries criminal cases of minors are mostly handled outside the criminal justice system. Only nine or eight resp. countries could provide separate data for women and foreigners.

Staff of the prosecuting authorities; workload

20 countries could provide data on the number of prosecutors/employees of the prosecuting authorities. The rates of public prosecutors per 100 000 population in these countries for the year 2015 show a wide variation from 25 in Bulgaria to three in France (see tables 2.2.3.1 and 2.2.3.2). Remarkably, more than 50 % of the prosecutors are women. Between 2011 and 2016 the numbers of prosecutors mostly remain stable. Only in Bulgaria and Slovenia is there an increase of more than ten percent.

In table 2.1.3 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 population mostly Western and Northern European countries, and under the opposing category of a relatively high rate of prosecutors only Central and Eastern European countries can be found. These rates do not correlate with the crime situation or with the number of police officers under the supervision of the prosecuting authorities and are especially not in line with the number of disposals made by public prosecution. On the contrary, in the group with a relatively low rate of total disposals and with a relatively high rate of prosecutors one can find only Central and East European countries whereas in the group with a high rate of disposals and a relatively low rate of prosecutors only West European countries are represented (except or Turkey). 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.

Table 2.1.3 Rate of prosecutors by rate of all cases disposed of

		Prosecutors per 100.000 population in 2015		
		low: up to 10.0	middle: more than 10.0 up to 6.0	high: more than 16.0
Cases disposed of per 100.000 popu- lation in 2015	low: up to 1500	Czech Republic Netherlands Serbia	Albania* Denmark Georgia*	Hungary* Latvia*
	middle: more than 1500 up to 5000	Austria* Finland	Estonia* Slovenia*	Bulgaria* Lithuania* Poland*
	high: more than 5000	France* Germany Sweden Turkey*	Portugal	

* Cases disposed of include proceedings against unknown offenders.

Persons whose freedom of movement was restricted

Data on “persons whose freedom of movement was restricted” refer to decisions made before the final conviction of defendants and while they were under criminal investigation. In the former edition we differentiated four categories: *Besides persons in police custody and persons in pre-trial detention also persons under bail and persons under electronic monitoring.* But regarding the latter categories the statistical data were poor. So, this time only data on persons in police custody and in pre-trial detention were collected.

Twelve countries could provide data on persons in police custody, here the order was mostly made by the police but also by the prosecuting authority. In 19 countries data were available on pre-trial detention (see tables 2.2.4). Further data on pre-trial detention can be found in the chapter 4 on prisons.

2.2. Tables

2.2.1 Criminal cases handled by the prosecuting authorities 2011-2016

Table 2.2.1.1 Criminal cases handled by the prosecuting authorities per 100 000 population – Output cases: Total

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	675.2	744.9	841.6	1127.0	1188.8	1121.4	66.1
Armenia	379.3	308.3	463.9	587.5	558.6	602.3	58.8
Austria	3390.4	3407.5	3395.1	3289.0	3417.6		
Azerbaijan				18.2	19.5	19.2	
Belgium	6559.1	6437.2	6264.0	5932.5	5463.6		
Bosnia-Herzegovina	531.2	538.2	578.2	566.6	582.4	515.3	-3.0
Bulgaria	2182.6	1978.2	2002.7	1920.5	1814.2	1800.9	-17.5
Croatia							
Cyprus							
Czech Republic	1050.5	1044.8	1072.3	1051.3	952.3	859.7	-18.2
Denmark	1282.2	1257.6	1196.7	1144.9	1069.8	1048.6	-18.2
Estonia	3265.1	2999.1	2655.3	2494.3	2481.1	1732.8	-46.9
Finland	3968.4	3743.8	3556.1	3359.3	3499.4	3065.7	-22.7
France		6935.3	6680.3	6638.9	6466.4	6722.6	
Georgia	391.3	249.4	464.2	428.2	477.9	453.6	15.9
Germany	5751.8	5678.1	5640.1	5820.0	6147.1	6308.6	9.7
Greece							
Hungary	1225.8	1133.7	1179.6	1161.7	1121.8	1093.8	-10.8
Iceland	1950.7	1787.1	1854.2	1556.5	1553.0	2038.0	4.5
Ireland							
Italy	5553.0	5422.6	5241.4	4924.9			
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	1389.8	1336.2	1286.5	1539.7	1356.2	1615.8	16.3
Latvia		571.2	568.3	573.7	616.2	644.7	
Lithuania	1166.2	1427.7	1559.0	1565.6	1362.0	1151.6	-1.2
Luxembourg					2883.3		
Malta							
Moldova							
Montenegro	935.2	1212.0	1065.1	1242.0	1162.8	1153.1	23.3
Netherlands	1302.9	1345.5	1274.4	1259.6	1163.0	1143.6	-12.2
North Macedonia							
Norway							
Poland	2457.0	2364.0	2357.2	2139.3	1822.8	1883.5	-23.3
Portugal	5437.8	5420.8	5141.1	6222.1	4714.7	4352.7	-20.0
Romania					3242.9		
Russian Federation	733.7	687.7	682.9	667.6	685.7	679.9	-7.3
Serbia	1126.1	1181.2	1089.7	1258.1	1413.7	1543.9	37.1
Slovak Republic	709.2	800.0	806.5	768.1	675.1	613.7	-13.5
Slovenia	1602.6	1575.3	1528.2	1614.0	1599.6	1460.6	-8.9
Spain							
Sweden					5615.2		
Switzerland							
Turkey	5816.2	5774.7	6048.5	6214.7	6413.0	5698.3	-2.0
Ukraine					1244.7	1256.5	
UK: England & Wales	2265.6	1978.4	1772.9	1694.4	1579.5	1482.1	-34.6
UK: Northern Ireland	3507.0	3397.3	3133.0	2933.3	2801.4	2742.5	-21.8
UK: Scotland	4758.4	4747.4	4954.3	4746.5	4324.0	3973.0	-16.5
<i>Mean</i>	2460.8	2499.5	2463.0	2389.4	2311.9	1959.3	
<i>Median</i>	1602.6	1575.3	1559.0	1561.1	1483.4	1358.6	
<i>Minimum</i>	379.3	249.4	463.9	18.2	19.5	19.2	
<i>Maximum</i>	6559.1	6935.3	6680.3	6638.9	6466.4	6722.6	

Table 2.2.1.2 Percentage brought before a court of the total output of criminal cases handled by the prosecuting authorities

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	37.8	33.7	33.5	41.7	42.7	40.3	6.8
Armenia	21.7	24.0	17.1	13.3	15.7	15.3	-29.6
Austria	24.4	24.4	24.0	23.8	22.1		
Azerbaijan				51.4	48.2	44.8	
Belgium	5.3	5.0	5.0	5.3	5.5		
Bosnia-Herzegovina							
Bulgaria	28.6	28.1	26.7	25.2	25.3	26.6	-7.1
Croatia							
Cyprus							
Czech Republic	75.9	76.5	77.3	77.6	84.1	77.4	1.9
Denmark	60.5	57.5	56.2	55.7	56.2	55.0	-9.1
Estonia	21.7	21.9	21.2	21.2	21.0	31.3	44.4
Finland	32.1	33.7	32.9	34.2	31.7	34.6	7.9
France		13.3	13.6	13.5	13.8	13.3	
Georgia	104.1	98.4	81.1	87.9	86.2	95.2	-8.6
Germany	11.7	11.3	10.6	9.9	9.1	8.9	-24.2
Greece							
Hungary	53.0	52.1	53.0	54.0	53.5	56.0	5.7
Iceland	74.8	79.1	76.2	73.6	76.0	82.9	10.8
Ireland							
Italy							
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)							
Latvia		78.9	77.1	79.1	80.3	79.0	
Lithuania	88.2	83.2	80.9	80.6	79.9	80.2	-9.1
Luxembourg							
Malta							
Moldova							
Montenegro							-51.7
Netherlands	53.6	47.5	46.8	48.3	51.2	51.7	-3.5
North Macedonia							
Norway							-9.8
Poland	40.9	40.1	37.7	34.7	25.9	36.9	-16.0
Portugal	13.4	13.6	13.2	8.4	11.6	11.2	
Romania					6.3		
Russian Federation							-39.5
Serbia	66.4	68.3	67.7	44.2	42.2	40.2	
Slovak Republic							-25.4
Slovenia	49.7	46.6	44.0	42.6	36.1	37.1	
Spain							
Sweden					35.6		
Switzerland							
Turkey	68.2	67.4	67.2	61.5	62.2	56.7	-16.8
Ukraine							
UK: England & Wales	70.3	71.9	73.0	68.3	69.8	68.0	-3.3
UK: Northern Ireland							
UK: Scotland	44.0	40.3	35.1	38.2	42.5	42.0	-4.5
<i>Mean</i>	53.8	50.3	48.5	46.4	44.2	49.0	
<i>Median</i>	49.7	46.6	44.0	43.4	42.3	43.4	
<i>Minimum</i>	5.3	5.0	5.0	5.3	5.5	8.9	
<i>Maximum</i>	191.6	140.2	140.1	111.4	102.2	95.2	

Notes on tables 2.2.1.1 and table 2.2.1.2

Azerbaijan	The figures only refer to cases in which the investigation was carried out by the prosecutor. The vast majority of cases where other law enforcement agencies carried out the investigation are not included.
Belgium	For the minors, the counting unit is the person and not the case. They cannot be added in this table
Bulgaria	The relevant figures are introduced in the Excel file. It is to be noted here, as well as in connection with Question D2SCR16, that all types of cases (i. e. input cases, output cases and pending cases) are monitored and recorded by prosecution statistics. Every year the relevant figures are reported in the annual reports on the activities of the prosecution authorities in Bulgaria. The probable deviations from the data concerning the specific items and provided for the 5th Edition of the European Sourcebook cannot be explained without consulting the primary source of information used for the 5th Edition. Nor could they be comprehensively explained without conducting specific criminological research.
Denmark	In order to make the Danish prosecution data comparable to data from other countries, cases that are administratively settled with fines, handled by the police, are not included in the data. Judgements rendered in absentia and settled with a fine are not included either.
Estonia	Decrease in 2016 can be associated with the rise of the legal upper limit for the "small value" and decriminalisation of several offences from January 2015, but also due to technical changes in the databases.
Hungary	The source of data for Tables 2.2.1.1, 2.2.1.2, 2.2.2.1, and 2.2.2.2 (Prosecution Caseload Statistics) is different from the source of the data in Table 2.2.2.3 (Standard Criminal Statistics of Investigation Authorities and Prosecutors). The data included in Standard Criminal Statistics of Investigation Authorities and Prosecutors is recorded at the output stage: data is collected when the public prosecutor or the investigating authorities complete the investigation. Data included in Prosecution Caseload Statistics is collected at different stages: data is recorded regarding input, output and pending cases. The counting unit used is also different in the two databases (see section 2.3). The counting unit used in Prosecution Caseload Statistics is number of cases, while the counting unit in the data provided using the Standard Criminal Statistics of Investigation Authorities and Prosecutors is number of offences. This means that the data included in the two databases are not comparable to each other.
Netherlands	Statistics Netherlands stopped providing Prosecution and Court statistics. Therefore figures starting in 2010 are slightly different from the years before that
Romania	The data was provided in word and pdf format (different from the ones used for the LINCS study), following the translation into Romanian language.
Serbia	Cases pending on 31st December 2014 T21PB14: For adult offenders: in the public prosecutors' offices - 29465 + at other agencies 74778 = 104243; for juvenile offenders: 98 in the public prosecutors' offices + 599 at other agencies =697; for unknown offenders that remained unknown: 55.890 Input cases for 2015 T21PA15: 115398 reported known adult offenders; 8.330 reported juvenile offenders and 57.771 reported unknown offenders = 181499 Output cases total include charged adult and juvenile offenders and dismissals of criminal complaints. Cases brought before a court include both adult and juvenile offenders.
Turkey	"Cases brought before court" refers to number of "decisions", while all other data in this table refers to number of "suspects". Approximately 48% of all cases involve unknown suspects.
UK: England & Wales	Data are inclusive of youth defendants. The Crown Prosecution Service collate data on defendant offender types: adult or youth. A youth defendant is aged 10 to 17 inclusive at the time of the commission of the offence and is prosecuted in youth courts.
UK: Scotland	The Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service is a live database and is not suited to producing the data on pending and output cases. All data are given on a financial year basis i.e 2011 = 2011-12 (1 April to 31 March) Overall statistics can be found at http://www.copfs.gov.uk/images/Documents/Statistics/Statistics%20on%20Case%20Processing%20Last%205%20Years%202010-15.pdf

2.2.2 Criminal cases handled by the prosecuting authorities in 2015

Table 2.2.2.1 Percentage of cases relating to minors, women and foreigners among criminal cases handled by the prosecuting authorities – Output cases: Total

	Total per 100,000 population	of which % of minors	of which % of women	of which % of foreigners	% of EU-citizens among foreigners
Albania	1188.8				
Armenia	558.6				
Austria	3417.6				
Azerbaijan					
Belgium	5463.6				
Bosnia-Herzegovina	582.4				
Bulgaria	1814.2	1.5			
Croatia					
Cyprus					
Czech Republic	952.3	2.5	15.5	6.9	62.4
Denmark	1069.8	13.4	10.0	16.4	35.9
Estonia	2481.1				
Finland	3499.4	4.8	20.7	11.9	47.5
France	6466.4				
Georgia	477.9	3.7	4.8	5.3	1.4
Germany	6147.1				
Greece					
Hungary	1121.8	9.0			
Iceland	1553.0				
Ireland					
Italy					
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	1356.2				
Latvia	616.2				
Lithuania	1362.0	6.5	12.2	0.9	
Luxembourg	2883.3	7.3	26.3	63.6	
Malta					
Moldova					
Montenegro	1162.8				
Netherlands	1163.0	7.8	15.9		
North Macedonia					
Norway					
Poland	1822.8				
Portugal	4714.7				
Romania	3242.9				
Russian Federation	685.7				
Serbia	1413.7	5.3			
Slovak Republic	675.1				
Slovenia	1599.6	4.5	17.5	6.1	29.7
Spain					
Sweden	5615.2	16.7	6.7		
Switzerland					
Turkey	6413.0		12.6	1.3	
Ukraine	1244.7				
UK: England & Wales	1579.5				
UK: Northern Ireland	2801.4				
UK: Scotland	4324.0				
Mean	2433.5	6.3	14.2	14.0	35.4
Median	1579.5	5.0	14.1	6.5	35.9
Minimum	477.9	1.2	4.8	0.9	1.4
Maximum	6466.4	16.7	26.3	63.6	62.4

Table 2.2.2.2 Percentage of cases relating to minors, women and foreigners among all criminal cases handled by the prosecuting authorities – Output cases: Cases brought before a court

	Total per 100,000 population	of which % of minors	of which % of women	of which % of foreigners	% of EU-citizens among foreigners
Albania	507.1				
Armenia	87.4	4.0			
Austria					
Azerbaijan					
Belgium					
Bosnia-Herzegovina					
Bulgaria	459.3	3.4			
Croatia	375.4	3.1	12.2	3.0	38.6
Cyprus					
Czech Republic	801.3	2.2	14.7	6.8	61.2
Denmark	601.1	12.0	8.2	15.2	38.9
Estonia	522.3				
Finland	1108.1	4.5	17.0	10.6	48.7
France					
Georgia	412.0	1.8	5.1		
Germany	560.0	34.1			
Greece					
Hungary	600.1	6.1			
Iceland	1179.9	8.5	10.3	9.2	27.9
Ireland					
Italy					
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)					
Latvia					
Lithuania	1088.7	6.8	8.0	0.2	
Luxembourg					
Malta					
Moldova					
Montenegro					
Netherlands	595.7	6.9	11.8		
North Macedonia					
Norway					
Poland	472.6				
Portugal	548.9				
Romania					
Russian Federation					
Serbia	596.4	6.3	7.9		
Slovak Republic					
Slovenia	577.4	4.9	11.3	7.2	28.2
Spain					
Sweden	2000.1	5.4	13.4		
Switzerland					
Turkey	3987.4				
Ukraine	392.8	4.3		1.1	
UK: England & Wales					
UK: Northern Ireland					
UK: Scotland					
Mean	832.0	7.1	10.9	6.7	40.6
Median	577.4	5.2	11.3	7.0	38.7
Minimum	87.4	1.8	5.1	0.2	27.9
Maximum	3987.4	34.1	17.0	15.2	61.2

Notes on table 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2

Belgium	The counting unit is the proceedings relating to one person only: that explains the difference with the figure in the table 2.2.1.1. Offenders for which the nationality is unknown are included.
Czech Republic	Counting unit – a person.
Denmark	In order to make the Danish prosecution data comparable to data from other countries, cases that are administratively settled with fines, handled by the police, are not included in the data. Judgements rendered in absentia and settled with a fine are not included either.
Germany	Data on minors are only separately available for cases brought before a court. No published data available on the number of females or foreigners.
Netherlands	Statistics Netherlands stopped providing Prosecution and Court statistics. Therefore, figures starting in 2010 are slightly different from the years before that
Serbia	The data about reported female offenders relate only to adult persons.
Turkey	“Cases brought before court” are number of decisions; other are number of “suspects”
UK: England & Wales	The CPS does not collect data on the nationality of defendants.

Table 2.2.2.3 Percentage of different types of disposals by the prosecuting authorities in 2015: Total (2/2)

	Total Data per 100,000 population	Cases brought before a court	Sanctions and measures imposed by the prosecutor that lead to a formal verdict and count as a conviction	Conditional disposals		Of which (%)			
				of which: Conditional disposals by the prosecutor without formal verdict	of which: Other measures	of which: Proceedings dropped or because private prosecution is recommended	of which: Proceedings dropped for legal or factual reasons (excluding cases in which the offender is unknown)	of which: Proceedings dropped because offender remained unknown	of which: Other disposals
Netherlands	1163.0	51.2	15.6	6.2	43.9	61.8	9.2	10.9	5.7
North Macedonia									
Norway									
Poland	1822.8	25.9		2.2				21.0	11.7
Portugal	4714.7	11.6		3.9					75.9
Romania	3242.9	6.3	93.4				20.9		
Russian Federation	685.7								
Serbia	1413.7	42.2	25.6	2.3	12.4	74.0			
Slovak Republic	675.1								
Slovenia	1599.6	36.1	12.6	6.4	48.8	2.4	20.2		
Spain									
Sweden	5615.2	35.6							
Switzerland									
Turkey	6413.0	62.2		0.2	12.1	87.9		45.3	11.0
Ukraine	1244.7								
UK: England & Wales	1579.5	69.8							
UK: Northern Ireland	2801.4								
UK: Scotland	4324.0	42.5							
Mean	2385.7	42.5	29.4	12.9	33.2	50.1	13.1	27.1	30.4
Median	1566.3	39.1	15.6	5.8	32.1	61.8	9.2	22.9	15.5
Minimum	96.6	5.5	3.8	0.2	4.8	0.7	0.9	1.2	0.0
Maximum	6466.4	86.2	93.4	94.5	64.1	100.0	31.1	72.5	90.8

Notes on table 2.2.2.3

Austria	"Proceedings dropped unconditionally due to lack of public interest or for efficiency reasons or because private prosecution is recommended": § 190 Z 2 StPO; "Proceedings dropped for legal or factual reasons (excluding cases in which the offender is unknown)": § 190 Z 1 StPO.
Azerbaijan	The figures only refer to cases in which the investigation was carried out by the prosecutor. The vast majority of cases where other law enforcement agencies carried out the investigation are not included.
Belgium	This table concerns only adults.
Bulgaria	According to Bulgarian law, criminal proceedings cannot be unconditionally dropped because the offender remained unknown. When the offender is unknown, the criminal proceedings are temporarily suspended until the offender is found or until the proceedings can be unconditionally dropped on other grounds (most often on the ground of statute of limitation). The figure shows the number of proceedings with unknown offenders, which were suspended in 2015.
Czech Republic	Other disposals = proceedings postponed, transferred, discontinued
Finland	All dropped cases are included in Proceedings dropped unconditionally due to lack of public interest or for efficiency reasons or because private prosecution is recommended.
Germany	Separate data on minors only available for a few items.
Hungary	Please note that we are unable to divide the disposals by age that is why there is no data relating minors.
Netherlands	Statistics Netherlands stopped providing Prosecution and Court statistics. Therefore, figures starting in 2010 are slightly different from the years before that.
Poland	Conditional disposals means disposal ordered by court but motioned by prosecutors.
Portugal	Sanctions imposed by the prosecutor (or by the court but without a formal court hearing) based on the defendant's admission of guilt and sanctions negotiated between the prosecutor and the defendant without admission of guilt have no correspondence in Portuguese Law. The 1997 Code of Penal Procedure (281.º article) has introduced provisional suspension of proceedings under the responsibility of the prosecuting authorities for less serious offences. This last possibility has been understood here has conditional disposals whenever the defendant meet the conditions and the prosecuting authorities dispose of the case.
Serbia	Proceedings dropped for legal or factual reasons include cases in which the offender is unknown. Plea Agreement concluded, accepted by the court, Deferring Criminal Prosecution (principle of opportunity, diversion)
Turkey	Counting unit is Decision Rendered.
UK: Scotland	Proceedings dropped unconditionally due to lack of public interest or for efficiency reasons included in Proceedings dropped unconditionally due to lack of public interest or for efficiency reasons. Information on minors not available

2.2.3 Criminal cases handled by the prosecuting authorities in 2015 by offence groups

Table 2.2.3.1 Criminal cases total and major road traffic offences

	Criminal offences total		Major road traffic offences	
	Total per 100,000 population	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100,000 population	of which % of cases brought before a court
Albania	1188.8	42.7	123.5	86.4
Armenia	558.6	15.7		
Austria	3417.6			
Azerbaijan	(19.5)	(48.2)		
Belgium	5463.6	5.5		
Bosnia-Herzegovina	582.4			
Bulgaria	1814.2	25.3		
Croatia				
Cyprus				
Czech Republic	952.3	84.1	203.6	90.6
Denmark	1069.8	56.2		
Estonia	2481.1	21.0	271.1	92.5
Finland	3499.4	31.7	1943.5	17.8
France	6466.4			
Georgia	477.9	77.7	12.2	94.3
Germany	6147.1	9.1	1018.5	6.2
Greece				
Hungary	2842.2	47.1	179.5	84.7
Iceland	1553.0	76.0		
Ireland				
Italy				
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	1356.2			
Latvia	616.2			
Lithuania	1362.0	79.9	35.1	45.1
Luxembourg				
Malta				
Moldova				
Montenegro	1162.8	52.0	112.4	90.0
Netherlands	1163.0	51.2	182.9	48.0
North Macedonia			255.9	
Norway				
Poland	1822.8			
Portugal				
Romania	3242.9	6.3	193.0	43.8
Russian Federation	685.7			
Serbia	1413.7	42.2	124.6	28.9
Slovak Republic	675.1			
Slovenia	1599.6	36.1	26.8	58.8
Spain				
Sweden	5615.2	35.6	591.7	13.5
Switzerland				
Turkey	6413.0	62.2	219.4	54.0
Ukraine	1244.7			
UK: England & Wales	1576.5			
UK: Northern Ireland	2801.4			
UK: Scotland	4324.0			
Mean	2291.3	41.8	343.4	57.0
Median	1553.0	42.2	187.9	54.0
Minimum	19.5	5.5	12.2	6.2
Maximum	6466.4	84.1	1943.5	94.3

Table 2.2.3.2 Homicide and bodily injury

	Intentional homicide		Homicide completed		Bodily injury		Aggravated bodily injury	
	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court
Albania	7.3	41.0	1.8	32.1	30.6	49.0	3.9	67.0
Armenia								
Austria								
Azerbaijan								
Belgium	10.9	53.3	2.7	54.3	598.2	8.3		
Bosnia-Herzegovina								
Bulgaria								
Croatia								
Cyprus								
Czech Republic	1.7	79.9			46.2	79.9	6.9	96.3
Denmark	3.0	47.3	0.9	56.0	137.7	65.3	21.8	69.3
Estonia	4.1	85.2			413.8	25.1	7.6	54.0
Finland	3.0	100.0	1.1	100.0	186.0	88.2	12.4	98.7
France								
Georgia	4.8	94.9	3.0	98.2	73.0	47.0	3.6	97.0
Germany	5.1				527.8	12.7		
Greece								
Hungary	1.9	87.0	1.0	83.8	127.9	58.2	60.2	63.9
Iceland	2.1	71.4	1.2	0.0	0.0		15.5	35.3
Ireland								
Italy	4.8	71.4	1.3	55.9	79.2	161.0		
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)								
Latvia								
Lithuania	5.0	88.4			342.4	60.9	5.5	96.9
Luxembourg								
Malta								
Moldova								
Montenegro	11.7	216.4	2.9	283.3	67.2	87.1	28.9	99.4
Netherlands	8.9	78.4			151.4	52.4	19.0	83.0
North Macedonia			2.8		14.6	61.7		
Norway								
Poland								
Portugal								
Romania	20.0	22.3	12.5	13.6	405.3	6.2	2.6	48.1
Russian Federation								
Serbia	4.1	79.2	4.1	79.2	44.3	44.5	17.0	51.4
Slovak Republic								
Slovenia	1.9	75.0	1.1	60.9	79.1	46.5	0.7	86.7
Spain								
Sweden	10.2	32.9	3.1	30.1	565.8	20.3		
Switzerland								
Turkey	45.5	36.9			1029.0	70.2	12.4	90.3
Ukraine								
UK: England & Wales								
UK: Northern Ireland								
UK: Scotland								
Mean	8.2	75.6	2.8	72.9	246.0	55.0	14.5	75.8
Median	4.8	76.7	2.3	56.0	132.8	52.4	12.4	83.0
Minimum	1.7	22.3	0.9	0.0	0.0	6.2	0.7	35.3
Maximum	45.5	216.4	12.5	283.3	1029.0	161.0	60.2	99.4

Table 2.2.3.3 Sexual offences

	Sexual assault		Rape		Sexual abuse of a child	
	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court
Albania	4.0	59.1	0.7	26.3	0.5	64.3
Armenia						
Austria						
Azerbaijan						
Belgium	77.0	14.1	34.9	16.5	7.0	16.8
Bosnia-Herzegovina						
Bulgaria						
Croatia						
Cyprus						
Czech Republic	10.3	72.8	4.3	75.8	5.7	69.4
Denmark	19.2	44.3	5.0	30.0	4.7	46.2
Estonia	13.0	47.4	9.3	38.5	1.8	66.7
Finland	13.6	98.1	4.8	98.8	7.3	100.0
France						
Georgia	12.1	77.3	0.9	97.1	0.7	63.0
Germany						
Greece						
Hungary	13.8	63.7	4.2	75.0	0.7	54.9
Iceland	0.0		14.0	8.7	17.9	18.6
Ireland						
Italy	11.2	51.6			1.6	40.6
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)						
Latvia						
Lithuania	8.7	95.3	3.1	92.4	5.5	93.2
Luxembourg						
Malta						
Moldova						
Montenegro	6.1	18.4	1.1	128.6	0.3	100.0
Netherlands	17.1	46.3	3.3	41.0	0.9	57.7
North Macedonia	3.2	59.7	1.9	46.2	1.4	78.6
Norway						
Poland						
Portugal						
Romania	22.1	16.7	11.9	18.4	8.2	15.1
Russian Federation						
Serbia	4.8	55.4	1.8	52.3	0.5	86.1
Slovak Republic						
Slovenia	15.7	52.5	3.0	51.6	6.4	47.0
Spain						
Sweden	107.6	34.4	40.6	22.5	39.6	46.5
Switzerland						
Turkey	81.5	38.4				
Ukraine						
UK: England & Wales						
UK: Northern Ireland						
UK: Scotland						
Mean	23.2	52.5	8.5	54.1	6.2	59.1
Median	13.0	52.0	4.2	46.2	3.2	60.3
Minimum	0.0	14.1	0.7	8.7	0.3	15.1
Maximum	107.6	98.1	40.6	128.6	39.6	100.0

Table 2.2.3.4 Robbery and theft

	Robbery		Theft total		Aggravated theft		Theft of a motor vehicle		Theft by means of domestic burglary	
	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court
Albania	716.2	31.9	499.6	25.2	376.5	12.3	8.5	3.3		
Armenia										
Austria										
Azerbaijan										
Belgium	193.4	9.6	1209.1	4.4			83.6	4.3	199.4	2.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina										
Bulgaria										
Croatia										
Cyprus										
Czech Republic	16.2	90.0	220.0	85.5						
Denmark	16.8	62.7	175.9	45.1			17.1	45.1	30.0	14.4
Estonia	27.2	36.0	1249.9	7.4						
Finland	14.2	96.7	569.4	26.5	10.8	99.0	8.4	96.3		
France										
Georgia	20.5	73.7	107.2	58.8						
Germany			866.5	15.8						
Greece										
Hungary	14.5	69.6	1140.8	22.0			41.9	23.1		
Iceland										
Ireland										
Italy	23.4	77.4	164.3	61.8					16.3	66.9
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)										
Latvia										
Lithuania	23.7	91.8	179.4	98.6			25.7	85.0	32.0	90.8
Luxembourg										
Malta										
Moldova										
Montenegro	10.1	188.9	169.4	98.3	63.2	126.5	3.7	91.3		
Netherlands	21.6	79.3	292.2	64.2	122.7	72.3				
North Macedonia			88.2	108.8	87.0	81.8				
Norway										
Poland										
Portugal										
Romania	25.0	32.5	1109.6	2.8	708.9	3.5				
Russian Federation	0									
Serbia	15.5	90.9	283.4	51.8	91.2	76.5				
Slovak Republic	0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	
Slovenia	7.1	77.6	372.9	31.2	63.1	68.2	2.4	52.0		
Spain										
Sweden	32.3	43.5	757.5	34.3	155.4	37.3	42.0	28.9	40.1	43.5
Switzerland										
Turkey	90.3	53.7	973.7	24.3						
Ukraine										
UK: England & Wales										
UK: Northern Ireland										
UK: Scotland										
Mean	74.6	70.9	548.9	45.6	186.5	64.1	25.9	45.6	63.6	43.6
Median	21.6	73.7	372.9	34.3	91.2	72.3	17.1	34.3	32.0	43.5
Minimum	7.1	9.6	88.2	2.8	10.8	3.5	2.4	2.8	16.3	2.4
Maximum	716.2	188.9	1249.9	108.8	708.9	126.5	83.6	108.8	199.4	90.8

Table 2.2.3.5 Fraud, forgery, money laundering, corruption

	Fraud		Cyber fraud		Forgery of documents		Money laundering		Corruption in the public sector	
	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court
Albania	36.4	48.7	1.9	3.6	19.3	28.5	5.9	9.9	1.9	87.0
Armenia										
Austria										
Azerbaijan										
Belgium	149.3	2.6	141.8	1.9	74.8	10.8	17.3	10.0	1.8	17.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina										
Bulgaria							1.7	32.8	21.8	30.8
Croatia	0.0								0.0	
Cyprus										
Czech Republic	53.9	81.2			5.8	72.7	1.8	88.5	2.1	88.3
Denmark	47.4	51.9			12.8	62.0			0.4	55.0
Estonia	62.8	26.9			35.8	35.0	2.6	52.9	3.2	35.7
Finland	104.7	78.3			17.2	61.8	2.9	97.5	0.2	100.0
France										
Georgia	35.2	58.3			5.6	100.0			3.9	59.2
Germany	1283.3	8.5					48.5		2.1	
Greece										
Hungary	324.4	84.9	22.1	16.8	230.0	69.6	0.3	55.6	7.7	94.2
Iceland										
Ireland										
Italy							4.3	54.9	2.7	46.0
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)										
Latvia										
Lithuania	106.6	89.4			71.1	82.3	2.9	71.8	36.6	93.4
Luxembourg										
Malta										
Moldova										
Montenegro	44.8	65.9	0.5	100.0	47.1	67.6	0.5	33.3	112.4	21.6
Netherlands	12.8	47.1			18.5	59.1	6.5	53.0	0.1	30.4
North Macedonia							0.2			
Norway										
Poland					0.0					
Portugal										
Romania	178.4	4.0	1.3	10.7	50.8	3.4	1.7	19.3	24.2	14.6
Russian Federation	0.0		0.0		0.0					
Serbia	55.4	27.9	0.1	50.0	43.7	27.9	0.2	26.7	2.7	51.0
Slovak Republic										
Slovenia	292.0	33.1			71.7	35.4	5.2	48.6	4.0	17.1
Spain										
Sweden	613.8	64.1	99.2	32.4	39.8	111.2	18.9	30.5	1.3	19.4
Switzerland										
Turkey	488.2	22.3			336.8	30.6	1.7	44.8	7.4	35.8
Ukraine										
UK: England & Wales										
UK: Northern Ireland										
UK: Scotland										
Mean	228.8	46.8	38.1	30.8	67.6	53.5	6.8	45.6	12.4	49.8
Median	104.7	48.7	1.9	16.8	41.8	60.5	2.7	46.7	2.7	40.9
Minimum	12.8	2.6	0.1	1.9	5.6	3.4	0.2	9.9	0.1	14.6
Maximum	1283.3	89.4	141.8	100.0	336.8	111.2	48.5	97.5	112.4	100.0

Table 2.2.3.6 Drug offences

	Drug offences total		Drug trafficking	
	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court	Total per 100 000	of which % of cases brought before a court
Albania	45.6	33.7	3.6	57.3
Armenia				
Austria				
Azerbaijan				
Belgium	305.3	15.0	22.4	15.8
Bosnia-Herzegovina				
Bulgaria	83.6	40.2		
Croatia	0.0			
Cyprus				
Czech Republic	40.7	86.7	31.4	88.4
Denmark	69.5	59.9	2.8	60.5
Estonia	46.2	69.4	46.2	69.4
Finland	182.0	45.2	72.0	98.6
France				
Georgia	127.8	58.7	8.0	89.6
Germany	404.5	13.9		
Greece				
Hungary	67.2	41.9	4.6	85.0
Iceland			0.0	
Ireland				
Italy			1.3	36.8
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)				
Latvia				
Lithuania	69.8	92.9		
Luxembourg				
Malta				
Moldova				
Montenegro	28.9	118.9	23.0	130.1
Netherlands	79.4	48.4		
North Macedonia				
Norway				
Poland				
Portugal				
Romania	18.2	15.8	16.6	16.0
Russian Federation				
Serbia	74.6	68.1	17.6	94.1
Slovak Republic				
Slovenia	48.8	74.6		
Spain				
Sweden	971.2	38.0	112.1	45.5
Switzerland				
Turkey	186.7	52.2	97.5	50.1
Ukraine				
UK: England & Wales				
UK: Northern Ireland				
UK: Scotland				
Mean	158.3	54.1	32.8	66.9
Median	72.2	50.3	20.0	64.9
Minimum	18.2	13.9	1.3	15.8
Maximum	971.2	118.9	112.1	130.1

Notes on tables 2.2.3.1 - 2.2.3.6

Azerbaijan	The figures only refer to cases in which the investigation was carried out by the prosecutor. The vast majority of cases where other law enforcement agencies carried out the investigation are not included.
Belgium	Concerns only adults
Bulgaria	The approach in the "Annual Report on the Activities of the Prosecution Authorities in Bulgaria 2015" concerning the groups of offences, amounts to summarising the offences as they are grouped in the appropriate Chapters of the Penal Code (e. g. one total figure is reported for "Crimes against Personality", where "homicide" "bodily injury" and "sexual offences" are included; one total figure is reported for "Property Crimes", where "theft", "robbery" and "fraud" are included, etc.). This comes to explain the use of asterisks (*) for most of the offence groups in the Excel file. The figures introduced in the Excel file relate to types of criminal offences specified in the report as separate items, the criterion of selection being "considerable public interest".
Czech Republic	counting unit – a person
Denmark	In order to make the Danish prosecution data comparable to data from other countries, cases that are administratively settled with fines, handled by the police, are not included in the data. Judgements rendered in absentia and settled with a fine are not included either.
Estonia	Some proceedings may appear repeatedly if a proceeding covered different articles of the Penal Code within the same category (e.g., forgery of documents, corruption) or different categories. The figures may differ from the figures published earlier or used in other sources, due to some differences in methodology and/or different time of inquiries from databases.
Germany	Data in prosecution statistics are only differentiated roughly by offence groups. German statistics do not provide a detailed breakdown by offence. Therefore, data are unavailable for some offence categories, for others the definition differs from the definition given in the definitions section (see 2.2.D, below).
Serbia	The data for criminal offences of minors are not included in the table 2.2.
Turkey	Counting unit is Decision Rendered Homicide does not include injury leading to death Aggravated injury includes injury leading to death
UK: England & Wales	All figures represent numbers of defendants. The Principal Offence Category is allocated at the conclusion of the prosecution proceeding against a defendant to indicate the type and seriousness of the charges brought. Homicides include cases of manslaughter and threats to kill as intentional homicides. Figures for each of the offence categories shown above are slightly understated, as certain cases (those in which the defendant cannot be traced, or has died, or been found unfit to plead) are not allocated an offence category. For these, and other definitional reasons, the above figures differ from the official records maintained by the Ministry of Justice.
UK: Scotland	Data refer to financial years, i.e., 2010=2010-11 Domestic burglary cannot be separated from other types of burglary

2.2.4 Police custody and pre-trial detention

Table 2.2.4.1 Persons whose freedom of movement was restricted in 2015 – per 100,000 population

	Persons sent to police custody	Persons sent to pre-trial detention (ordered by the court)
Albania	289.9	162.2
Armenia	28.8	33.8
Austria		98.7
Azerbaijan		
Belgium	88.5	
Bosnia-Herzegovina		
Bulgaria	47.1	
Croatia		
Cyprus		
Czech Republic		31.9
Denmark
Estonia		53.2
Finland	450.7	41.4
France		75.8
Georgia	160.2	107.6
Germany		
Greece		
Hungary	66.4	45.2
Iceland	728.7	1027
Ireland		
Italy		27.5
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)		
Latvia		
Lithuania		174.2
Luxembourg		
Malta		
Moldova		
Montenegro		
Netherlands		
North Macedonia		
Norway		
Poland	559.1	33.1
Portugal		...
Romania	52.2	38.8
Russian Federation		
Serbia		79.8
Slovak Republic		
Slovenia		22.8
Spain		
Sweden	296.0	92.9
Switzerland		
Turkey		32.5
Ukraine		
UK: England & Wales		
UK: Northern Ireland		
UK: Scotland		
Mean	230.3	66.7
Median	131.5	45.2
Minimum	28.8	22.8
Maximum	621.8	174.2

Notes on Table 2.2.4.1

Albania	Concerns arrests in flagrante delicto and judicial police detention orders Concerns security measures of imprisonment issued by the courts
France	Ordered by court = decisions from the " <i>Juge des libertés et de la détention</i> " and from the courts (<i>tribunal correctionnel and tribunaux et juges pour enfants</i>).
Italy	The sample is from 60% of Italian Criminal Court
Poland	1) Persons in police custody ordered by police – are related to the number of persons in custody until 48 hours. 2) Persons in pre-trial detention represent number of persons for whom detention was ordered by court but on prosecutors' motion.

2.2.5 Prosecution staff

Table 2.2.5.1 Staff of the prosecuting authority per 100,000 population: Number of employees: Total

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania		28.1	18.1	28.5	29.4	30.0	
Armenia							
Austria							
Azerbaijan							
Belgium							
Bosnia-Herzegovina							
Bulgaria			65.6	67.0			
Croatia	38.4	40.0	39.2	38.4	39.7	41.3	7.7
Cyprus							
Czech Republic	13.3	13.3	13.4	13.3	13.4	11.2	-16.2
Denmark		21.0	21.4	21.2	21.5	21.5	
Estonia	19.5	18.7	19.3				
Finland	9.8	10.1	10.0	9.9	9.4	9.1	-6.9
France							
Georgia				19.0	23.3	23.1	
Germany	19.1	18.9	18.8	18.8	18.6	18.7	-2.2
Greece							
Hungary	41.5	45.2	45.5	46.4	46.1	45.8	10.2
Iceland							
Ireland							
Italy							
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)							
Latvia							
Lithuania		42.9	42.9	43.9	43.6	43.1	
Luxembourg						8.3	
Malta							
Moldova							
Montenegro		40.0	41.7	43.4	45.5	49.7	
Netherlands		28.5		26.9		27.2	
North Macedonia							
Norway							
Poland		35.3	35.4	35.3	35.1	35.4	
Portugal							
Romania							
Russian Federation							
Serbia		25.3	25.3	28.2	29.3	30.8	
Slovak Republic							
Slovenia	21.8	21.1	20.4	15.8	17.8	24.5	12.7
Spain							
Sweden		14.1	14.0	13.9	14.0	14.4	
Switzerland							
Turkey							
Ukraine					35.1	35.2	
UK: England & Wales					10.2		
UK: Northern Ireland	31.3	29.6	29.8	29.8	27.5	25.8	-17.3
UK: Scotland					28.5		
Mean	24.3	27.0	28.8	29.4	27.1	27.5	
Median	20.7	26.7	23.4	28.2	23.3	26.5	
Minimum	9.8	10.1	10.0	9.9	9.4	8.3	
Maximum	41.5	45.2	65.6	67.0	46.1	49.7	

Table 2.2.5.2 Staff of the prosecuting authority: Number of prosecutors per 100,000 population

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	of which % of women in 2015	% change 2011-2016
Albania		10.9	11.6	11.6	11.6	11.7	26.2	
Armenia								
Austria	4.5	4.4	4.7	4.7	4.8			
Azerbaijan								
Belgium								
Bosnia-Herzegovina								
Bulgaria	21.4	23.6	24.0	24.3	24.5	24.9		16.1
Croatia	14.4	14.4	14.5	14.2	14.9	14.8		3.0
Cyprus								
Czech Republic	11.3	11.2	11.2	11.3	5.8			
Denmark		10.0	9.9	10.2	10.3	10.5	65.4	
Estonia	13.1	12.5	13.0			12.5		-4.2
Finland	6.5	6.8	6.8	6.7	6.5	6.8		3.8
France		2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.0		
Georgia				9.6	11.6	11.7	75.6	
Germany	7.6	7.6	7.5	7.6	7.6	7.8	48.0	2.6
Greece								
Hungary	17.9	18.2	18.4	19.0	19.0	19.1	60.0	7.0
Iceland								
Ireland								
Italy								
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)								
Latvia	22.1	22.5	22.2	22.8	23.0	22.9	61.7	3.5
Lithuania		25.5	24.9	24.5	24.3	24.1	48.9	
Luxembourg								
Malta								
Moldova								
Montenegro		17.2	17.4	17.2	18.6	19.3	56.0	
Netherlands		4.7		4.7		5.5		
North Macedonia								
Norway								
Poland		16.4	16.5	16.4	16.1	15.8		
Portugal	13.2	13.3	13.3	12.7	12.9	12.7	63.9	-3.3
Romania								
Russian Federation								
Serbia		0.8	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.8	28.9	
Slovak Republic								
Slovenia	9.2	9.3	9.3	9.4	10.6	10.5	67.6	13.5
Spain								
Sweden		9.6	9.4	9.4	9.6	9.7	59.7	
Switzerland								
Turkey		5.9	5.9	6.6	5.9	5.8	6.0	
Ukraine								
UK: England & Wales								
UK: Northern Ireland								
UK: Scotland								
Mean	12.8	11.8	12.2	11.7	12.1	12.5	51.4	
Median	13.1	10.9	11.4	10.2	11.1	11.7	59.7	
Minimum	4.5	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.8	6.0	
Maximum	22.1	25.5	24.9	24.5	24.5	24.9	75.6	

Notes on tables 2.2.5.1 and 2.2.5.2

Serbia	Total number of employees presents a sum of employees in the public prosecutors' offices: public prosecutors and their deputies, civil servants and appointees. Number of prosecutors: these are the numbers of public prosecutors but the number of those with the function of public prosecution (holders of public prosecution function), which includes public prosecutors, and their deputies is higher: 2012-707; 2013-679; 2014-684; 2015-695; 2016-725. And for women: 376 public prosecutors and their deputies (holders of public prosecution function).
UK: Eng- land & Wales	The above figures are inclusive of staff employed within CPS Headquarters as well as those working within the regions of the Service. Numbers are shown as full-time equivalents.
UK: Scot- land	Staff in Post figures (Including Temporary, Permanent & Paid Absence), mid-year.

2.3 Technical information

Table 2.3.1 What is the counting unit used?

	Case	Proceedings	Person	Other	Offence	If other, please explain
Albania		X				
Armenia		X				
Austria		X				
Azerbaijan						
Belgium		X				
Bosnia-Herzegovina						
Bulgaria		X				
Croatia						
Cyprus						
Czech Republic		X	X			
Denmark	X					
Estonia		X				
Finland	X					
France		X				
Georgia		X				
Germany		X				
Greece						
Hungary	X					
Iceland						
Ireland						
Italy						
Kosovo						
Latvia	X					
Lithuania				X		
Luxembourg						
Malta						
Moldova						
Montenegro	X					
Netherlands	X					
North Macedonia			X			
Norway						
Poland		X				
Portugal		X				
Romania	X					
Russian Federation						
Serbia		X				
Slovak Republic						
Slovenia*	X					
Spain				X		
Sweden**						
Switzerland						
Turkey				X		
Ukraine						
UK: England & Wales	X					
UK: Northern Ireland						
UK: Scotland	X					

* Prosecution statistics includes all the actions taken by the courts and prosecutors for clarification and prosecution. Therefore, the data is overestimated

** The statistics of processed offences linked to a suspect is based on offences and suspects registered and processed by Swedish Police, Swedish Customs and Swedish Prosecution Authority. A processed offence refers to an offence where a decision has been taken which entails that the processing of the offence was completed. Offences with person-based clearances are processed offences where a conviction decision (a decision to indict, issue a summary sanction order, or waive prosecution) has been made.

Table 2.3.2 At what stage cases are recorded

	Input cases	Output cases	Pending cases
Albania			
Armenia			
Austria*	X	X	X
Azerbaijan		X	
Belgium			
Bosnia-Herzegovina			
Bulgaria	X	X	X
Croatia		X	
Cyprus			
Czech Republic	X	X	X
Denmark	X	X	X
Estonia		X	
Finland			
France	X		
Georgia			
Germany	X	X	X
Greece			
Hungary	X	X	X
Iceland			
Ireland			
Italy			
Kosovo			
Latvia	X		
Lithuania		X	
Luxembourg			
Malta			
Moldova			
Montenegro	X	X	
Netherlands			
North Macedonia	X	X	X
Norway			
Poland		X	
Portugal	X	X	X
Romania	X		
Russian Federation			
Serbia	X	X	X
Slovak Republic			
Slovenia	X		
Spain			
Sweden*		X	
Switzerland			
Turkey**			
Ukraine		X	
UK: England & Wales			
UK: Northern Ireland			
UK: Scotland			

* All cases of criminal offences also the cases handled only by the police and not passed to the prosecuting authority.

** Different tables used different stages.

Table 2.3.3 Concerning the criminal cases handled by the prosecuting authority

1=Included 2=Excluded	Cases reported to the prosecuting authority by other institutions	Cases where the offender remained unknown	Cases dropped, condition- ally disposed of or sanctioned by the police
Albania	1	1	2
Armenia	1	1	2
Austria	1	1	2
Azerbaijan	1	1	1
Belgium	1	1	2
Bosnia-Herzegovina			
Bulgaria	1	1	2
Croatia	1	1	2
Cyprus	1	1	2
Czech Republic	1	2	1
Denmark	1	2	2
Estonia	1	1	2
Finland	1	2	2
France	1	1	2
Georgia	1	1	2
Germany	1	2	...
Greece			
Hungary	1	1	2
Iceland	1	1	2
Ireland			
Italy	2	1	2
Kosovo			
Latvia	1	1	2
Lithuania	1	1	1
Luxembourg			
Malta			
Moldova			
Montenegro	1	1	
Netherlands	1	...	2
North Macedonia	1	1	1
Norway			
Poland	1	1	2
Portugal	1	1	1
Romania	1	1	
Russian Federation			
Serbia	1	1	1
Slovak Republic			
Slovenia	1	1	2
Spain			
Sweden	1	2	1
Switzerland			
Turkey	1	1	2
Ukraine	1	1	1
UK: England & Wales	1	2	...
UK: Northern Ireland			
UK: Scotland	1	2	3

Table 2.3.4 Disposal categories (output data) (1/2)

	Cases brought before a court (e.g. <i>indictment, acte d'accusation, An-Klagschrift</i>)	Sanctions and measures imposed by the prosecutor (or by the court, but on application of the prosecutor and without a formal court hearing) that lead to a formal verdict and count as a conviction (e.g. <i>penal order, Strafbefehl</i>)	Conditional disposals by the prosecutor without formal verdict	Fine/transaction Payment of an amount of money to the treasury or to a charitable organization	Restitution	Victim-Offender-Mediation	Community service	Supervision	Order to undergo a specific therapeutic treatment	Other
Albania	1	1	3
Armenia	1	3	1	3	3	1	1	3	3	1
Austria	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Azerbaijan	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Belgium	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Bosnia-Herzegovina	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Bulgaria	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Croatia	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cyprus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Czech Republic	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Denmark	1	2	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	2
Estonia	1	3	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	3
Finland	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
France	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Georgia	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2
Germany	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
Greece	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Hungary	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Iceland	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ireland	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Italy	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Kosovo	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Latvia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lithuania	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Luxembourg	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	2

Table 2.3.4 Disposal categories (output data) (2/2)

	Cases brought before a court (e.g. indictment, acte d'accusation, Anklage-schrift)	Sanctions and measures imposed by the prosecutor (or by the court, but on application of the prosecutor and without a formal court hearing) that lead to a formal verdict and count as a conviction (e.g. penal order, Strafbefehl)	Conditional disposals by the prosecutor without formal verdict	Fine/transaction Payment of amount of money to the treasury or to a charitable organization	Restitution	Victim-Offender-Mediation	Community service	Supervision	Order to undergo specific therapeutic treatment	Other
Malta										
Moldova	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
Montenegro	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
Netherlands	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
North Macedonia										
Norway										
Poland	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Portugal	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	3	1	1
Romania	1	3	3	3	1	1	3	3	3	3
Russian Federation										
Serbia	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	3
Slovak Republic										
Slovenia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Spain										
Sweden	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
Switzerland										
Turkey	1	3	1	1	3	1	3	3	3	3
Ukraine	1	3	3							
UK: England & Wales		1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
UK: Northern Ireland										
UK: Scotland		1	1	1	1	1				1

Table 2.3.4 (cont.) Disposal categories (output data) (1/3)

	Pro-ceed-ings dropped unconditionally to lack of public interest or efficiency reasons or because private prosecution is recommended	Pro-ceed-ings dropped for legal or factual reasons (excluding cases in which the offender is unknown)	Lack of evidence	Act not an offence	No criminal responsibility	No complaint from victim (where this is required for a prosecution) or complaint withdrawn	Ne bis in idem	Statute of limitation	Offender not available	Proceedings dropped because the offender remained unknown	Offender known	Other disposals	No competence	Transfer to another domestic authority	Transfer to a foreign authority
...	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Albania															
Armenia															
Austria															
Azerbaijan															
Belgium															
Bosnia-Herzegovina															
Bulgaria															
Croatia															
Cyprus															
Czech Republic															
Denmark															
Estonia															
Finland															
France															
Georgia															
Germany															
Greece															
Hungary															
Iceland															

1=Included
2=Excluded
3=Concept does not exist

Table 2.3.4 (cont.) Disposal categories (output data) (2/3)

	Pro-ceed-ings dropped	Pro-ceed-ings un-conditionally due to lack of public interest or efficiency reasons or because private prosecution is recommended	Lack of evidence	Act not an offence	No criminal responsibility	No complaint from victim (where this is required for a prosecution) or complaint withdrawn	Ne bis in idem	Statute of limitation	Of-fender not available	Pro-ceed-ings dropped because of-fender remained unknown	Of-fender unknown	Other disposals	No competence	Trans-fer to another domestic authority	Trans-fer to a foreign authority
1=Included															
2=Excluded															
3=Concept does not exist															
Ireland	1		1	1	3	3	3	3	1		1		1	1	1
Italy															
Kosovo															
Latvia															
Lithuania			2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		3	3	2
Luxembourg															
Malta															
Moldova	1		1	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	3		2	2	2
Montenegro		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3			1	1	1
Netherlands															
North Macedonia	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3		1	1	1
Norway															
Poland	1		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1		2	2	1
Portugal	3		1	1	1	1	1	1	3				1	1	1
Romania	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1				2	1	1
Russian Federation															
Serbia															
Slovak Republic	3		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3		1	1	1

Table 2.3.4 (cont.) Disposal categories (output data) (3/3)

Pro-ceed-ings un-derly- ingly due to lack of pub-lic inter-est or effi- ciency reasons or be- cause private prose- cution is recom- mended	Pro-ceed-ings dropped for legal or fac- tual rea- sons (exclud- ing cases in which the of- fender is un- known)	Lack of evi- dence	Act not an of- fence	No cri- minal re- sponsi- bility	No com- plaint from vic- tim (where this is re- quired for a prose- cution) or com- plaint with- drawn	Ne bis in idem	Statute of limi- tation	Of- fender not availa- ble	Pro-ceed-ings dropped be- cause the of- fender re- mained un- known	Of- fender known	Other dispo- sals	No com- pe- tence	Trans- fer to other do- mestic au- thority	Trans- fer to a foreign au- thority
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	2
Slovenia														
Spain	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	1	3
Sweden														
Switzerland	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	1
Turkey	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	2						
Ukraine														
UK: England & Wales	1	1	1	1	1	...	1	1			1		1	2
UK: Northern Ireland										1	1			
UK: Scotland														

1=Included
 2=Excluded
 3=Concept does not exist

Explanation of options available to prosecutors

Albania	<p>Article 328 of the Albanian Code of Criminal Procedure provides the grounds for dismissal of a case by the prosecution authorities, such as when:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> it is clear that the fact does not exist; the fact is not provided for by law as a criminal offence; the victim has not lodged a complaint or waives it, in cases where the proceedings are initiated on his request; the person cannot be taken as a defendant or he may not be punished; there exists a reason that extinguishes the criminal offence or for which the criminal proceedings should not be initiated or continued; it is proven that the defendant has not committed the offence or it is not proven that the defendant has committed the offence; the defendant has been adjudicated by a final court decision for the same act; the defendant dies; in other cases provided for by the law.
Armenia	The majority of the cases mentioned- fines, restitution, etc. are not available to prosecutors, thus no such statistics exist.
Belgium	Proceedings can be dropped for three kinds of reasons: - technic reasons (offender unknown, no competence) - opportunity reasons (for example : other priorities, behaviour of the victim, ..) - other reasons (administrative fine, praetorian probation, ...) Other possible decisions by the prosecutor are: - junction with another proceeding - transfer to another district - transaction - mediation - transfer to the examining magistrate - direct transfer to the court
Bulgaria	After the completion of the investigation the public prosecutor has the following options: 1) to terminate the proceedings; 2) to temporarily suspend the proceedings; 3) to submit to the court a proposal for releasing the offender of criminal responsibility by imposing administrative sanctions; 4) to submit to the court a proposal for a plea bargain agreement; or 5) to submit the case to court through a bill of indictment.
Croatia	Other disposals are not possible because we used prosecution data from the court statistics.
Czech Republic	Conditional disposals by the prosecutor without formal verdict are possible in minors' cases Other = appropriate restrictions and obligations No private prosecution complaint from victim = if the criminal prosecution is subject to the consent of the victim Offender unknown = deferral proceedings Offender not available = proceedings are discontinued, not dropped https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/506062018001/consolide CCP §§ 200–205.2.
Estonia	To sue (bring a case before a court), to convict a defendant to a fine, to drop a case
Finland	France Sanctions imposed by PP = composition pénale + ordonnance pénale + comparution sur reconnaissance préalable de culpabilité. In particular, the « composition pénale » is included though according to French it does not lead to a formal conviction (but court agreement is necessary and the case is recorded in national criminal record). These sanctions are included in the conviction chapter. Cases transmitted by the prosecutor to the examining magistrate: if the offender remains unknown, the case is counted within "unknown offender", the other cases are counted within "cases brought before a court". Pending cases are not counted.
France	
Germany	<p>Cases brought before a court: Included are normal indictments, applications for summary decisions („beschleunigtes Verfahren“) according to section 417 Code of Criminal Procedure, applications for simplified juvenile proceedings („vereinfachtes Jugendverfahren“) according to section 76 Act on Juvenile Courts and applications for a special kind of proceeding („Sicherungsverfahren“) according to section 413 Code of Criminal Procedure designed for persons who are dangerous but obviously not criminally responsible for their deeds, e.g. due to a mental illness.</p> <p>Sanctions imposed by the prosecutor (or by the court, but on application of the prosecutor and without a formal court hearing) that lead to a formal verdict and count as a conviction: Counted are all cases in which the Public Prosecution Office applies by the court for a „Strafbefehl“ (penal order) with a special sanction (mostly fines). The court issues the penal order after a summary review of the case and without a court hearing. If the accused raises an objection, a court hearing takes place.</p> <p>Conditional disposals: Counted are cases in which the prosecutor makes use of his limited discretionary power whether or not to prosecute and suspends prosecution with the court's and the defendant's consent on the condition that the defendant for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> restores the damage resulting from the offence,

- pays a fine,
- does community work,
- pays alimony,
- seriously tries to achieve a settlement with the victim by victim-offender mediation.

Supervision or therapeutic treatment are not possible as a condition for such a disposal.

Proceedings dropped because offender remained unknown: The category of „offender unknown“ is only counted on an input basis in German prosecution statistics; cases where the offender remained unknown are not at all counted in output data for Germany. Therefore, this category is excluded from the tables in the prosecution chapter.

Latvia

It is difficult to choose from given categories. According to Criminal Procedure Law:

Section 377. Circumstances that Exclude Criminal Proceedings

The initiation of criminal proceedings shall not be permitted, and initiated criminal proceedings shall be terminated, if:

9) a settlement between a victim and a suspect or accused has taken place in criminal proceedings that may be initiated only on the basis of an application of a victim and the harm inflicted by the criminal offence has been completely eliminated or reimbursed;

Section 379. Termination of Criminal Proceedings, Releasing a Person from Criminal Liability

(1) An investigator with a consent of a supervising public prosecutor, public prosecutor or a court may terminate criminal proceedings, if:

1) a criminal offence has been committed that has the features of a criminal offence, but which has not caused harm that would warrant the application of a criminal punishment;

2) the person who has committed a criminal violation or a less serious crime has made a settlement with the victim or his or her representative in the cases determined in the Criminal Law;

3) a criminal offence has been committed by a minor and special circumstances of the committing of the criminal offence have been determined, and information has been acquired regarding the minor that mitigates his or her liability;

4) it is not possible to complete the criminal proceedings within reasonable term;

5) the person committed the criminal offence during the time period when he or she was subject to human trafficking and was forced to commit the offence.

(2) An investigator, with the consent of a supervising public prosecutor, or a public prosecutor may terminate criminal proceedings, and send materials regarding a minor for the application of a compulsory measure of a correctional nature.

(3) A public prosecutor may terminate criminal proceedings, conditionally releasing from criminal liability.

Section 415. Termination of Criminal Proceedings, Conditionally Releasing from Criminal Liability

(1) If a public prosecutor, taking into account the nature of and harm caused by a committed criminal offence, personal characterising data, and other conditions of a case, achieves conviction that an accused will hereinafter not commit criminal offences, the prosecutor may terminate criminal proceedings, conditionally releasing from criminal liability.

Lithuania

Sanctions imposed by the prosecutor: The prosecutor can demand a penal order (CCP 418). It is a summary process when a court trial does not exist. A penal order is written by a judge with a demand of a prosecutor (prosecutor states a demand with all pretrial material). Therefore in summary process the role of a prosecutor is very important. Lithuanian Criminal Procedure Code also establishes a special accelerated procedure, in which the prosecutor has a large role to act. The law provides for the following main conditions to apply such procedure: 1. apparent circumstances of the offense; 2. criminal proceedings for the offense shall be dealt with in the District Court; 3. prosecutor should apply to court the day offense was committed or not later than ten days after the offense was committed. This procedure differs from the normal process, because: 1) the prosecutor does not write the indictment, but provides a statement to the court along with the pre-trial investigation material. However, although such procedure is simplified, the case is investigated also in a court hearing. Therefore, the number of pre-trial investigations that were finished by such simplified and accelerated procedure, is provided in a column "cases brought before a court." Conditional disposals The following conditional disposals are entrenched in CCP: 1) Release from criminal liability after reconciliation is reached between the culprit and the victim. (CCP 212.5). Person who commits a misdemeanor or a minor crime, or commits a negligent crime, may be released from criminal liability if the victim and the culprit reach reconciliation and voluntarily agree on the making of restitution for damage caused by the commission of the crime. A habitual offender, a dangerous habitual offender or a person who has already been released from criminal liability on the basis of reconciliation between the culprit and the victim may not be released from criminal liability. 2) Release from criminal liability when a person is given to another person who deserves court trust (on bail). A person must be convicted for the

	<p>first time, (s)he must regret and confess, also agree to restitute for damage and there should be a ground upon the court could suppose that a culprit will not commit further crimes. In 1st and 2nd cases – if a culprit makes new crime (misdemeanor), the process is resumed.</p>
North Macedonia	<p>Regarding data for proceedings dropped unconditionally due to lack of public interest or for efficiency reasons or because private prosecution is recommended - it should be noted that part of the criminal offences of this category are prosecuted with private criminal lawsuit therefore those cases are not included in the prosecutor's statistics</p>
Poland	<p>The following are disposal categories available to public prosecutors. Within these categories there may be "subcategories" such as mentioned in the tables above.</p> <p>According to Polish Criminal Code of Procedure (CCP), the case (i.e. formally instituted criminal proceedings) may be either brought to the court or dropped. The case may be dropped in the following circumstances: no offence has been committed/no sufficient grounds to suspect, that the offence has been committed; an offence has formally been committed but it is negligible (e.g. theft of a quarter dollar coin); the perpetrator is not liable to be held guilty or punished (e.g. due to his or her insanity); the suspect deceased; the applicable statute of limitation prevents the proceedings be conducted/continued; res iudicata; no Polish court has jurisdiction; lack of charges by competent prosecutor (the provision addressed to courts); lack of complaint by the victim (where it is required); other grounds preventing criminal prosecution. Moreover, there are two specific modes of disposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) By the court: the so-called "penal order". In cases where summary proceedings are allowable, the court may give up such proceedings and instead impose a penalty in the form of order, without formal hearing. A subsequent objection by the defendant makes it null and void. b) By court/public prosecutor. Public prosecutor may, having the consent by the suspect/accused obtained, if the offence is liable to punishment of up to 5 years imprisonment, and some other conditions fulfilled, enclose to the charge sheet a motion (request) for sentencing without a hearing. In this mode, only a "mitigated" sentence may be passed. By "mitigated" we understand: no penalty at all or; mitigated penalty; or suspended prison sentence.
Portugal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Persons in police custody ordered by police – are related to the number of persons in custody until 48 hours. 2) Persons in pre-trial detention represent the number of persons for whom detention was ordered by court but on prosecutors motion. <p>(a) In the Portuguese legal system it's not possible for the police to drop, apply a sanction or conditionally dispose of a criminal case.</p>
Serbia	<p>The abandonment from prosecution of an unknown offender of a criminal offence is possible only after expiration of the statutory deadline for prosecution for a particular criminal offense, when a special decision is made.</p>
Sweden	<p>The statistics of processed offences linked to a suspect is based on offences and suspects registered and processed by Swedish Police, Swedish Customs and Swedish Prosecution Authority. A processed offence refers to an offence where a decision has been taken which entails that the processing of the offence was completed. Offences with person-based clearances are processed offences where a conviction decision (a decision to indict, issue a summary sanction order, or waive prosecution) has been made. All cases of criminal offences also the cases handled only by the police and not passed to the prosecuting authority.</p>
Turkey	<p>"Proceedings dropped because offender remained unknown" – in Turkey cases do not get disposed BECAUSE offender is unknown. Such cases will either wait for the state of limitations, or the prosecutor can dismiss it on other grounds (such as lack of evidence). "D2DC16R" – box below is not clickable. I could not exclude it due to difference in counting units. "other disposals" - cases where the case was transferred to a different prosecution office were included here as well. Also lack of venue decisions are included in this category.</p>
UK: England & Wales	<p>Pre charge the prosecutor has the options of deciding that a case is suitable for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charge and prosecution; • Caution; • Reprimand, final warning or offence taken into consideration; • Request for further evidence from the police; or • No charge either on the grounds of the evidence or the public interest. Post-charge proceedings are subject to a process of continual review, and the prosecutor may decide at any time before the commencement of a trial to discontinue proceedings on consideration of the evidence or the public interest.

Other technical information on the tables

Table 2.3.5 Rules of statistical recording applied for Table 2.2.1: Are decisions made outside a criminal procedure (such as, e.g., measures of constraint against illegal immigrants) excluded?

Yes			No
Armenia	Denmark	Montenegro	France*
Austria	Estonia*	North Macedonia	UK: Scotland**
Belgium	Finland	Poland	
Bulgaria	Georgia	Romania	
Croatia	Hungary	Serbia	
Czech Republic	Italy		
Turkey	Lithuania		

* Constraints against illegal immigrants are considered as administrative measures ("retention administrative"). Illegal immigrants can be detained in administrative centres (different from ordinary prisons, depending on the ministry of the interior) before the expulsion from the national territory.

** Information on persons held as suspects is not available.

Table 2.3.6 Are minors included in Tables in the total of cases?

Yes			No	Partially
Albania	Estonia*	Netherlands	Belgium	North Macedonia
Armenia	Finland	Romania	Denmark	Poland*
Austria	France	Slovenia	France	Portugal**
Azerbaijan	Georgia	Sweden	Italy	Serbia***
Bulgaria	Germany	Turkey****	Montenegro	
Croatia	Hungary	UK: England &		
Czech Republic	Latvia	Wales		
	Lithuania	UK: Scotland		

* Cases of minors are related only to the most serious offences (e.g. Homicide, rape).

** Only minors between 16-17 years old.

*** The records on criminal offences of minors are not recorded separately for each criminal offence in the prosecution statistics, but rather the records contain only the number of persons against whom complaints were filed, who have been charged or convicted.

**** No separate statistics for minors are available, but totals include minors (even though this is not clearly specified).

Table 2.3.7 Age bracket used for minors

1=Yes 2=No	Same as the one used in Ta- ble 1.2.2	If no, mini- mum age	If no, maxi- mum age	Comments
Albania	
Armenia	1	14	18	
Austria				
Azerbaijan	2	14	18	
Belgium				
Bosnia-Herzegovina				
Bulgaria	1			
Croatia	1	14	18	
Cyprus				
Czech Republic	2	15	18	
Denmark	1			
Estonia	1			
Finland	2	15	18	Minors less than 15 years old do not have criminal responsibility and cannot be prosecuted.
France	1			
Georgia				
Germany	2	14	18/21	Young adults are included in the data on minors if they have been prosecuted based on the rules of juvenile criminal law. In practice, the majority of young offenders below 21 is treated in accordance with juvenile criminal law.
Greece				
Hungary	1			
Iceland				
Ireland				
Italy	1			
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)				
Latvia	1			
Lithuania	1			
Luxembourg				
Malta				
Moldova				
Montenegro		14	18	
Netherlands	2	12	18	
North Macedonia	1			
Norway				
Poland	2	15	17	It includes only the most serious offences (e.g. homicide)
Portugal				
Romania	1			
Russian Federation				
Serbia	1			
Slovak Republic				
Slovenia	1	14	18	
Spain				
Sweden	1			
Switzerland				
Turkey				No data for minors was available in this section
Ukraine				
UK: England & Wales				
UK: Northern Ireland				
UK: Scotland	1			

Table 2.3.8 Rules of statistical recording

	Are there written rules regulating the way in which data are recorded?	How are individual proceedings counted if more than one person is involved?	How are multiple offences of the same kind counted?	How is a person counted who is subject to two or more proceedings in one year?	Are data collected by other authorities (apart from the prosecutor or examining judge) included?
	1=Yes 2=No	1: As one case 2: As two or more cases	1: As one offence 2: As two or more offences 3:Uncertain	1: As one case 2: As two or more cases	1: Included 2: Excluded
Albania	1	2
Armenia	1		1		1
Austria		1	1	2	2
Azerbaijan	1		1	1	1
Belgium		1	2	2	2
Bosnia-Herzegovina					
Bulgaria	1	1	1	2	2
			As two or more cases if there are two or more proceedings		
Croatia	1	2		2	2
Cyprus					
Czech Republic	1			2	2
Denmark	2	2	1	2	2
Estonia	1	1		2	1
Finland	1	2	1	2	2
France	1	1	1		2
Georgia					
Germany	1	1	1	2	...
Greece					
Hungary	1	1	1	2*	1
Iceland					
Ireland					
Italy	2	1	1	1	2
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)					
Latvia	2	1	1	2	2
Lithuania	1	1	2	1	2
Luxembourg					
Malta					
Moldova					
Montenegro	1	1	1	2	2
Netherlands	1	2	2	2	
North Macedonia	2	2	1	2	2
Norway					
Poland	1	1	1	2	2
Portugal	1	1	1	2	2
Romania		1	1	2	2
Russian Federation					
Serbia	2	2	1	2	2
Slovak Republic					
Slovenia	2	2	1	2	2
Spain					
Sweden	1	2	2	2	1
Switzerland					
Turkey	2	2	2	2	2
Ukraine					
UK: England & Wales	1	2	1	2	2
UK: Northern Ireland					
UK: Scotland	1	2	1	2	1

* The offender involved in more than one criminal procedure is counted as multiple offenders. If the offences committed are evaluated in the same criminal procedure, the person suspected of more than one offence is counted as one person.

Table 2.3.8 (cont.) Rules of statistical recording: Do the police have separate powers to drop proceedings, conditionally dispose of them or issue a penal order that counts as a conviction? If yes, which powers do they have?

Yes, they have the following powers

1 = true

	<i>No, none of these 1 = true</i>	<i>Drop because fender mains known</i>	<i>be- of- re- un-</i>	<i>Drop for other factual or for legal reasons</i>	<i>Drop for public interest reasons/simple caution</i>	<i>Conditional disposal</i>	<i>Penal order</i>
Albania	1						
Armenia				1		1	
Austria	1						
Azerbaijan							
Belgium	1						
Bosnia-Herzegovina							
Bulgaria	1						
Croatia	1						
Cyprus							
Czech Republic			1	1	1		
Denmark			1				1
Estonia	1						
Finland			1	1	1	1	1
France							
Georgia	1						
Germany	1						
Greece							
Hungary			1	1			
Iceland							
Ireland							
Italy	1						
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)							
Latvia							
Lithuania							
Luxembourg							
Malta							
Moldova							
Montenegro	1						
Netherlands			1			1	
North Macedonia	1						
Norway							
Poland			1	1	1		
Portugal	1						
Romania	1						
Russian Federation							
Serbia	1						
Slovak Republic							
Slovenia	1						
Spain							
Sweden				1	1		1
Switzerland							
Turkey	1						
Ukraine	1						
UK: England & Wales	1						
UK: Northern Ireland							
UK: Scotland						1	

Table 2.3.8 (cont.) Rules of statistical recording: Do the police have separate powers to drop proceedings, conditionally dispose of them or issue a penal order that counts as a conviction?

	Please explain the options available
Armenia	The police investigators have the right to drop the cases, when the victim decided to go for mediation in cases when the victim's complaint is a mandatory requirement, as well as when the act constituted no crime
Netherlands	Actually, the police have no powers to drop at all. But in practice drops and disposals are used under the responsibility of the prosecutor (but they do not appear in the prosecution statistics).
Poland	Police can only apply, in term of disposal above, and the confirmation by the prosecutors is obligatory.
Sweden	Kommentar FUB och OBOT...

Table 2.3.8 (cont.) Rules of statistical recording: Have the data recording methods described above been substantially modified between 2011 and 2016?

This applies to three countries:

Hungary	There were some changes in the categories used after the New Criminal Code came into force
Sweden	The statistics of processed offences linked to a suspect is based on offences and suspects registered and processed by Swedish Police, Swedish Customs and Swedish Prosecution Authority. A processed offence refers to an offence where a decision has been taken which entails that the processing of the offence was completed. Offences with person-based clearances are processed offences where a conviction decision (a decision to indict, issue a summary sanction order, or waive prosecution) has been made.
Ukraine	In accordance with the Criminal Procedural Code of Ukraine 2012 (article 214) the investigator or prosecutor shall immediately, but not later than 24 hours after the submission of the application, notification of a criminal offence or after an independent identification of circumstances which may indicate a criminal offence, from any source, shall be obliged to enter the relevant information into the Unified Register of Pre-trial Investigations.

2.4 Sources

2.4.1 Sources of tables in sections 2.2.1–2.2.4

Albania	Statistics reported by District Prosecutions to the General Prosecution for 2015
Armenia	Publication – Social-economical Situation in Armenia, January 2016 https://www.armstat.am/file/article/sv_01_16a_520.pdf ST26
Austria	Security Reports, Ministry of Justice (Sicherheitsbericht 2015, Bericht über die Tätigkeit der Strafjustiz)
Azerbaijan	Information about crimes 2013-2016 is available on the official website of the State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan https://www.stat.gov.az/source/crimes/ and The General Prosecutor's Office of Azerbaijan
Belgium	College of general Prosecutors - Statistical analysts http://www.om-mp.be/sa/start/n/home.html
Bulgaria	Letter from the Supreme Prosecutor's Office of Cassation to the National Correspondent dated 10 August 2018, not published. Source relating to the number of proceedings concerning minors dropped for legal or factual reasons (excluding cases in which the offender is unknown): Annual Report on the Activities of the Prosecution Authorities in Bulgaria 2015. See https://www.prb.bg/media/filer_public/32/f6/32f603e3-9c3e-483d-aa29-aa2c93e693f1/doklad_zh_prilozhenieto_na_zakona_i_deinostta_na_prokuraturata_i_razsledvashchite_organ_i_za_2015_g.pdf (in Bulgarian only).
Croatia	Croatian Bureau of Statistics – data provided by the court
Czech Republic	Statement of the Ministry of Justice No. V(MS) 001 a V(MS) 002, counting unit = matter (proceedings)! statistical sheet of the Ministry of Justice, overview No. 6, counting unit – a person
Denmark	Prosecutor general
Estonia	Ministry of Justice – not published. Kuritegevus Eestis 2017. Justiitsministeerium. Tallinn, 2018. www.just.ee
Finland	Statistics Finland, Syytetyt, tuomitut ja rangaistukset 7.8.2018 http://pxnet2.stat.fi/PXWeb/pxweb/fi/StatFin/StatFin_oik_syyttr/Statistics_Finland_Rikos- ja_pakkokeino_tilasto_7.8.2018 http://pxnet2.stat.fi/PXWeb/pxweb/fi/StatFin/StatFin_oik_rpk/
France	Ministère de la Justice / SG / SEM / SDSE / Cadres du parquet, SID statistiques pénales Source for the pre-trial detention : Ministère de la justice / DAP/ Me5/ Infocentre penitencier
Georgia	Report of Main Prosecutor office of Georgia 2015 , 2016
Germany	Statistisches Bundesamt, Staatsanwaltschaften 2011-2016, Wiesbaden 2012-2017.
Hungary	Prosecution Caseload Statistics
Iceland	Standard Criminal Statistics of Investigation Authorities and Prosecutors
Ireland	The National Prosecutor annual report
Italy	Italian Institute of statistics - http://www.istat.it - Ministry of Justice. Department of Statistics
Latvia	The Prosecution Office
Lithuania	Information Technology and Communications Department under the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania – Information Processing and Statistics Division. Prison Department under the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania – General Unit.
Netherlands	Ministry of Justice / WODC
North Macedonia	Prosecution Statistics
Poland	General Prosecution, Department of Statistics
Portugal	Directorate-General for Justice Policy – Ministry of Justice
Romania	Public Ministry – General Prosecutor's Office (www.mpublic.ro)
Serbia	Annual report on the work of public prosecutors' offices
Slovenia	Source is IT system of state prosecutor office
Sweden	Swedish National Council of Crime Prevention, Processed offences linked to a suspect Sweden, Official Crime statistics. https://bra.se/statistik/kriminalstatistik/handlagda-brottsmisstankar.html The Swedish Prosecution Authority www.aklagare.se
Turkey	Ministry of Justice, General Directorate for Judicial Records and Statistics http://www.adlisicil.adalet.gov.tr/ar-siv.html Ministry of Justice, General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses http://www.cte.adalet.gov.tr/ website of the General Prosecutor's Office of Ukraine since 2013 https://www.gp.gov.ua/ua/statinfo.html/
Ukraine	
UK: England & Wales	The above figures are collected through a single national computer system (Compass), and are derived from a related Management Information System capable of inter-relational analyses of the database.
UK: Scotland	Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service (from data published on website at http://www.copfs.gov.uk/About/corporate-info/Caseproclast5)

Source of the data in Tables 2.2.5.1, 2.2.5.2

Albania	Statistics reported by District Prosecutions to the General Prosecution for 2015
Austria	Security Reports, Ministry of Justice (Sicherheitsbericht, Bericht über die Tätigkeit der Strafjustiz)
Bulgaria	Letter from the Supreme Prosecutor's Office of Cassation to the National Correspondent dated 10 August 2018, not published.
Croatia	Report from the prosecution office.
Czech Republic	Economic department of the Ministry of Justice
Denmark	Prosecutor general
Estonia	Office of the Prosecutor General - not published
Finland	Valtakunnansyyttäjälaitos. Vuosikertomukset 2015 & 2013. Henkilöstöllinpäätös 2016 http://www.vksv.fi/fi/index/julkaisu/jaohjeet/vuosikertomukset.html
France	Ministère de la Justice / Direction des Services Judiciaires/Conseil d'État/Enquête CE PEJ
Georgia	Georgia Main Prosecutor Office Reports: 2014,2015,2016
Germany	Personalbestand der Staats- und Anwaltschaften bei den Landgerichten, Bundesamt für Justiz. Personalbestand der Staatsanwaltschaften bei den Oberlandesgerichten, Bundesamt für Justiz.
Hungary	OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR GENERAL – Human Resource System
Latvia	The Prosecution Office
Lithuania	Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Lithuania.
Netherlands	CEPEJ
North Macedonia	Prosecution statistics
Poland	General Prosecution, Department of Statistics
Serbia	State council of public prosecutors and the Ministry of Justice – Personnel service
Slovenia	MFERac – IT system for staff recording for public authorities
Sweden	The Swedish Prosecution Authority www.aklagare.se
Turkey	Ministry of Justice, Directorate for Criminal Records and Statistics, Judicial Statistics Archive http://www.adlisicil.adalet.gov.tr/en/statarchive2.html
Ukraine	The Law of Ukraine "About the prosecutor's office" on 14.10.2014, article 14 https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1697-18 . The official website of the GeneralProsecutor's Office of Ukraine: https://www.gp.gov.ua/
UK: England & Wales	Staff records are held centrally within a CPS Corporate Information System.
UK: Scotland	Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service. Staff in Post figures (Including Temporary, Permanent & Paid Absence), mid year.

3 Conviction Statistics

3.1 General comments

3.1.1 Introduction

The tables in this chapter refer to persons who have been convicted and the sanctions and measures imposed on them. Information is presented on the type of offence for which they were convicted (2011-2016) and the sex, age, and nationality of the offender (2015). Information on persons receiving sanctions and measures (2015) looks at minors and all offenders separately for each offence type. The unit for the table on sanctions and measures is the *person* on whom the sanction is imposed, not the sanction itself. Sentence lengths (2015) for custodial sentences for each offence type are also presented but only for all offenders and not separately for minors. For 8 countries data is available on the number of offenders that were held in pre-trial detention before their conviction. New in this edition is information on the number of judges. However, only a few countries could give separate data on judges in criminal courts.

Three countries (Greece, Ireland, and Malta) did not provide any information on convictions and are therefore not included in the tables.

Interpretation of such information is more difficult than for police statistics because conviction statistics closely reflect the different criminal justice systems in each country. These differences affect the likelihood that a suspect will appear

before a court, the type of court and how this relates to the age of the suspect. Similarly, there are differences in recording due to the inclusion or not of all possible convictions (e.g., including guilty pleas at the police/prosecutor stage) and the availability of data. The range of sentencing options for the court may also differ as once again they reflect the criminal code in question. For some countries short custodial sentences will have automatically been converted to non-custodial alternatives through administrative procedures. These are not shown here as the statistics only reflect the initial court decision.

It is also important to note that the offence for which an offender is convicted may often differ substantially from the initial offence recorded by the police or for which the offender was initially charged. Often at the court stage, an offender may agree to plead guilty to a less serious offence or the prosecutor may decide there is insufficient evidence to convict for the original offence.

3.1.2 Offence definitions

The definitions used in the various police statistics presented here show some uniformity between countries. In contrast, those for sanctions/measures often vary substantially in definition as they are based on the judicial system of each country and are entirely dependent on the definitions 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’ are often not identified as separate offences, for example in the Netherlands, but are included in the general category ‘theft’. For other offences the scope of the offence may vary; for example, classifying the offence as theft as opposed to theft of a motor vehicle depends on whether the owner was permanently deprived of an article or not.

3.1.3 Definition of a conviction

When preparing the questionnaire, an attempt was made to provide a definition for a ‘conviction’ of an offender that was acceptable to most criminal justice systems. The need for such a definition 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 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) the sanctions were imposed by the police and (c) other state authorities imposed the sanction/measure. In addition, there is a system of police cautioning or issuing a fixed penalty in many countries (e.g., the United Kingdom) while other countries such as the Dutch and the French have systems for diverting offenders from the courts. These cases are excluded from the convictions statistics. This position is more complex for offences committed by minors which are counted in many different ways for all offence types.

The information presented here cannot therefore be said to give an accurate measure of either how many crimes recorded by the police result in a conviction or how many suspected offenders are convicted, except for the most serious offences, e.g., homicide. However, even in such cases it should be noted that offenders may eventually be convicted for a less serious offence than the one for which they were initially prosecuted by the courts.

In some countries legal persons could be convicted as well. However, except for crimes like fraud, forgery of documents and corruption, the numbers of legal persons convicted were negligible.

The definition of a minor varies. For example, in Germany, 'minor' covers all those under 18 years of age when they committed the crime. However, for Germany this will also include a proportion of those aged between 18 to 20 years who are also covered by juvenile laws. This applies to other countries as well.

3.1.4 Minimum age of conviction

The sentencing options for convicted offenders depend upon their age as well as the scope of juvenile law. Usually, the same minimum and maximum age are used as by the police, and is reported in chapter 1. Only 5 countries apply other age brackets, mostly for the minimum age. Below these minimum ages many countries have alternative ways of dealing with minors. In some cases, they are offence dependent, with the aim of diverting young offenders from the formal criminal justice system.

3.1.5 Validation checks

Once the term 'convictions' had been defined, it was expected that the number of persons convicted would be equal to or less than the number of suspected offenders. Similarly, the number of offenders convicted should be equal to the number of persons receiving a sanction or measure. Due to time delays and use of other sources this is not always the case. Also, for some countries there can be a conviction without a sanction or measure.

Finally, the number of custodial sentences given in the sentencing tables should be equal to the totals for which sentence lengths are shown. Some small differences in some countries arose as a result of the different times at which such statistics were recorded.

Although validation checks identified many errors in the figures, and in some cases called for further explanation, it is possible that some errors have gone undetected.

3.1.6 Methodology

Most countries apply some form of written rules to regulate the collection of conviction data. This normally includes some form of 'principal offence rule' so that an

offender convicted at one court appearance for more than one offence will be shown only once in the statistics. However, for a few countries no principal offence rule applies, and a person convicted for several offences during the same trial will be counted several times in each table. While most countries count the most serious offence, it was often not clear whether they determined the seriousness of the offence based upon a) the nature of the offence, b) the punishment imposed or c) the maximum sentence applicable. While most countries count each court conviction separately, 6 countries (Armenia, Bulgaria, Georgia, Italy, Latvia, and Spain) count different court convictions in the same year as only one conviction.

There were two different procedures identified with respect to the point at which statistics on court decisions were recorded. Thirteen countries replied that the information they provided was related to the position before any appeal on either the verdict or the sentence. For sixteen countries, information was collected only after any such appeals were completed. Variations in the point at which data was collected will affect any comparisons between court statistics. The remaining fourteen countries gave no information on this issue.

3.1.7 Results

The tables cover convictions for the period 2011-2016 and sanctions/measures for the year 2015. The commentary draws on the definitional material collected in this survey although a full analysis would require additional research in each country. In some countries, limitations on the data available (e.g., type of thefts) reflects the absence of such a breakdown in their criminal code. Also, for some countries minors are completely or partially excluded from the tables with total persons convicted or receiving sanctions/measures.

Different migration patterns are reflected in the proportion of foreigners among those convicted, with Luxembourg, Switzerland and Austria having the highest proportions. Thirteen countries could identify those foreigners with EU citizenship. In some countries, it is the ethnic origin of the suspect rather than nationality that is recorded for court decisions. In view of such variations, there is no discussion in this chapter of conviction rates for foreigners.

3.1.8 Total crimes

Convictions

Cyprus, Finland, and Norway show the highest number of convictions (6 387, 3 321 and 5 026 per 100 000 inhabitants in 2015). England & Wales also had a high number of convictions (2 158), while Armenia (94 in 2015) and Azerbaijan (138 in 2015) had the lowest levels. Many of the differences reflect both the way that major road traffic offences and minors are dealt with within the formal criminal justice system and whether they are recorded in the court statistics. Because of the high number of traffic convictions in Norway and Finland, when these are excluded the rates

would be comparable with many other countries such as England & Wales, Turkey, Belgium, Denmark, and others. In general, the number of convictions show a decrease over the period 2011 – 2016, with an increase for a few countries only (Albania with 60%, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Spain with 23% and 8 other countries with lower percentages) The largest decreases were found in Cyprus (-48%), Ukraine (-47%) and Croatia (-42%).

Wide variations in the percentage of minors measured under total crimes will also be indicative of the number of traffic offences that are included. Typically, the percentage of minors is about 5% or a little lower in most countries. The percentage of women measured under total crimes ranges between 5.4% (Turkey) and 29.5% (England & Wales).

Sanctions and measures

For all countries, fines were the most frequently used sanction (38% of all sanctions), followed by suspended custodial sanctions and measures (25%). The highest proportions of unsuspended custodial sanctions can be found in Armenia (36%) and Latvia (34%).

For minors, non-custodial sanctions were most frequently used (48%).

3.1.9 Major road traffic offences

Convictions

The number of convictions for major road traffic offences varied widely between countries, from very low rates in Armenia, Italy, and England & Wales (less than 8 per 100 000 population in 2015) to almost 4 000 in Norway. The percentage of those convicted for traffic offences who were minors was below 7% in all countries except Albania (30%) and Ukraine (10%). The differences may reflect the age at which driving is permitted in each country and the seriousness of offences dealt with by fixed penalties but outside the court system.

Sanctions and measures

Offenders were usually fined (44%) with only 12% sentenced to custody. Armenia (37%) and England & Wales (43%) had the highest rates of custody, although this may reflect the more serious nature of offences included.

For minors, the sanctions used in the main were fines (37%) and non-custodial sentences (44%). Bulgaria and England & Wales had a relatively high rate of custody at 42% and 18%.

3.1.10 Homicide

Convictions

Since the numbers of homicides in most countries are relatively small, conviction rates may fluctuate substantially. Turkey showed the highest levels of total homicide convictions (this included attempted homicide) at 20 per 100 000 population (in 2015), but provided no data for homicides when attempted homicides were excluded. With 4.5 convictions per 100 000 population Georgia had the highest level for completed homicide. Many countries had conviction rates of about 1 per 100 000 population for completed homicide.

The mean percentage of minors among homicide convictions for all countries was a little under 5%. High proportions were found in the Netherlands (9.4%) and Austria (10.0%). On average about 10% of the convicted offenders for homicide were women.

Sanctions and measures

For all countries, custody was the main sanction for completed and attempted homicides. Only in four countries, Belgium, Portugal, Switzerland, and Turkey the rates for unsuspended custody in homicides were somewhat lower, where this reflects the use of alternative sanctions. Minors were mainly sentenced to custody as well.

3.1.11 Bodily injuries

Convictions

Variations in conviction rates for bodily injuries have been explained in previous reports by whether less serious assaults are included. In this report, as in the fourth and fifth edition, aggravated bodily injuries are shown separately and, other than in previous editions, all countries (with the exception of Northern Ireland and Spain) were able to make the distinction between bodily injury (total) and aggravated bodily injury. In 2015 the highest conviction rates for aggravated bodily injury were in Hungary (45 per 100 000), Montenegro (25) and Germany (23), while very low rates were recorded in Turkey, Albania, Armenia, and Poland (under 3). As with total crime, the majority of countries show a decrease in the number of convictions over the period 2011-2016.

In the majority of countries, less than 10% of aggravated bodily injuries were committed by women with Finland (15.2%) and Portugal (14.7%) among the exceptions. The average proportion of minor offenders was 5.2% with Germany (15.7%) well above this average.

Sanctions and measures

Custody and suspended custodial sanctions and measures were the main sanctions for aggravated bodily injury, each with about 40% of the total convictions. Portugal (with 36% fines) and Switzerland (66% fines) were the exceptions. For minors, non-custodial sanctions were the main measure used (about 40% of the total).

3.1.12 Rape

Convictions

There were wide variations between countries in the rape conviction rate per 100 000 population, possibly reflecting both social as well as criminal justice variations. High levels were recorded in 2015 in Lithuania (7.1), Moldova (4.2), and Estonia (3.6). Very low levels were recorded in Armenia (0.1) and Ukraine (0.2). No clear trend was found for the period 2011-2016.

About 8% of those convicted were minors, with the highest proportions in France (30%) and Hungary (16.7%). As expected, the percentage, with an average of 1% the number of convicted women for rape is very low, with Serbia (5.6%) and the Netherlands (4.8%) being the highest.

Sanctions and measures

The majority (typically more than 90%) of those offenders convicted of rape offences were sentenced to custody, of which about 70% unsuspended. For minors, custody and suspended sentences were the main sanctions used, each with a little over 40%.

3.1.13 Sexual assaults

Convictions

Sexual assaults also include rapes. Conviction rates for sexual assault vary from about 1 (or even less) per 100 000 in Ukraine (0.4), Albania (1.1) and Bulgaria (1.8) to more than 15 in Norway (15.5), Scotland (21.4) and Turkey (25.9). The trend over the period 2011-2016 is slightly increasing. Typically, about one third of the sexual assaults refer to sexual abuse of a child (minor). With an average of about 10%, the highest proportion of minors convicted were in Czech Republic (24.5%) and Switzerland (19.2%).

Sanctions and measures

About half of the sanctions and measures for sexual assault were unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures with little variations between countries. For minors suspended custodial sanctions and measures were used most often.

3.1.14 Robbery

Convictions

The highest numbers of robbery convictions per 100 000 population were in Lithuania (29), Turkey and Moldova (28) with the lowest rates in France (0.8), Armenia (3.3) and Azerbaijan (3.4). Almost all countries showed a considerable decrease in the number of convictions in the period 2011-2016.

With 16% the number of minors convicted for robbery was high compared to most other crimes. Austria (34%), Switzerland, England & Wales, and Hungary (all 28%) were the highest. The average number of women convicted for robbery was somewhat under 6%.

Sanctions and measures

About 60% of all offenders received unsuspended custodial sanctions. However, this fell to about one third or lower in Germany, Portugal, and Switzerland. For minors, unsuspended custodial sentences were the main sanctions used (37%).

3.1.15 Theft

It is important to note that this group includes burglaries, which in countries such as the UK are normally considered separately. Also, it excludes theft with violence (robbery), which in some countries will be (partly) included. The figures here therefore could relate to another range of offences than is often seen in international comparisons of police statistics. In this edition a new table on aggravated theft was included since many countries in Europe have this concept of aggravated theft in their legislation (which could include theft by means of burglary as well). Only a few countries provided figures for theft of a motor vehicle and (domestic) burglary separately.

Convictions

The highest rates for theft convictions were found in Finland (545 per 100 000 population), a much higher rate than in the next group with Denmark (297), Turkey (226) and Scotland (233). Very low levels of theft convictions were found in Armenia (17) and Azerbaijan (20). In general, the number of theft convictions has decreased a little over this period.

Wide variations in convictions for minors reflect how the criminal justice system in each country deals with minors. England & Wales (42%), France (22%) and Turkey (21%) have the highest proportions of minors. A much higher proportion (15%) of theft offenders were women than for most other offences, in particular in Finland (30%), Scotland (29%), Spain (38%) and Sweden (33%).

Sanctions and measures

For thefts, unsuspended custody was the most frequently applied sanction for offenders (31%) followed by suspended sentences (28%) and fines (27%). Only Armenia, Finland, Germany, Norway, and Switzerland showed a high use of fines, while non-custodial sanctions were applied most frequently in Croatia, Poland, and Serbia.

For minors, non-custodial sanctions were mainly used, although Bulgaria (40%) and Turkey (41%) had a high use of custody.

3.1.16 Fraud

Next to fraud, in this edition tables for cyber fraud and forgery of documents were introduced.

Convictions

The highest rates for fraud convictions were found in Germany (110), Finland (84) and Turkey (83), with very low levels in Ukraine (6), the Netherlands (5) and Armenia (3). Only a few countries could provide figures for cyber fraud. For forgery of documents the conviction rates vary from 2.1 (England & Wales) to 63.4 (Hungary). There was no clear trend over the period 2011-2016.

A very low percentage of fraud offenders were minors, with the exception of Sweden and England & Wales (6%). A relatively high proportion (23%) of offenders were women, in particular in Scotland (49%), Germany, Finland, and Czech Republic (34%).

Sanctions and measures

Suspended sentences were the most frequently used sanctions for fraud offences, with unsuspended custodial sanctions the next most frequent. Armenia and Georgia have a high use of custody.

The largest part (47%) of minors were given non-custodial sanctions.

3.1.17 Money laundering

Convictions

While most countries provided data, only a few showed any significant level of convictions. Spain (5.9), Belgium (4.2), Switzerland (3.8) and Italy (3.1) were the highest. There were very few minors convicted of money laundering. About 25% of the offenders were women. In the Netherlands 5% of the convicted offenders for money laundering were legal persons.

Sanctions and measures

Due to the small number of sanctions for this crime it is hard to draw any conclusions. Custodial sanctions, either suspended or unsuspended seem to be used the most. Too few minors were convicted to include any analysis.

3.1.18 Corruption

Convictions

By far the highest number of convictions for corruption were found in Lithuania (26.8). Other countries had a conviction rate of less than 5, with many countries even below 1.

Only France (10%) had any significant number of minors convicted. Corruption convictions were over 80% males, except in Croatia and Sweden. Some convictions for legal persons were found in Finland and Romania.

Sanctions and measures

Suspended sentences were the most frequent sanctions used (about 50%). Again, there were too few minors convicted to allow for analysis.

3.1.19 Drug trafficking

Convictions

The highest conviction rates were found in Finland (65 per 100 000 population), Turkey (69) and Switzerland (99). While some countries showed a considerable increase (Sweden and France) there was no clear overall trend for the period 2011-2016.

Under 4% of those convicted for drug trafficking were minors. The average for women was between 8% and 9% with the highest proportion in Czech Republic (17%).

Sanctions and measures

For the majority of countries custody was the most frequently used sanction for drug trafficking, with the exception of Finland and Switzerland.

Non-custodial sanctions and measures were frequently used for minors.

3.1.20 Attrition and punitivity

Attrition is defined as:

The "loss" of cases or, more technically, the filtering out of cases during the criminal justice process.

Because the Sourcebook collects data on different aspects of the criminal justice process, this enabled - while producing the previous (fifth) edition of the

Sourcebook - a study of attrition rates in the different countries of Europe. However, to describe attrition exactly it would be necessary to rely on case-flow statistics which follows the path of individual cases throughout the system. Few such statistics are available and *true attrition rates* are not collected at present. However, the study was able to thoroughly scrutinize the available attrition indicators and assess their quality and usability, taking into account the status quo of attrition research. Full results were reported in Heiskanen et al (2014).²⁶

In summary, twelve possible indicators for attrition on the level of police, prosecution, courts, and prisons were identified, differentiating between intra level and inter level indicators. In the end, four indicators were proposed: the rate of offences, suspects, convicted persons and those sentenced to an unsuspended prison sentence. Their relation to each other reflects the different processes of attrition: Suspects per recorded offences (offender ratio), convicted per suspected persons (conviction ratio) and persons sentenced to unsuspended prison sentences per all persons convicted (punitivity ratio 1). Alternatively, while this last ratio gives a clear view of attrition on the conviction level, the punitivity ratio 3 (the number of prisoners divided by convicted persons) is better suited to look at punitivity itself because it combines both the ratio of unsuspended prison sentences and the length of the sentence actually served. See also Smit et al (2012).²⁷

Using data from the first four editions of the Sourcebook, both the offender ratio and the conviction ratio have been calculated for several countries from 1900 to 2006. See Aebi & Linde (2012).²⁸ For a discussion on punitivity and other attrition indicators see also Blumstein et al. (2005),²⁹ where punitivity is seen in two ways: in a broad sense it relates prison sentences to recorded crimes and in a narrow sense it is defined as the ratio between persons committed to prison and persons convicted multiplied by the average time served. This 'narrow punitiveness' is actually theoretically similar to the punitivity ratio 3 as defined here. However, in practice it is generally easier to get data for the number of prisoners than for the average time served. In the Sourcebook tables 3.2.5.1 – 3.2.5.21 only the average sentence imposed is available, not the average time served. And there are many missing values here.

We show below how the data collected in this edition enabled good estimates to be made of both the conviction ratio and the punitivity ratio (ratio 3 as mentioned

²⁶ Heiskanen, M., Aebi, M., van der Brugge, W. & Jehle J.-M. (Eds.) Recording Community Sanctions and Measures and Assessing Attrition A Methodological Study on Comparative Data in Europe, published by HEUNI, 2014.

²⁷ Smit, P., van Eijk, A. & Decae, R. (2012). Trends in the Reaction on Crime in Criminal justice Systems in Europe in 1990-2007. European Journal on Criminal policy and Research, 18, 55-82.

²⁸ Aebi, M.F. & Linde, A. (2012). Crime Trends in Western Europe according to Official Statistics from 1990 to 2007. In van Dijk J., Tseloni A. and Farrell G. (Eds.). The International Crime Drop: New Directions in Research (pp. 37-75). New York, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

²⁹ Blumstein, A., Tonry, M. & van Ness, A. (2005) Cross-National Measures of Punitiveness. Crime and Justice, 33 (Crime and Punishment in Western Countries, 1980-1999), pp.347-376.

above) for various countries for the year 2016. Not all countries were able to provide data needed for the calculation of such ratios. A small number of countries with conviction ratios over 1.0 were also excluded as this almost certainly meant a statistical misalignment between the definitions for suspects and convictions. For the punitivity ratio it is perfectly all right for the ratio to be greater than 1. However, in practice it was not possible to compute the punitivity ratio for different crime types, so only the ratio for total crime is given. Tables 3A and 3B summarize the information collected for 2016.

Table 3A Attrition: Examples of conviction ratios for main offence groups: Europe, 2016

	Number of countries for which a conviction ratio was calculated	Low Conviction ratio	Medium Conviction ratio	High Conviction ratio
Intentional homicide	21	0.16 (Sweden)	0.45 (Ukraine)	1.00 (Hungary)
Bodily injury	20	0.11 (Portugal)	0.28 (France)	0.87 (Poland)
Rape	19	0.08 (Germany)	0.37 (Italy)	0.91 (Bulgaria)
Robbery	21	0.03 (France)	0.41 (Netherlands)	0.98 (Azerbaijan)
Total theft	23	0.10 (Austria)	0.46 (Moldova)	0.93 (Lithuania)

Table 3B Punitivity: Examples of punitivity ratios for Total Crime: Europe, 2016

	Number of countries for which a punitivity ratio was calculated	Low Punitivity ratio	Medium Punitivity ratio	High Punitivity ratio
Total crime	35	0.02 (Finland)	0.23 (Portugal)	1.12 (Ukraine)
		0.04 (Denmark)	0.25 (Poland)	1.51 (Armenia)
		0.05 (Belgium)	0.25 (Hungary)	1.67 (Azerbaijan)

3.1.21 Crime types, relative number of convicted persons

Table 3C presents the relative position of eight of the above-mentioned crime types for persons convicted. Because of the variation in the way traffic offences are dealt with in different countries, the relative positions were computed using total offences *excluding* traffic offences.

Typically, theft is the most common crime with up to 46% (Ukraine) of the total. Next comes drugs crimes with an average of about twelve percent, followed by bodily injury with an average of eleven percent. As expected, the percentage of homicide convictions is low, with some exceptions only about a half percent.

Table 3C Persons convicted by type of offence in percentage (excluding traffic offences), 2015:

	Total per 100 000 population	of which: % traffic offences	Total per 100 000 population excluding Traffic	% of Total excluding Traffic offences							
				Homicide	Bodily injury	Rape	Robbery	Theft	Theft by means of Burglary	Fraud	Drugs
Albania	559	2	550	1.1	2.7	...	1.2	11.2	...	1.3	4.0
Armenia	94	3	92	0.7	3.7	0.1	3.5	18.4	...	3.2	...
Austria	374	...	374	0.2	13.6	0.5	2.4	21.9	3.3	7.0	13.8
Azerbaijan	138	11	123	2.8	...	0.2	2.7	16.3	...	8.0	21.1
Belgium	1614	...	1614	0.1	...	0.2	1.1	4.7	...	1.3	3.3
Bosnia-Herzegovina	509	...	509
Bulgaria	386	29	275	0.7	3.5	0.4	3.6	31.5	...	2.8	7.9
Croatia	308	7	286	0.6	5.7	0.8	2.7	25.6	11.4	7.4	5.7
Cyprus	2696	100
Czech Republic	622	24	470	0.2	5.7	0.3	2.0	28.2	...	6.5	5.5
Denmark	1252	7	1163	0.1	7.1	0.2	0.4	25.5	2.2	2.0	21.9
Estonia	561	42	323	0.8	30.2	1.1	3.9	32.5	...	5.3	13.5
Finland	3321	58	1391	0.2	11.0	0.2	0.8	39.2	...	6.0	12.4
France	864	36	552	0.1	15.8	0.3	0.9	24.9	...	2.3	17.2
Georgia	406	5	386	1.2	11.7	0.1	2.7	20.9	...	3.2	28.6
Germany	911	20	725	0.1	10.2	0.1	1.2	22.5	2.1	15.1	9.5
Hungary	728	19	587	0.3	14.1	0.3	2.2	29.2	5.4	7.0	2.2
Iceland
Italy	363	0	362	0.4	5.2	0.7	3.3	15.6	...	2.4	10.0
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	938	...	938	0.0
Latvia	481	2	471	0.6	4.1	0.2	3.9	38.2	12.0
Lithuania	636	2	625	0.7	27.5	1.1	4.6	22.0	...	7.1	10.0
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	546	18	447	0.8	15.2	0.1	3.0	33.5	...	1.2	8.0
North Macedonia	5026	77	1169	10.6	29.6
Norway	684	23	527	0.3	12.8	0.4	2.6	19.7	6.7	12.7	8.2
Poland	595	33	398	0.6	15.6	0.2	5.5	13.5	0.5	2.8	9.6
Portugal
Romania	510	...	510
Russian Federation	494	7	457	0.4	5.7	0.2	2.6	30.4	...	2.3	9.5
Serbia	548	...	548
Slovak Republic	399	3	386	0.1	6.5	0.3	1.8	24.5	8.6	9.5	8.4
Slovenia	480	40	287	0.5	27.8	...	6.1	16.0	...	5.2	...
Spain	1095	21	867	0.2	7.5	0.3	0.8	25.3	...	1.4	26.7
Sweden	1505	50	753	0.2	5.1	0.2	1.2	20.7	...	5.3	32.8
Switzerland	515	...	515	0.3	6.0	0.2	0.9	27.1	...	2.9	...
Turkey	1971	2	1924	1.0	13.7	...	1.4	11.7	...	4.3	6.4
Ukraine	222	5	210	0.9	8.3	0.1	5.3	45.8	15.4	2.8	12.6
UK: England & Wales	2158	0	2150	0.1	2.4	0.1	0.4	8.3	1.2	1.0	3.8
UK: Northern Ireland	1317	...	1317	...	14.6	...	0.3	9.2	1.8	0.7	7.9
UK: Scotland	1984	...	1984	...	12.7	0.1	0.4	11.8	0.9	0.6	6.4
Mean	995	22	710	0.6	10.9	0.3	2.4	21.7	5.0	4.5	12.3
Median	578	18	515	0.4	9.3	0.2	2.3	22.0	2.8	3.2	9.5
Minimum	94	0	92	0.1	2.4	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.6	2.2
Maximum	5026	100	2150	2.8	30.2	1.1	6.1	45.8	15.4	15.1	32.8

3.2 Tables

3.2.1 Total number of convictions per 100 000 population

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

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	312	299	296	436	559	521	67
Armenia	121	114	120	101	94	84	-30
Austria	435	423	407	388	374	350	-20
Azerbaijan	148	140	139	141	138	142	-4
Belgium	2002	1974	1907	1529	1614	2184	9
Bosnia-Herzegovina							
Bulgaria	409	465	537	530	509	490	20
Croatia	557	519	468	440	386	396	-29
Cyprus	567	500	406	367	308	330	-42
Czech Republic	10338	8300	7024	8008	6387	5343	-48
Denmark	669	680	741	693	622	582	-13
Estonia	1195	1236	1151	1024	1252	1351	13
Finland	769	727	644	585	561	582	-24
France	3776	3537	3367	3175	3321	2899	-23
Georgia	930	935	913	874	864	874	-6
Germany	406	243	375	374	406	420	3
Greece	1007	963	939	927	911	898	-11
Hungary
Iceland	852	758	733	773	728	729	-15
Italy
Italy	448	438	414	373	363	346	-23
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)							
Latvia	1024	1163	868	1006	938	1047	2
Lithuania	443	438	427	460	481	453	2
Luxembourg	574	655	691	721	636	563	-2
Moldova	1463	...
Montenegro
Netherlands	589	555	553	534	546	489	-17
North Macedonia	512	466	485	588	515	417	-19
Norway	5652	5611	5430	5250	5026	4973	-12
Poland	1113	1072	928	773	684	763	-31
Portugal	763	785	711	532	597	570	-25
Romania	169	...
Russian Federation							
Serbia	548	517	513	501	510	513	-6
Slovak Republic	456	466	486	523	494	488	7
Slovenia	558	649	667	621	548	501	-10
Spain	389	429	571	472	399	339	-13
Sweden	587	588	589	598	622	786	34.0
Switzerland	1448	1372	1221	1140	1095	999	-31
Turkey	1417	1528	1551	1543	1505	1481	4
Ukraine	1683	2027	2123	1899	1971	1816	8
UK: England & Wales	339	358	271	226	222	179	-47
UK: Northern Ireland							
UK: Scotland	2339	2177	2071	2121	2158	2124	-9
UK: Northern Ireland	1832	1725	1576	1446	1317	1269	-31
UK: Scotland	2181	2040	1896	1976	1984	1849	-15
Mean	1300	1233	1163	1149	1096	1044	
Median	629	668	679	609	608	575	
Minimum	121	114	120	101	94	84	
Maximum	10338	8300	7024	8008	6387	5343	

Table 3.2.1.2 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Major road traffic offences

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	26	23	25	10	10	99	283
Armenia	3	4	4	4	3	4	23
Austria
Azerbaijan	15	16	19	16	15	12	-21
Belgium	1428	1570
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	144	127	113	108	111	130	-10
Croatia	38	35	30	25	22	24	-37
Cyprus	6190	4460	3840	4204	2696	2410	-61
Czech Republic	162	155	161	159	152	140	-14
Denmark	147	149	125	107	89	77	-47
Estonia	254	245	234	221	238	242	-5
Finland	2222	2068	1961	1858	1930	1682	-24
France	368	349	335	319	313	315	-14
Georgia	18	14	15	17	20	17	-5
Germany	215	208	198	194	186	188	-13
Hungary	155	146	102	134	141	159	3
Iceland
Italy	2	2	2	2	2	2	7
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	9	9	8	10	10	10	16
Lithuania	13	12	12	11	12	10	-27
Luxembourg
Moldova	45	55	61	78	90	76	69
Montenegro
Netherlands	92	91	97	89	98	69	-25
North Macedonia
Norway	4392	4376	4174	4063	3857	3840	-13
Poland	365	350	264	190	157	168	-54
Portugal	324	307	251	171	197	186	-43
Romania	56	...
Russian Federation
Serbia	52	47	50	49	37	31	-40
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	15	15	20	16	13	17	13
Spain	247	227	217	208	193	187	-24
Sweden	303	282	250	234	229	211	-31
Switzerland	723	745	733	768	752	737	2
Turkey	7	10	16	34	47	48	549
Ukraine	12	14	13	13	12	10	-21
UK: England & Wales	8	7	7	7	8	9	12
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	580	520	445	444	388	360	
<i>Median</i>	144	127	100	98	94	77	
<i>Minimum</i>	2	2	2	2	2	2	
<i>Maximum</i>	6190	4460	4174	4204	3857	3840	

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

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	7.3	6.6	5.2	6.2	5.9	4.8	-34
Armenia	1.7	1.5	1.3	1.3	0.6	0.8	-53
Austria	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.9	0.7	0.7	-4
Azerbaijan	2.8	3.2	3.7	3.0	3.5	3.0	10
Belgium	2.3	2.7	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.2	-4
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	2.0	1.9	1.5	1.5	1.8	1.4	-30
Croatia	3.5	2.5	2.9	2.7	1.8	1.8	-50
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.1	0.9	-25
Denmark	1.1	1.2	1.3	0.9	1.2	1.0	-6
Estonia	3.0	4.5	5.2	2.4	2.7	2.7	-9
Finland	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.6	2.6	2.7	-25
France	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	9
Georgia	4.5	5.5	4.7	3.6	4.5	6.4	42
Germany	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	-12
Hungary	2.0	2.6	2.7	2.2	1.9	2.1	3
Iceland
Italy	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.8	10
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	3.1	4.1	3.1	3.7	2.7	2.8	-8
Lithuania	7.1	6.3	5.8	6.7	4.5	5.0	-29
Luxembourg	9.5	...
Moldova	4.9	4.5	3.9	4.1	3.4	4.2	-15
Montenegro
Netherlands	5.5	4.9	4.7	3.9	3.6	3.2	-41
North Macedonia	1.7	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	-21
Norway
Poland	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.4	1.5	1.4	-22
Portugal	2.9	3.1	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.1	-28
Romania	4.6	...
Russian Federation
Serbia	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.8	1.9	2.5	-10
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.3	-1
Spain	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.4	...
Sweden	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.7	20
Switzerland	1.1	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5	31
Turkey	20.6	23.8	27.6	18.9	19.7	21.1	2
Ukraine	3.1	3.3	2.9	2.0	1.9	1.5	-50
UK: England & Wales	2.7	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.6	-2
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	3.3	3.4	3.3	2.9	2.7	3.1	
<i>Median</i>	2.5	2.6	2.4	2.1	1.9	2.1	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.3	
<i>Maximum</i>	20.6	23.8	27.6	18.9	19.7	21.1	

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

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia	1.2	0.6	-53
Austria	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4	6
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.1	-26
Croatia	1.3	1.2	1.6	1.2	0.8	0.7	-48
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.4	-36
Estonia
Finland	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.0	-35
France	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	-10
Georgia	4.5	5.5	4.7	3.6	4.5	6.4	42
Germany	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	-4
Hungary	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.2	9
Iceland
Italy	0.8	0.8	0.9	1.0	0.8	1.0	34
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg	0.3	...
Moldova	4.9	4.5	3.9	4.1	3.4	4.2	-15
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	1.5	1.4	1.1	1.1	-24
Portugal	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.1	0.9	-33
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.9	1.7	1.7	2.0	1.3	1.5	-22
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.3	-1
Spain	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.5	...
Sweden
Switzerland	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.5	21
Turkey
Ukraine	0.0
UK: England & Wales	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5	-19
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	2.2	2.1	2.2	1.7	1.5	1.6	-30
<i>Mean</i>	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.2	
<i>Median</i>	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.7	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	
<i>Maximum</i>	4.9	5.5	4.7	4.1	4.5	6.4	

Table 3.2.1.5 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Bodily injury

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	18	18	13	11	15	13	-30
Armenia	6	4	5	4	3	4	-26
Austria	67	66	60	55	51	49	-27
Azerbaijan
Belgium	59	55	53	52
Bosnia-Herze- govina
Bulgaria	14	13	10	11	10	10	-23
Croatia	22	20	21	19	16	18	-19
Cyprus
Czech Republic	26	30	31	28	27	28	10
Denmark	114	109	94	83	83	83	-27
Estonia	121	114	105	93	98	110	-10
Finland	199	209	193	169	153	142	-29
France	88	93	90	86	87	88	0
Georgia	35	23	16	30	45	16	-55
Germany	96	91	86	79	74	74	-23
Hungary	52	48	84	89	83	77	47
Iceland
Italy	23	21	21	18	19	20	-14
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	17	15	19	19	19	17	3
Lithuania	52	127	164	174	172	170	227
Luxembourg	802	...
Moldova	8	6	6	6	5	5	-41
Montenegro
Netherlands	78	74	71	68	68	62	-21
North Macedonia	37	34	36	36	31	31	-18
Norway
Poland	88	84	79	72	67	71	-20
Portugal	68	70	70	57	62	61	-11
Romania	13	...
Russian Federa- tion
Serbia	28	28	29	31	26	24	-15
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	32	28	35	27	25	20	-36
Spain	72	72	73	72	80	119	65
Sweden	100	87	79	66	65	57	-43
Switzerland	44	45	44	42	39	38	-13
Turkey	133	168	218	217	263	240	81
Ukraine	17
UK: England & Wales	55	47	43	47	51	50	-8
UK: Northern Ire- land	...	223	212	185	192	182	...
UK: Scotland	286	305	259	243	252	260	-9
<i>Mean</i>	68	75	75	71	71	92	
<i>Median</i>	53	55	60	55	51	54	
<i>Minimum</i>	6	4	5	4	3	4	
<i>Maximum</i>	286	305	259	243	263	802	

Table 3.2.1.6 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Aggravated bodily injury

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	3.4	4.2	3.2	3.2	2.5	2.3	-34
Armenia	3.4	2.9	4.0	3.6	2.9	2.6	-22
Austria	14.0	15.8	14.6	12.2	12.0	11.2	-20
Azerbaijan	2.5	2.9	3.1	4.7	3.1	3.1	23
Belgium	33.9	31.6	32.1	33.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.4	...
Croatia	13.2	13.5	12.9	10.6	8.8	10.5	-20
Cyprus
Czech Republic	4.6	4.9	4.8	3.9	4.2	4.6	1
Denmark	17.7	16.7	15.4	12.0	12.0	12.5	-29
Estonia	4.9	6.7	4.0	4.2	3.0	4.9	1
Finland	12.2	11.6	10.6	9.4	9.9	8.9	-27
France	13.7	13.5	13.2	12.3	12.7	12.5	-9
Georgia	2.0	1.5	5.2	6.0	6.1	4.0	102
Germany	35.3	32.0	28.4	25.1	23.4	22.9	-35
Hungary	39.3	36.4	46.0	49.7	45.2	41.1	5
Iceland
Italy	12.7	12.3	12.2	11.0	11.9	12.8	1
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	7.9	7.0	7.9	7.7	8.3	7.2	-8
Lithuania	8.1	6.3	7.4	8.0	6.3	6.5	-19
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro	18.4	27.7	28.8	25.4	25.2	25.1	36
Netherlands	11.3	10.4	9.4	8.5	7.3	6.5	-43
North Macedonia	11.4	8.4	9.2	10.2	8.2	7.0	-38
Norway
Poland	2.7	2.6	2.5	1.8	2.2	2.3	-15
Portugal	9.6	12.2	11.2	9.4	9.6	10.2	6
Romania	1.6	...
Russian Federation
Serbia	11.1	11.5	12.0	12.4	10.8	10.6	-4
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	7.1	5.7	8.1	5.4	5.7	5.0	-29
Spain
Sweden	7.9	7.3	6.1	6.1	6.2	5.8	-28
Switzerland	9.5	9.9	9.8	9.5	9.3	10.1	6
Turkey	1.8	2.2	2.3	1.8	2.2	2.0	13
Ukraine	6.6	6.1	5.7	3.9	3.6	3.0	-54
UK: England & Wales	11.3	10.2	9.1	9.2	9.3	8.5	-25
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	26.8	25.7	24.1	19.5	19.5	20.6	-23
<i>Mean</i>	12.1	12.0	12.1	11.3	10.0	9.2	
<i>Median</i>	10.3	10.1	9.3	9.3	8.3	7.0	
<i>Minimum</i>	1.8	1.5	2.3	1.8	2.2	0.4	
<i>Maximum</i>	39.3	36.4	46.0	49.7	45.2	41.1	

Table 3.2.1.7 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Sexual assault

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.1
Armenia	0.9	1.9	118
Austria	4.9	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4	-9
Azerbaijan
Belgium	7.1	6.5	6.1	5.6	5.8	5.3	-25
Bosnia-Herze- govina
Bulgaria	2.9	3.2	3.2	2.6	1.8	2.3	-22
Croatia	5.1	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.0	4.6	-11
Cyprus
Czech Republic	4.7	5.0	5.2	5.0	4.9	5.6	20
Denmark	5.5	6.0	5.8	5.0	5.6	5.9	7
Estonia	3.5	3.5	4.3	3.8	5.4	4.0	14
Finland	9.4	10.2	9.0	10.0	9.6	10.2	9
France	15.2	15.7	14.7	13.3	13.5	13.3	-12
Georgia	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.4	3.7	1.9	53
Germany	4.4	4.3	4.0	3.7	3.5	3.4	-24
Hungary	1.9	2.2	2.0	2.3	3.9	2.8	50
Iceland
Italy	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.3	3.4	3.2	-16
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	10.5	8.7	6.4	7.7	9.0	7.2	-32
Luxembourg	8.5	...
Moldova	5.4	4.5	5.3	4.4	5.8	5.2	-4
Montenegro
Netherlands	6.1	6.0	6.3	6.0	6.0	5.1	-18
North Macedonia	2.6	2.3	3.1	2.4	2.7	1.9	-28
Norway	18.3	16.8	17.7	15.1	15.5	16.6	-9
Poland	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.8	-2
Portugal	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.4	4.7	4.5	29
Romania	3.0	...
Russian Federa- tion
Serbia	2.5	2.7	3.1	3.4	2.0	2.4	-2
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	4.2	4.6	6.3	4.4	4.2	3.6	-14
Spain	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.1	0.9	-30.1
Sweden	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.5	4.1	4.1	-18
Switzerland	7.3	7.6	8.3	8.1	8.1	7.6	5
Turkey	12.4	20.4	26.3	25.4	25.9	23.4	88
Ukraine	0.7	0.4	0.4	...
UK: England & Wales	10.6	10.1	9.9	10.9	11.9	12.9	21
UK: Northern Ire- land	...	12.0	10.8	10.1	8.8	9.6	...
UK: Scotland	14.3	14.8	16.2	19.8	21.4	21.4	50
<i>Mean</i>	6.0	6.5	6.8	6.3	6.6	6.4	
<i>Median</i>	4.8	4.6	5.1	4.4	4.7	4.5	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.4	
<i>Maximum</i>	18.3	20.4	26.3	25.4	25.9	23.4	

Table 3.2.1.8 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Rape

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.2	-18
Austria	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	-6
Azerbaijan	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	63
Belgium	4.3	3.8	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.0	-30
Bosnia-Herze- govina
Bulgaria	1.2	1.6	1.8	1.4	1.0	1.1	-3
Croatia	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.7	2.3	2.3	-7
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.6	1.6	2.2	29
Denmark	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.0	2.2	2.4	0
Estonia	1.4	2.2	2.5	1.7	3.6	2.5	75
Finland	2.4	3.5	2.7	2.7	3.0	3.8	56
France	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.5	-21
Georgia	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.9	63
Germany	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6	-31
Hungary	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.3	1.7	2.2	184
Iceland
Italy	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.4	2.6	2.4	-17
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	1.0	1.1	0.8	1.6	0.8	0.8	-16
Lithuania	8.7	6.8	4.9	5.8	7.1	5.3	-39
Luxembourg	2.6	...
Moldova	4.4	3.3	3.7	3.1	4.2	3.7	-15
Montenegro	0.8	1.5	2.6	1.1	0.3	1.3	59
Netherlands	0.8	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6	-19
North Macedonia	0.9	0.6	1.0	0.7	1.2	0.7	-23
Norway
Poland	2.1	2.1	2.1	1.8	1.9	1.8	-10
Portugal	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.9	1.0	20
Romania	1.8	...
Russian Federa- tion
Serbia	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.2	0.8	0.8	-13
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	0.7	1.0	1.2	0.6	1.0	0.5	-29
Spain
Sweden	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.9	-17
Switzerland	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.5	28
Turkey
Ukraine	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.2	-72
UK: England & Wales	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.2	2.3	15
UK: Northern Ire- land
UK: Scotland	0.7	0.9	1.4	1.7	2.3	1.9	183
<i>Mean</i>	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.8	...
<i>Median</i>	1.2	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.7	...
<i>Minimum</i>	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	...
<i>Maximum</i>	8.7	6.8	4.9	5.8	7.1	5.3	...

Table 3.2.1.9 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Sexual abuse of a child

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania
Armenia
Austria	1.8	1.5	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.6	-11
Azerbaijan
Belgium	4.1	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.2	2.8	-32
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.9	...
Croatia	1.8	1.4	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.6	-67
Cyprus
Czech Republic	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.3	13
Denmark	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.3	44
Estonia	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.6	1.4	0.7	-30
Finland	5.1	5.4	5.4	6.1	5.5	4.7	-8
France	5.1	5.1	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.6	-9
Georgia
Germany	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.8	1.7	-24
Hungary	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.2	1.5	2.1	148
Iceland
Italy	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	-13
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.6	16
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro	0.2	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.5	0.5	199
Netherlands	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.3	122
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.9	7
Portugal	2.2	2.7	2.9	2.2	3.3	3.0	32
Romania	1.1	...
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.3	0.3	-29
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	2.4	2.2	3.4	2.1	1.8	2.5	3
Spain	...	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.7	...
Sweden	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	-29
Switzerland	4.3	4.6	5.0	4.7	5.4	4.7	8
Turkey
Ukraine	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	-49
UK: England & Wales	7.2	7.0	7.2	7.8	9.2	11.6	61
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.1	
<i>Median</i>	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.6	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	7.2	7.0	7.2	7.8	9.2	11.6	

Table 3.2.1.10 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Robbery: Total

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	4.2	5.1	5.3	5.8	6.5	3.6	-15
Armenia	4.3	3.2	3.7	2.9	3.3	2.6	-39
Austria	8.9	8.8	8.3	7.8	8.8	7.4	-17
Azerbaijan	3.4	2.8	2.6	3.3	3.4	4.6	35
Belgium	24.9	24.5	23.8	21.6	18.4	18.6	-25
Bosnia-Herze- govina
Bulgaria	18.0	16.0	13.2	11.7	9.8	9.3	-48
Croatia	10.0	9.8	9.6	9.9	7.6	6.9	-31
Cyprus
Czech Republic	12.9	13.2	13.2	10.5	9.6	8.6	-33
Denmark	7.0	6.9	6.7	4.8	4.7	4.2	-40
Estonia	20.5	21.7	14.7	12.8	12.5	13.3	-35
Finland	10.5	9.8	9.7	10.5	11.8	10.3	-2
France	...	7.4	6.4	5.5	5.2	5.0	...
Georgia	9.6	5.5	13.3	10.5	10.6	9.0	-7
Germany	12.0	11.3	10.7	9.8	9.0	8.4	-30
Hungary	15.4	12.9	13.3	14.1	12.9	11.0	-29
Iceland
Italy	14.0	13.9	13.6	12.5	12.0	13.0	-7
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	20.0	14.9	21.9	19.9	18.5	14.7	-26
Lithuania	39.7	34.9	26.5	31.2	28.5	22.7	-43
Luxembourg	10.9	...
Moldova	33.2	31.4	31.7	26.1	27.5	25.7	-23
Montenegro
Netherlands	18.2	19.6	18.0	15.4	13.5	12.2	-33
North Macedonia	6.6	5.9	5.8	6.8	4.8	2.9	-56
Norway
Poland	21.1	20.1	17.7	15.4	13.5	14.9	-29
Portugal	30.2	32.9	27.9	19.3	22.1	22.1	-27
Romania	7.8	...
Russian Federa- tion
Serbia	10.9	12.3	13.2	13.7	11.9	13.0	20
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	6.9	7.0	10.5	7.5	6.8	4.3	-38
Spain	19.6	18.8	17.6	17.0	...
Sweden	10.4	9.7	7.5	8.6	6.6	7.5	-28
Switzerland	9.5	10.7	12.8	10.3	9.0	7.9	-17
Turkey	25.8	26.1	33.3	23.6	27.7	31.0	20
Ukraine	21.1	21.2	16.2	11.7	11.2	9.7	-54
UK: England & Wales	16.6	14.7	11.9	9.7	8.2	7.0	-58
UK: Northern Ire- land	...	9.4	9.5	5.1	4.1	2.5	...
UK: Scotland	9.9	11.4	9.8	8.4	7.2	7.0	-29
<i>Mean</i>	15.2	14.2	14.0	12.3	11.7	10.8	
<i>Median</i>	12.4	11.8	13.2	10.5	9.8	9.0	
<i>Minimum</i>	3.4	2.8	2.6	2.9	3.3	2.5	
<i>Maximum</i>	39.7	34.9	33.3	31.2	28.5	31.0	

Table 3.2.1.11 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Theft

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	64	70	68	72	61	52	-19
Armenia	24	18	17	16	17	16	-34
Austria	87	90	92	87	82	72	-17
Azerbaijan	18	17	16	18	20	25	38
Belgium	81	85	86	80	76	72	-11
Bosnia-Herze- govina
Bulgaria	201	175	138	110	87	77	-62
Croatia	122	103	98	86	73	85	-31
Cyprus
Czech Republic	154	170	182	167	133	115	-25
Denmark	347	350	337	314	297	272	-22
Estonia	222	199	157	131	105	105	-53
Finland	616	560	539	491	545	429	-30
France	140	149	151	144	138	137	-2
Georgia	68	57	77	74	81	68	0
Germany	171	164	165	163	163	161	-5
Hungary	224	207	194	195	172	151	-32
Iceland
Italy	59	60	57	56	56	57	-3
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	0	0	0	0	0	0	...
Latvia	179	182	174	188	180	159	-11
Lithuania	196	183	179	190	138	112	-43
Luxembourg	116	...
Moldova	77	78	77	65	78	66	-15
Montenegro
Netherlands	150	145	153	153	150	146	-3
North Macedonia	139	137	154	133	139	90	-35
Norway	140	135	143	128	124	106	-24
Poland	167	174	153	123	104	113	-32
Portugal	62	70	65	49	54	48	-23
Romania	24	...
Russian Federa- tion
Serbia	80	98	118	133	139	138	74
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	84	96	135	115	95	77	-8
Spain	74	77	95	168	...
Sweden	274	262	228	222	220	198	-28
Switzerland	167	197	201	177	156	153	-8
Turkey	159	181	244	215	226	199	25
Ukraine	130	145	97	85	96	81	-38
UK: England & Wales	249	225	215	204	179	153	-39
UK: Northern Ire- land	...	144	135	130	122	104	...
UK: Scotland	295	278	249	235	233	214	-27
<i>Mean</i>	156	153	148	138	132	118	
<i>Median</i>	140	145	143	130	122	106	
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Maximum</i>	616	560	539	491	545	429	

Table 3.2.1.12 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Aggravated theft

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Armenia
Austria	49	53	55	51	48	38	-24
Azerbaijan
Belgium	39	39	40	38	35	33	-14
Bosnia-Herze- govina
Bulgaria	31	...
Croatia	70	58	52	48	35	39	-45
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark	60	53	46	38	34	33	-45
Estonia
Finland	11	12	10	10	8	9	-19
France
Georgia
Germany	32	32	32	30	29	31	-1
Hungary	224	207	194	195	172	151	-32
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova	36	38	37	32	37	31	-15
Montenegro	47	57	66	64	60	57	21
Netherlands	71	72	75	71	66	60	-16
North Macedonia	89	83	89	79	82	50	-45
Norway
Poland	51	52	45	41	35	37	-28
Portugal	36	40	38	29	32	28	-22
Romania	15	...
Russian Federa- tion
Serbia	41	50	56	59	69	65	59
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland	9	10	13	13	12	11	23
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ire- land
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	54	53	53	50	47	40	
<i>Median</i>	44	51	46	40	35	33	
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Maximum</i>	224	207	194	195	172	151	

Table 3.2.1.13 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Theft of a motor vehicle

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Armenia	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	-35
Bulgaria	3.6	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.4	-33
Denmark	15.7	13.0	11.0	9.2	7.9	8.1	-48
Finland	9.2	9.1	7.0	6.4	5.9	6.1	-33
Hungary	5.2	4.9	4.8	5.3	5.0	5.2	0
North Macedonia	3.9	13.2	1.7	3.1	2.5	1.6	-58
Portugal	1.5	1.3	1.0	0.7	0.9	0.6	-57
Serbia	3.8	4.3	3.9	4.3	3.3	3.6	-6
Spain	5.6	5.7	5.2	5.0	4.4	4.2	-25
Sweden	5.9	4.8	3.7	3.5	3.2	2.5	-57
Ukraine	4.8	5.8	5.6	5.3	5.7	4.6	-3
UK: England & Wales	9.0	7.6	6.5	6.3	6.1	5.9	-35
UK: Scotland	9.1	8.5	7.0	5.1	6.0	5.5	-39
<i>Mean</i>	5.9	6.2	4.6	4.4	4.1	3.9	
<i>Median</i>	5.2	5.7	4.8	5.0	4.4	4.2	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	
<i>Maximum</i>	15.7	13.2	11.0	9.2	7.9	8.1	

Table 3.2.1.14 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Theft: Burglary

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Austria	15.3	15.1	13.7	13.7	12.5	14.1	-8
Croatia	65.4	53.5	48.0	44.7	32.7	35.8	-45
Denmark	43.8	39.9	35.4	29.2	25.7	24.5	-44
Germany	18.5	17.9	17.2	16.1	14.9	15.0	-19
Hungary	34.8	36.5	31.7	28.9	...
Poland	51.4	51.6	45.5	41.1	35.3	36.8	-28
Portugal	3.1	3.2	2.7	1.7	2.1	1.8	-44
Slovenia	29.3	31.0	52.6	38.1	33.4	24.6	-16
Ukraine	55.8	54.7	33.1	27.6	32.3	27.0	-52
UK: England & Wales	45.3	39.6	34.9	31.3	26.8	23.3	-49
UK: Northern Ireland	...	33.9	28.5	24.3	23.1	19.7	...
UK: Scotland	29.1	28.2	25.6	19.4	18.3	15.8	-46
<i>Mean</i>	35.7	33.5	31.0	27.0	24.1	22.3	
<i>Median</i>	36.6	33.9	34.0	28.4	26.2	23.9	
<i>Minimum</i>	3.1	3.2	2.7	1.7	2.1	1.8	
<i>Maximum</i>	65.4	54.7	52.6	44.7	35.3	36.8	

Table 3.2.1.15 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Theft: Domestic burglary

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Denmark	21.6	21.9	19.1	15.2	12.9	13.6	-37
Germany	3.1	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.6	14
Hungary	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.0	...
Portugal	1.4	1.6	1.3	0.9	1.3	1.0	-27
UK: England & Wales	25.9	23.1	20.5	18.0	15.0	12.4	-52

Table 3.2.1.16 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Fraud

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	13	14	6	7	7	6	-55
Armenia	5	4	5	4	3	3	-34
Austria	31	29	29	30	26	26	-15
Azerbaijan	5	7	7	10	10	14	189
Belgium	22	23	21	200	21	20	-5
Bosnia-Herze- govina
Bulgaria	9	9	8	7	8	10	5
Croatia	34	35	32	25	21	22	-36
Cyprus
Czech Republic	29	29	37	34	31	30	5
Denmark	18	21	22	20	23	27	49
Estonia	27	30	26	26	17	24	-13
Finland	80	80	76	79	84	78	-3
France	13	16	15	13	12	12	-11
Georgia	7	8	7	7	12	26	274
Germany	124	111	109	111	110	108	-12
Hungary	58	46	44	44	41	36	-39
Iceland
Italy	11	9	9	7	9	10	-17
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	39	37	45	53	44	41	5
Luxembourg	77	...
Moldova	12	11	13	13	18	15	23
Montenegro
Netherlands	6	5	5	5	5	4	-31
North Macedonia	15	13	16	16	15	11	-25
Norway
Poland	88	81	74	68	67	74	-16
Portugal	8	10	11	10	11	11	26
Romania	5	...
Russian Federa- tion
Serbia	8	8	10	10	10	11	33
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	32	34	53	46	37	26	-17
Spain	17	20	22	38	...
Sweden	19	17	15	13	12	11	-43
Switzerland	33	36	40	38	40	39	17
Turkey	54	66	112	77	83	89	64
Ukraine	8	9	8	7	6	5	-45
UK: England & Wales	27	22	22	24	22	18	-32
UK: Northern Ire- land	...	16	15	11	10	9	...
UK: Scotland	20	15	12	13	11	10	-50
<i>Mean</i>	29	28	29	33	26	28	
<i>Median</i>	20	17	17	18	17	19	
<i>Minimum</i>	5	4	5	4	3	3	
<i>Maximum</i>	124	111	112	200	110	108	

Table 3.2.1.17 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Cyber fraud

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Denmark	2.0	2.3	2.7	2.6	5.0	8.1	309
Hungary	1.2	3.2	3.7	4.4	...
Luxembourg	77.4	...
Montenegro	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.3	1.8	0.0	...
Portugal	1.3	1.5	2.1	1.5	1.9	1.8	35
Romania	0.0	...
Serbia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
Switzerland	9.3	10.0	9.6	8.6	8.7	8.2	-12
North Macedonia	0.1
<i>Mean</i>	2.5	2.8	2.3	2.7	3.5	12.5	
<i>Median</i>	1.3	1.5	1.2	2.1	2.8	3.1	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	9.3	10.0	9.6	8.6	8.7	77.4	

Table 3.2.1.18 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Forgery of documents

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	15.7	19.5	16.5	11.9	14.3	16.0	2
Armenia
Austria	9.3	9.1	8.7	9.0	9.6	10.9	17
Azerbaijan
Belgium	17.3	18.7	16.1	15.3	14.7	14.7	-15
Bosnia-Herze- govina
Bulgaria
Croatia	32.4	27.2	24.5	22.2	18.4	17.9	-45
Cyprus
Czech Republic	3.2	3.3	2.6	2.9	3.1	6.2	96
Denmark	12.0	12.4	13.2	9.2	10.2	10.2	-15
Estonia	9.1	7.8	6.7	8.7	6.9	9.7	6
Finland	25.1	20.1	20.0	16.4	14.2	11.0	-56
France	6.2	7.5	7.3	7.0	7.0	6.7	7
Georgia	4.0	4.4	6.3	5.2	3.1	5.4	36
Germany	21.4	21.1	20.5	20.2	19.2	19.6	-8
Hungary	57.7	58.5	76.8	70.7	63.4	57.1	-1
Iceland
Italy	17.6	17.2	15.7	14.1	15.3	13.9	-21
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	28.0	32.0	31.9	31.4	29.3	26.4	-6
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro	26.3	27.6	24.5	20.4	17.4	16.6	-37
Netherlands	13.4	12.2	10.1	9.0	9.4	9.1	-32
North Macedonia	21.7	16.7	12.8	11.7	10.0	10.1	-54
Norway
Poland	20.3	19.8	18.3	16.7	15.7	19.6	-3
Portugal	10.0	9.7	9.8	7.3	7.7	6.0	-40
Romania	1.3	...
Russian Federa- tion
Serbia	26.6	25.0	21.1	21.6	15.3	12.5	-53
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	12.4	13.9	13.7	15.1	15.3	16.3	31
Sweden	8.5	7.6	7.1	7.8	7.4	6.2	-27
Switzerland	42.5	43.7	50.7	47.9	49.8	46.0	8
Turkey	31.7	38.7	52.2	38.1	36.9	38.5	21
Ukraine	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.1	2.3	1.5	-55
UK: England & Wales	3.7	3.3	3.2	2.5	2.1	1.9	-47
UK: Northern Ire- land
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	18.4	18.5	19.0	17.1	16.1	15.2	
<i>Median</i>	16.5	17.0	14.7	13.0	14.3	11.0	
<i>Minimum</i>	3.2	3.3	2.6	2.5	2.1	1.3	
<i>Maximum</i>	57.7	58.5	76.8	70.7	63.4	57.1	

Table 3.2.1.19 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Money laundering

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	0.9	0.9	0.8	1.8	1.9	1.2	38
Armenia	0.0	0.0	-100
Austria	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.3	285
Azerbaijan
Belgium	2.4	2.0	2.3	2.9	4.2	5.2	120
Bosnia-Herze- govina
Bulgaria	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	46
Croatia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	...
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.6	160
Denmark
Estonia	4.7	3.4	2.0	3.3	2.8	2.6	-45
Finland	0.7	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.8	2.6	248
France
Georgia
Germany	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	-8
Hungary	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	81
Iceland
Italy	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.1	3.1	3.4	-13
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.6	69
Luxembourg
Moldova	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	-24
Montenegro	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Netherlands	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.0	2
North Macedonia	0.3	0.4	1.0	1.3	0.7	0.2	-34
Norway
Poland	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	-26
Portugal	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	343
Romania	0.1	...
Russian Federa- tion
Serbia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	276
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.6	1.0	0.2	297
Spain	3.1	3.4	4.3	5.4	5.9	6.5	110
Sweden	1.1	1.0	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.5	45
Switzerland	2.6	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.8	4.3	66
Turkey	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	-36
Ukraine	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	-94
UK: England & Wales	2.7	2.5	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.5	-9
UK: Northern Ire- land
UK: Scotland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
<i>Mean</i>	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.3	1.3	
<i>Median</i>	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.3	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	4.7	3.7	4.3	5.4	5.9	6.5	

Table 3.2.1.20 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Corruption in the public sector

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	1.7	1.0	1.1	0.9	2.9	2.4	45
Armenia	1.1	1.4	27
Austria	1.1	0.9	1.5	2.2	1.5	0.7	-38
Azerbaijan	0.3	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.4	36
Belgium	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.1	-63
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.0	1.1	1.7	12
Croatia	6.0	7.9	5.7	11.8	5.1	3.4	-43
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.4	0.9	0.9	-9
Denmark	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	192
Estonia	3.0	2.7	4.7	4.2	2.3	2.2	-27
Finland	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	-51
France	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	23
Georgia	2.1	1.0	2.6	1.7	2.5	3.0	43
Germany	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	-42
Hungary	1.3	1.2	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.8	42
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	12.2	19.7	25.2	30.5	26.8	16.7	36
Luxembourg
Moldova	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.9	1.7	65
Montenegro
Netherlands	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	-51
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	7.0	6.0	5.8	5.3	4.6	4.7	-33
Portugal	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.6	-9
Romania	3.0	...
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.7	1.6	1.4	1.1	1.2	1.4	109
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	0.2	0.2	1.0	0.8	0.8	1.1	446
Spain
Sweden	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	-52
Switzerland	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.3	163
Turkey	0.8	1.8	2.0	1.5	1.1	1.4	71
Ukraine	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.0	0.9	0.6	-63
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
<i>Mean</i>	1.6	2.0	2.3	2.6	2.2	1.8	
<i>Median</i>	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	12.2	19.7	25.2	30.5	26.8	16.7	

Table 3.2.1.21 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Drug offences: Total

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	18	12	23	22	22	29	64
Armenia	15	10	-36
Austria	53	51	50	51	52	46	-14
Azerbaijan	25	23	23	25	26	25	1
Belgium	50	48	47	52	54	54	8
Bosnia-Herze- govina
Bulgaria	19	19	20	19	22	27	37
Croatia	22	19	20	22	16	18	-19
Cyprus
Czech Republic	18	20	24	25	26	27	53
Denmark	244	272	271	292	254	217	-11
Estonia	37	36	39	46	44	54	48
Finland	155	145	156	151	173	162	4
France	77	81	86	90	95	98	28
Georgia	57	27	164	148	110	56	-2
Germany	69	67	66	69	69	70	1
Hungary	23	24	22	17	13	10	-56
Iceland
Italy	53	52	46	39	36	37	-29
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	47	49	43	42	57	61	31
Lithuania	47	48	48	57	62	53	13
Luxembourg	37	...
Moldova	26	26	20	19	21	16	-38
Montenegro
Netherlands	37	35	37	35	36	35	-4
North Macedonia
Norway	335	322	366	342	346	321	-4
Poland	55	51	48	46	43	51	-7
Portugal	39	43	39	33	38	39	0
Romania	4	...
Russian Federa- tion
Serbia	51	45	42	43	43	47	-8
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	25	29	45	36	32	26	5
Spain
Sweden	239	256	234	236	232	218	-9
Switzerland	202	226	239	244	247	244	21
Turkey	154	181	234	193	123	120	-22
Ukraine	56	56	40	30	26	21	-62
UK: England & Wales	110	103	100	90	81	73	-33
UK: Northern Ire- land	...	91	102	93	104	101	...
UK: Scotland	142	132	121	126	128	132	-7
<i>Mean</i>	81	83	91	88	85	75	
<i>Median</i>	51	49	47	46	52	49	
<i>Minimum</i>	15	12	20	17	13	4	
<i>Maximum</i>	335	322	366	342	346	321	

Table 3.2.1.22 Persons convicted per 100 000 population – Drug trafficking

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	2.5	2.5	6.9	4.6	4.6	3.6	44
Armenia	4.2	3.4	3.7	2.2	1.5	1.4	-68
Austria	12.3	14.7	13.7	13.6	14.8	15.4	26
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herze- govina
Bulgaria
Croatia	22.1	18.8	19.6	22.3	16.4	17.9	-19
Cyprus
Czech Republic	14.3	15.5	18.7	18.6	19.9	21.2	48
Denmark	34.2	35.3	36.8	32.5	31.9	28.6	-16
Estonia	36.6	36.4	38.7	46.1	43.5	54.1	48
Finland	66.4	64.0	67.2	68.5	65.1	64.2	-3
France	32.0	42.7	45.3	46.7	49.3	51.1	60
Georgia	0.6	0.3	1.3	2.9	3.2	0.4	-31
Germany	11.2	11.3	10.5	10.7	10.9	11.2	0
Hungary	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.0	...
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	15.2	15.1	14.0	17.8	18.4	16.2	6
Luxembourg	30.9	...
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	5.3	5.6	5.2	4.7	4.7	5.5	3
Portugal	31	35	31.3	27.1	29.4	27.8	-10
Romania	3.9	...
Russian Federa- tion
Serbia	28.9	22.8	19.0	17.1	12.6	14.5	-50
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	21.8	25.8	42.5	34.2	30.4	24.8	14
Spain
Sweden	11.3	16.5	16.8	13.6	25.8	23.8	110
Switzerland	70.6	83.3	89.4	94.0	99.4	94.4	34
Turkey	47.9	59.9	79.5	65.6	69.3	66.9	40
Ukraine	11.4	10.4	7.4	5.0	3.7	1.7	-85
UK: England & Wales	1.2	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.7	-38
UK: Northern Ire- land
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	22.9	24.8	26.0	25.1	25.4	24.3	
<i>Median</i>	15.2	16.5	17.7	17.4	17.4	17.1	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.6	0.3	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.4	
<i>Maximum</i>	70.6	83.3	89.4	94.0	99.4	94.4	

Notes on tables 3.2.1.1 to 3.2.1.22

Belgium	Reliable data are not (yet) available for traffic offences 2013-2016 and (aggravated) assault 2015-2016.
Bulgaria	Cyber fraud is not monitored as a separate item but is included in the total figure of fraud. For some crimes the number of convicted persons is higher than the number of suspects. This might be due to the duration of criminal proceedings, which usually exceeds one calendar year.
Czech Republic	Due to requalification of offences, the 2011 figures for intentional homicide, sexual assault total, rape and drug offences total are different from the fifth edition.
Denmark	Police tickets are included. Regarding appeal: If an appeal case is settled within the same year as the first conviction, the data refers to the appeal case. In other cases, the data refers to the first conviction. Drug offences include both some according to the penal code and some according to a special law on (less severe) drug offences. Part of the increase in both fraud and cyber fraud is caused by changes in the police registration practice in these types of cases. Cyber fraud includes violations of § 279a in the Penal Code exclusively, as this is currently the best approximation available of cyber fraud in a Danish context. As a result, some types of cyber fraud are not encompassed by the definition, and the definition may encompass offences, which are not 'cyber' fraud per se.
Estonia	All offence types within the same conviction are counted separately, but each offence type is counted only once, regardless of the number of offences. Accordingly, the total of convictions for different offence types exceeds the total number of persons convicted.
Finland	For sexual assault (total), those are exploitation of a person object to sex trade, buying sexual services from a minor, crimes related to child pornography, grooming and pimping. For robbery, extortion is also included. For fraud, incurrence and payment instrument frauds are also included For forgery of documents, forgery of money is also included.
Georgia	Assault excludes violence in family
Hungary	From 2013 on, the principal offence rule is not applied in recording convicted persons; therefore, data of 2011-2012 are not completely comparable with those of 2013-2016, according to the National Office for the Judiciary.
Lithuania	In 2011, sexual abuse of a child refers to two crimes: sexual abuse of a child who is under 14 years of age and satisfaction of sexual desires in violation of a minor's sexual self-determination, and(or) t integrity).
Netherlands	Statistics Netherlands stopped providing Prosecution and Court statistics. Therefore, figures starting in 2010 are slightly different from the years before that
Poland	Numbers do not include minors convicted in juvenile criminal proceedings. Minors in this tables are only those who committed an offence as a minor (under 17 years old) but were sentenced when they were 17, 18 or more years old.
Portugal	There was a change in the method of collection of statistics of the courts in 2007 and since then it became possible to determine the number of convicted of some crimes more detailed.
Serbia	Sexual abuse of a child includes the following criminal offences: sexual Intercourse with a child and sexual intercourse through abuse of position.
Spain	Theft of a motor vehicle includes the criminal offence unauthorised use of another's vehicle. For Total Criminal Offences the counting unit is the person convicted. A person convicted two or more times in the same year is counted only once in the total. For all the other categories, the counting unit is the main offence for which a person was convicted
Sweden	Convictions for offences listed include attempts, preparation, and conspiracy to commit an offence. Fraud: Data previously reported for the period 2007-2011 includes receiving/handling a stolen property. Data in this edition excludes this offence. Money laundering: In 2012, a new article concerning financing of bribery offences was added and data for persons convicted for this article is included. As of 2014, there is also a new law regarding money laundering, and data includes convictions accordingly. Drug trafficking: As of 2015, it is possible to distinguish drug trafficking from total drug offences to a larger extent than previously.

Turkey	Statistics do not refer to the number of persons, but to the total numbers of sanctions rendered by the court. So, if 1 person got 2 different sanction for the same crime (for example a fine and a suspended sentence), those would be counted as 2. Homicide does not include injury leading to death, aggravated assault includes injury leading to death Sexual assault includes "sex with a minor" which in Turkey is separate from "child sexual abuse", and refers to cases where victim is age 15-18, and no violence was used. Non-Penal code convictions account to about 15% of all convictions.
UK: England & Wales	Sexual Assault refers to all sexual offences. The various types of Burglary are not subsets of Theft, but standalone categories.
UK: Scotland	Data provided is for financial years i.e., 2010=2010-11 Domestic burglary is not separately identifiable from other types of burglary.

3.2.2 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners among convicted persons in 2015

Table 3.2.2.1 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Criminal offences: Total

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	559	5.5	3.7
Armenia	94	7.7	2.8	1.9
Austria	374	14.2	5.0	40.0	38.6	...
Azerbaijan	138
Belgium	1614	18.3	0.1	23.2	60.8	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina	509	...	1.7
Bulgaria	386	8.4	4.5	11.7
Croatia	308	11.4	3.2	3.3	37.4	0.4
Cyprus	6387	20.0	0.6
Czech Republic	622	15.1	2.1	7.4	60.2	0.1
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	3321	20.8	4.8	11.8	47.3	0.0
France	864	10.1	7.8	13.7
Georgia	406	6.3	1.9	2.7
Germany	911	19.8	4.2	28.3	40.5	...
Hungary	728	11.8	6.4	4.0	41.8	...
Iceland
Italy	363	16.6	...	32.5	45.7	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	938	...	3.3	0.5
Latvia	481	11.8	4.3
Lithuania	636	9.6	6.1	0.1
Luxembourg	1498	20.8	6.5	60.4
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	546	12.6	5.3	0.8
North Macedonia
Norway	49.1	...
Poland	684	10.3	0.3	2.7
Portugal	597	12.2	1.8	10.4	20.0	4.1
Romania	168	...	2.8	0.0	...	0.2
Russian Federation	510	...	3.1	3.8
Serbia	494	9.2	5.5	2.1	50.1	...
Slovak Republic	548	...	4.4	2.6
Slovenia
Spain	673	13.6	7.7	17.6	31.1	...
Sweden	1095	17.3	8.2
Switzerland	1505	16.8	9.7	56.0	41.7	...
Turkey	1971	5.4	6.9	1.1	...	0.0
Ukraine	222	11.6	4.8	0.9
UK: England & Wales	2158	29.5	23.1	0.6
UK: Northern Ireland	1317	16.8	4.7	0.0
UK: Scotland	1860	16.9
<i>Mean</i>	1014	13.8	4.9	14.1	43.4	0.6
<i>Median</i>	622	12.6	4.5	5.7	41.8	0.2
<i>Minimum</i>	94	5.4	0.1	0.0	20.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	6387	29.5	23.1	60.4	60.8	4.1

Table 3.2.2.2 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Criminal offences: Major traffic offences

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	10	5.0	29.9
Armenia	3	1.2	1.2	2.4
Austria
Azerbaijan	15
Belgium
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	111	2.8	0.5	1.8
Croatia	22	17.3	0.3	2.6	29.2	0.0
Cyprus	2696	19.6
Czech Republic	152	9.5	0.2	7.0	64.3	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	1930	20.1	4.0	10.5	53.4	0.0
France	313	8.9	0.8	10.1
Georgia	20
Germany	186	16.1	1.2	24.0	55.9	...
Hungary	141	6.1	0.9	3.2	79.8	...
Iceland
Italy	2	14.7	0.1	27.1
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	10	14.7	1.0
Lithuania	12	15.5	0.3	0.0
Luxembourg
Moldova	90	1.1	0.3
Montenegro
Netherlands	98	8.9	1.0	0.0
North Macedonia
Norway	55.7	...
Poland	157	5.8	0.0	1.8
Portugal	197	5.4	0.5	12.0	18.9	...
Romania	56
Russian Federation
Serbia	37	6.5	1.1	1.9	58.8	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	195	9.1	1.1	21.5
Sweden	229	11.5	6.5
Switzerland	752	16.0	3.4	49.6	65.0	...
Turkey	47	1.8	0.6	0.0	...	0.0
Ukraine	12	3.1	10.3	0.8
UK: England & Wales	8	5.9	3.9	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	278	9.4	3.0	11.0	53.4	0.0
<i>Median</i>	90	8.9	1.0	5.1	55.9	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	2	1.1	0.0	0.0	18.9	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	2696	20.1	29.9	49.6	79.8	0.0

Table 3.2.2.3 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Intentional homicide: Total

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	5.9	2.9	0.6
Armenia	0.6	10.5	0.0	5.3
Austria	0.7	16.7	10.0	40.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium	2.3	10.1	0.0	28.8	43.2	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.8	4.5	7.6	3.8
Croatia	1.8	9.0	1.3	2.6	0.0	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.1	11.3	5.2	13.0	60.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	2.6	16.6	2.8	5.5	12.5	0.0
France	0.6	11.2	6.9	18.3
Georgia	3.6	8.1	5.9
Germany	0.7	10.5	5.7	34.4
Hungary	1.9	12.6	3.7	4.7	77.8	...
Iceland
Italy	1.6	5.1	2.4	28.6
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	0.0
Latvia	2.7	11.1	5.6
Lithuania	4.5	7.7	8.5	0.0
Luxembourg	9.8
Moldova	3.4	10.0	4.2
Montenegro
Netherlands	3.6	6.7	9.4	0.0
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	1.5	14.0	1.2	0.9
Portugal	2.3	7.2	...	11.4
Romania	4.5	...	8.6
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.9	9.8	7.5	2.3	33.3	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	1.6	8.0	...	27.8	21.8	...
Sweden	1.6	6.4	4.5
Switzerland	1.5	11.4	4.9	48.0	35.6	...
Turkey	19.7	2.6	4.6	0.6	...	0.0
Ukraine	1.9	12.5	2.9	2.2
UK: England & Wales	2.5	10.1	3.3	0.5
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	3.0	9.5	4.7	15.5	35.5	0.1
<i>Median</i>	1.9	10.0	4.6	8.5	34.5	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	19.7	16.7	10.0	48.0	77.8	0.5

Table 3.2.2.4 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Intentional homicide: Completed

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania
Armenia
Austria	0.3	16.0	8.0	36.0
Azerbaijan	3.5
Belgium
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.4	5.1	9.2	1.0
Croatia	0.8	3.1	0.0	0.0	...	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	1.0	14.5	3.6	0.0
France	0.2	13.8	8.5	16.9
Georgia	2.6	3.1	2.1
Germany	0.4
Hungary	1.0	10.6	2.1	7.4	71.4	...
Iceland
Italy	0.8	5.2	1.7	24.0
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg	0.4	50.0
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	1.1
Portugal	1.1	12.8	...	9.2
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.3	13.3	4.4	3.3	100.0	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	0.3
Sweden
Switzerland	0.6	11.3	3.8	45.3	41.7	...
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	0.5	5.3	4.9	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	1.6	17.9	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	1.1	13.0	4.0	15.9	71.0	0.0
<i>Median</i>	0.9	12.1	3.7	9.2	71.4	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.2	3.1	0.0	0.0	41.7	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	3.5	50.0	9.2	45.3	100.0	0.0

Table 3.2.2.5 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Bodily injury

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	15	3.9	3.0
Armenia	3	22.5	0.0	2.9
Austria	51	8.6	7.5	29.9
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	10	3.1	6.4	1.3
Croatia	16	6.3	5.0	1.3	44.4	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	27	6.3	5.3	9.0	58.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	153	15.2	5.7	9.8	33.2	0.0
France	87	9.6	11.6	13.1
Georgia	45	1.7	2.1
Germany	74	10.4	10.7	26.9
Hungary	83	9.1	10.7	1.7	71.8	...
Iceland
Italy	19	13.2	1.4	30.3
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	0
Latvia	19	7.3	5.2
Lithuania	172	5.5	2.4	0.0
Luxembourg	821
Moldova	5	9.8	1.2
Montenegro
Netherlands	68	10.1	7.0	0.0
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	67	5.8	0.3	0.6
Portugal	62	16.7	2.3	7.3	14.6	...
Romania	13	...	2.3	0.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	26	6.5	8.5	1.0	38.9	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	85	10.6	5.8	24.4
Sweden	65	14.8	12.4
Switzerland	39	9.7	11.9	52.5	37.8	...
Turkey	263	4.8	4.8	0.1	...	0.0
Ukraine	17	12.2	2.2	0.7
UK: England & Wales	51	4.9	4.4	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	196	25.2	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	88	9.8	5.2	12.5	42.7	0.0
<i>Median</i>	51	9.4	5.0	7.3	38.9	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0	1.7	0.0	0.1	14.6	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	821	25.2	12.4	52.5	71.8	0.0

Table 3.2.2.6 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Aggravated bodily injury

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	2.5	1.4	7.0
Armenia	2.9	9.3	0.0	2.3	0.0	...
Austria	12.0	5.4	11.3	35.0
Azerbaijan	3.1
Belgium
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	8.8	3.5	5.6	1.9	57.1	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	4.2	9.0	1.6	13.0	62.1	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	9.9	15.2	3.5	5.9	37.5	0.0
France	12.7	8.8	11.1	15.2
Georgia	6.1	1.8	2.2
Germany	23.4	10.5	15.7	28.7
Hungary	45.2	5.5	9.5	1.9	77.1	...
Iceland
Italy	11.9	12.4	2.1	30.4
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	8.3	12.1	1.8
Lithuania	6.3	8.1	4.3	0.0
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro	25.2	1.9	3.8	1.9	33.3	...
Netherlands	7.4	9.3	10.1	0.0
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	2.2	8.3	0.0	0.8
Portugal	9.6	14.7	4.2	11.3	12.5	...
Romania	1.2	...	2.2	0.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	10.8	1.7	9.7	1.3	20.0	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	6.2	7.2	9.8
Switzerland	9.3	9.7	7.2	56.4	31.2	...
Turkey	2.2	2.3	3.4	0.8	...	0.0
Ukraine	3.6	12.7	3.0	0.9
UK: England & Wales	9.3	4.7	1.5	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	47.9	3.2	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	11.2	7.4	5.2	13.0	36.8	0.0
<i>Median</i>	8.6	8.2	3.8	4.1	33.3	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	1.2	1.4	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	47.9	15.2	15.7	56.4	77.1	0.0

Table 3.2.2.7 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Sexual assault

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	1.1	0.0	15.6
Armenia
Austria	4.3	1.6	8.9	26.1
Azerbaijan
Belgium	5.8	1.2	0.3	20.4	45.5	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.8	0.0	14.0	0.8
Croatia	4.0	0.0	4.8	4.2	14.3	0.0
Cyprus	3.9	3.0
Czech Republic	4.9	1.4	24.5	9.7	52.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	9.6	0.9	7.4	15.3	16.0	0.0
France	13.5	4.0	18.5	13.6
Georgia	3.7
Germany	3.5	1.3	12.2	19.8
Hungary	3.9	1.6	11.7	2.6	80.0	...
Iceland
Italy	3.4	1.9	3.0	36.7
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	9.0	3.0	14.1	0.0
Luxembourg	8.7	2.0
Moldova	5.8	0.5	8.7
Montenegro
Netherlands North Macedonia	6.0	3.3	8.8	0.0
Norway	51.5	...
Poland	3.7	1.2	0.3	0.6
Portugal	4.7	3.1	2.9	9.8	8.3	...
Romania	3.0	0.0	6.9	0.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	2.0	2.1	7.6	1.4	50.0	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	0.2	0.0	...	35.9
Sweden	4.1	1.2	13.9
Switzerland	8.1	1.8	19.2	22.9	39.9	...
Turkey	25.9	1.4	11.9	1.0	...	0.0
Ukraine	0.4	0.0	4.7	2.6
UK: England & Wales	11.9	1.0	6.6	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	20.2	6.4
<i>Mean</i>	6.3	1.6	9.8	13.1	39.7	0.0
<i>Median</i>	4.2	1.4	8.8	9.8	45.5	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.6	8.3	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	25.9	6.4	24.5	36.7	80.0	0.0

Table 3.2.2.8 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Rape

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania
Armenia	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Austria	1.7	0.7	8.7	41.6
Azerbaijan	0.3
Belgium	3.5	1.0	0.5	26.5	43.7	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.0	0.0	16.7	1.4
Croatia	2.3	0.0	7.1	6.1	16.7	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.6	0.6	8.4	17.5	65.5	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	3.0	1.2	7.4	28.4	17.4	0.0
France	1.5	1.5	30.0	14.2
Georgia	0.3	...	8.3
Germany	0.7	0.7	7.6	31.1
Hungary	1.7	1.2	15.7	2.3	75.0	...
Iceland
Italy	2.6	0.9	3.6	37.9
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	0.8	0.0	0.0
Lithuania	7.1	1.9	15.0	0.0
Luxembourg	2.7	0.0
Moldova	4.2	0.0	7.3
Montenegro	0.3	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	...
Netherlands	0.6	4.8	10.6	0.0
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	1.9	2.3	0.5	1.0
Portugal	0.9	...	3.4	23.6
Romania	1.8	0.0	10.2	0.0	...	0.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.8	5.6	7.4	3.7	50.0	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	3.0	1.0	10.7
Switzerland	1.4	0.0	6.0	59.5	36.2	...
Turkey
Ukraine	0.2	0.0	5.6	2.2
UK: England & Wales	2.2	1.0	9.3	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	1.9	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	1.8	1.0	8.0	19.3	38.1	0.0
<i>Median</i>	1.7	0.7	7.4	15.8	40.0	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	7.1	5.6	30.0	59.5	75.0	0.0

Table 3.2.2.9 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Sexual abuse of a child

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania
Armenia
Austria	1.5	1.5	14.4	10.6
Azerbaijan
Belgium	3.2	1.4	0.0	13.5	66.7	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	0.4	0.0	5.6	0.0	...	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	3.2	1.8	32.8	3.3	72.7	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	5.5	1.0	8.0	11.6	14.3	0.0
France	4.6	1.2	31.5	6.4
Georgia
Germany	1.8	1.5	14.8	11.4
Hungary	1.5	2.6	4.6	2.6	100.0	...
Iceland
Italy	0.3	1.7	1.1	17.0
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	1.6	6.5	6.5	0.0
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Netherlands	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	1.7	1.5	0.0	0.3
Portugal	3.3	3.8	3.2	7.6
Romania	1.1	...	1.9	0.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.3	0.0	13.6	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	1.0	1.0	23.0
Switzerland	5.4	1.8	20.8	26.6	56.3	...
Turkey
Ukraine	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
UK: England & Wales	9.2	0.7	5.7	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	2.3	1.5	9.4	7.4	62.0	0.0
<i>Median</i>	1.6	1.4	5.6	6.4	66.7	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	9.2	6.5	32.8	26.6	100.0	0.0

Table 3.2.2.10 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Robbery

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	6.5	0.0	8.0
Armenia	3.3	1.0	2.0	4.1
Austria	8.8	7.5	33.6	54.0
Azerbaijan	3.4
Belgium	18.4	8.5	0.1	38.5	42.7	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	9.8	3.1	15.2	1.4
Croatia	7.6	9.0	11.5	2.5	12.5	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	9.6	6.2	15.3	9.1	71.7	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	11.8	10.0	17.9	11.5	39.2	0.0
France	5.2	2.7	21.7	10.8
Georgia	10.6	0.5	11.6
Germany	9.0	6.8	24.5	31.2
Hungary	12.9	5.2	28.0	2.2	85.7	...
Iceland
Italy	12.0	8.7	6.3	43.0
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	18.5	5.7	15.3
Lithuania	30.2	5.5	26.3	0.0
Luxembourg	11.2
Moldova	27.5	3.6	5.6
Montenegro
Netherlands North Macedonia	13.5	7.9	25.6	0.0
Norway
Poland	13.5	5.2	0.3	0.5
Portugal	22.1	8.7	14.5	15.6	8.1	...
Romania	7.8	...	14.4	0.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	11.9	3.5	19.0	1.3	9.1	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	23.0	10.9	23.4	61.5
Sweden	6.6	4.9	22.5
Switzerland	9.0	5.9	28.2	57.3	28.6	...
Turkey	27.7	2.6	16.7	4.2	...	0.0
Ukraine	11.2	5.1	9.4	0.9
UK: England & Wales	8.2	6.1	28.0	0.3
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	6.2	13.8
<i>Mean</i>		6.1	16.8	19.8	38.3	0.0
<i>Median</i>	10.9	5.9	15.3	10.3	39.2	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	3.3	0.0	0.1	0.5	8.1	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	30.2	13.8	33.6	61.5	85.7	0.3

Table 3.2.2.11 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Theft

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	61	3.6	16.5
Armenia	17	6.1	9.1	0.0
Austria	82	22.2	8.0	56.6
Azerbaijan	20
Belgium	76	13.7	0.1	44.8	56.7	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	87	5.6	12.1	0.3
Croatia	73	9.6	6.8	2.6	59.3	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	133	15.5	3.7	6.3	79.3	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	545	30.1	7.2	15.4	49.2	0.0
France	138	11.8	21.8	22.1
Georgia	81	3.7	4.7
Germany	163	25.4	7.2	43.3	43.3	...
Hungary	172	11.9	13.1	1.0	83.4	...
Iceland
Italy	56	24.4	3.9	46.5
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	180	11.9	6.5
Lithuania	138	7.8	15.1	0.0
Luxembourg	118
Moldova	78	7.2	13.7	0.0
Montenegro
Netherlands	150	17.9	4.9	0.0
North Macedonia
Norway	0	77.3	...
Poland	104	10.9	0.4	1.0
Portugal	54	17.2	4.9	11.1	47.9	...
Romania	24	...	7.9	0.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	139	9.1	8.9	1.6	56.2	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	47	38.0	4.6	32.1
Sweden	220	33.2	13.6
Switzerland	156	22.2	19.7	66.6	25.0	...
Turkey	226	6.8	21.4	1.1	...	0.0
Ukraine	96	12.7	7.0	0.8
UK: England & Wales	179	20.3	42.2	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	167	29.1
<i>Mean</i>	122	15.8	10.6	19.6	57.8	0.0
<i>Median</i>	104	12.7	7.9	8.7	56.5	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0	3.6	0.1	0.0	25.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	545	38.0	42.2	66.6	83.4	0.0

Table 3.2.2.12 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 –Aggravated theft

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal per- sons
Albania	0.1	0.0	0.0
Armenia
Austria	47.8	13.3	9.8	69.4	0.0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	35.1	5.5	0.3	44.2	52.8	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	34.7	5.6	10.8	1.9	60.7	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	7.9	9.3	6.7	0.0
France
Georgia
Germany	29.2	9.2	10.6	46.3
Hungary	171.6	11.9	13.1	1.0	83.4	...
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova	37.4	6.8	13.8
Montenegro	60.0	4.6	19.8	6.2	8.7	...
Netherlands	65.9	15.4	8.1	0.0
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	35.3	4.0	0.6	0.6
Portugal	32.4	8.2	5.8	8.4	44.5	...
Romania	15.3	...	8.9	0.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	69.1	4.3	11.8	1.2	68.9	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland	12.1	11.7	5.8	84.8	19.3	...
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	43.6	7.8	8.4	26.4	42.3	0.0
<i>Median</i>	35.1	7.5	8.9	7.3	48.6	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	171.6	15.4	19.8	84.8	83.4	0.0

Table 3.2.2.13 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Theft of a motor vehicle

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Armenia	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bulgaria	2.5	0.0	22.5	1.1
Finland	5.9	8.4	17.4	2.8	44.4	0.0
Hungary	5.0	3.2	11.9	2.2	100.0	...
Portugal	0.9	5.7	17.0	4.5
Serbia	3.3	1.7	16.0	0.8	100.0	...
Spain	5.1	4.5	14.5	15.6
Sweden	3.2	7.0	31.1
Ukraine	5.7	1.1	20.4	0.7
UK: England & Wales	6.1	6.4	54.3	0.9
UK: Scotland	5.3	3.8	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	3.9	3.8	18.7	3.5	81.5	0.5
<i>Median</i>	5.0	3.8	17.0	1.7	100.0	0.5
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	6.1	8.4	54.3	15.6	100.0	0.9

Table 3.2.2.14 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Theft by means of burglary

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Austria	12.5	5.8	18.7	53.0
Croatia	32.7	5.4	10.7	1.8	60.0	0.0
Germany	14.9	6.5	12.9	41.2	48.1	...
Hungary	31.7	7.4	20.4	0.4	100.0	...
Poland	35.3	4.0	0.6	0.6
Portugal	2.1	4.7	8.4	7.5	50.0	...
Ukraine	32.3	5.3	10.6	0.7
UK: England & Wales	26.8	5.0	28.8	0.0
UK: Scotland	15.4	2.8
<i>Mean</i>	22.6	5.2	13.9	15.0	64.5	0.0
<i>Median</i>	26.8	5.3	11.8	1.8	55.0	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	2.1	2.8	0.6	0.4	48.1	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	35.3	7.4	28.8	53.0	100.0	0.0

Table 3.2.2.15 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Theft by means of domestic burglary

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Germany	3.4	9.0	12.2	48.6
Hungary	1.9	20.6	28.6	0.5	100.0	...
Portugal	1.3	5.3	7.6	6.9
UK: England & Wales	15.0	6.2	17.1	0.0

Table 3.2.2.16 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Fraud

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	7.0	14.4	2.0
Armenia	3.0	13.5	1.1	0.0
Austria	26.3	23.4	2.0	31.5
Azerbaijan	9.9
Belgium	20.6	18.3	0.0	31.3	66.2	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	7.8	24.0	0.9	1.4
Croatia	21.1	16.3	0.3	3.7	48.5	1.8
Cyprus
Czech Republic	30.7	34.1	0.7	4.0	72.5	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	83.7	33.8	2.3	10.5	40.5	0.0
France	12.5	26.8	3.3	18.8
Georgia	12.2	0.4	1.3
Germany	109.6	33.9	1.0	21.3	36.6	...
Hungary	41.3	23.0	2.0	1.7	77.1	...
Iceland
Italy	8.6	21.7	0.2	12.8
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	44.4	18.8	3.5	0.7
Luxembourg	79.2
Moldova	17.6	15.8	1.3
Montenegro
Netherlands North Macedonia	5.2	20.0	2.3	0.0
Norway
Poland	67.0	26.7	0.2	0.7
Portugal	11.1	29.5	0.5	5.9	4.5	1.9
Romania	5.2	...	0.3	0.7
Russian Federation
Serbia	10.4	15.3	1.5	2.0	66.7	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	14.9	25.3	0.0	13.9
Sweden	12.4	29.2	5.8
Switzerland	40.2	31.9	4.4	55.5	41.2	...
Turkey	82.7	7.0	0.6	0.4	...	0.0
Ukraine	5.9	22.7	3.1	0.4
UK: England & Wales	21.9	32.7	5.6	0.1
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	6.8	48.6	...	0.5
<i>Mean</i>	28.2	23.4	1.8	11.4	50.4	0.6
<i>Median</i>	14.9	23.2	1.3	4.0	48.5	0.1
<i>Minimum</i>	3.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	109.6	48.6	5.8	55.5	77.1	1.9

Table 3.2.2.17 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Cyber fraud

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	0.5	26.7	0.0
Hungary	3.7	19.3	10.9	4.3	75.0	...
Montenegro	1.8	18.2	0.0	9.1	0.0	...
Portugal	1.9	34.9	...	13.8
Romania	0.0	...	0.0	0.0
Serbia	0.0
Switzerland	8.7	24.3	8.0	63.7	40.1	...
<i>Mean</i>	2.4	24.7	3.8	22.7	38.4	0.0
<i>Median</i>	1.8	24.3	0.0	11.5	40.1	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	18.2	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	8.7	34.9	10.9	63.7	75.0	0.0

Table 3.2.2.18 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Forgery of documents

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	14.3	4.3	1.4
Armenia
Austria	9.6	12.3	3.4	67.7
Azerbaijan
Belgium	14.7	15.8	0.1	34.6	55.1	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	18.4	9.6	0.1	15.0	11.1	0.0
Cyprus	11.1	14.9
Czech Republic	3.1	16.7	0.3	62.7	12.6	0.3
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	14.2	21.3	12.6	35.3	31.6	0.0
France	7.0	26.5	1.3	40.6
Georgia	4.7
Germany	19.2	20.3	2.0	36.8
Hungary	63.4	22.8	1.7	4.8	37.2	...
Iceland
Italy	15.3	19.7	0.1	30.8
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	29.3	16.8	2.0	1.2
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro	17.4	5.6	0.9	21.3	4.3	...
Netherlands North Macedonia	9.4	20.2	0.4	1.1
Norway
Poland	15.7	26.2	0.9	26.3
Portugal	7.7	20.3	0.9	22.1	9.1	2.3
Romania	1.3	...	0.0	0.4
Russian Federation
Serbia	15.3	11.6	0.4	5.9	10.9	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	15.4	16.9	0.6	44.3
Sweden	7.4	17.4	4.4
Switzerland	49.8	26.4	9.8	66.8	22.9	...
Turkey	36.9	0.5	0.3	0.4	...	0.0
Ukraine	2.3	33.2	0.2	16.0	...	0.0
UK: England & Wales	2.1	10.0	11.1	0.2
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	16.2	16.9	2.4	31.3	21.7	0.6
<i>Median</i>	14.3	16.9	0.9	30.8	12.6	0.3
<i>Minimum</i>	1.3	0.5	0.0	0.4	4.3	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	63.4	33.2	12.6	67.7	55.1	2.3

Table 3.2.2.19 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Money laundering

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	1.9	5.5	12.7
Armenia
Austria	0.4	32.3	0.0	41.9
Azerbaijan
Belgium	4.2	16.4	0.0	48.6	41.7	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.3	...	0.0
Croatia	0.2	25.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.6	13.4	0.0	13.4	44.4	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	1.8	16.7	1.0	0.0
France
Georgia
Germany	0.9	24.7	0.1	32.4
Hungary	0.1	14.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	...
Iceland
Italy	3.1	18.6	0.5	37.7
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	0.7	38.1	0.0	0.0
Luxembourg
Moldova	0.1	25.0	0.0
Montenegro	0.0
Netherlands	2.5	20.0	1.7	4.8
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	0.3	18.3	0.0	2.5
Portugal	0.3	50.0	...	26.5
Romania	0.1	...	0.0	0.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	6.2	14.4	5.4	28.3
Sweden	1.7	25.3	3.1
Switzerland	3.8	19.1	0.0	73.1	26.5	...
Turkey	0.1	7.7	0.0	0.0	...	0.0
Ukraine	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
UK: England & Wales	2.3	20.3	2.3	0.6
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	1.3	24.5	1.2	22.8	28.2	0.7
<i>Median</i>	0.4	20.0	0.0	20.4	34.1	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	6.2	60.0	12.7	73.1	44.4	4.8

Table 3.2.2.20 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Corruption

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	2.9	7.1	0.0
Armenia
Austria	1.5	19.8	0.8	10.7
Azerbaijan	0.2
Belgium	0.5	7.1	0.0	8.9	60.0	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.1	12.8	0.0	9.0
Croatia	5.1	28.4	0.0	5.1	9.1	0.5
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.9	8.4	0.0	15.8	13.3	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	0.1	0.0	0.0	33.3
France	0.4	9.0	9.7	10.1
Georgia	2.5	4.3
Germany	0.2	13.5	0.0	27.5
Hungary	1.5	10.5	0.0	9.9	73.3	...
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	26.8	7.8	0.3	0.0
Luxembourg
Moldova	1.9	20.6	0.0
Montenegro
Netherlands North Macedonia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Norway
Poland	4.6	14.4	0.2	5.5
Portugal	0.3	11.1
Romania	3.0	...	0.0	1.7
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.2	7.2	0.0	1.2	0.0	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	0.1	27.3	0.0
Switzerland	0.7	20.4	0.0	68.5	2.7	...
Turkey	1.1	4.1	0.6	1.0	...	0.0
Ukraine	0.9	17.4	0.0	0.5
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	2.4	12.0	0.6	13.2	26.4	5.1
<i>Median</i>	1.0	9.8	0.0	9.4	11.2	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	26.8	28.4	9.7	68.5	73.3	33.3

Table 3.2.2.21 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Drug offences: Total

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	22	3.2	2.1
Armenia
Austria	52	7.9	6.3	44.0
Azerbaijan	26
Belgium	54	8.6	0.1	32.7	44.5	...
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria	22	9.4	3.6	1.7
Croatia	16	5.9	5.9	6.6	54.3	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	26	16.0	3.0	17.3	17.5	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	173	13.0	3.3	10.3	39.5	0.0
France	95	6.1	8.1	8.5
Georgia	110	0.8	0.4
Germany	69	10.2	6.1	21.5	33.9	...
Hungary	13	7.1	5.8	4.9	33.3	...
Iceland
Italy	36	7.1	1.4	43.1
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	57	18.0	1.6
Lithuania	62	10.3	3.6	0.0
Luxembourg	38	17.8
Moldova	21	9.7	3.1
Montenegro
Netherlands	36	13.7	2.1	0.0
North Macedonia
Norway	0	73.0	...
Poland	43	4.7	0.8	1.2
Portugal	38	11.7	2.2	17.1	21.6	...
Romania	4	...	0.6	0.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	43	7.8	5.0	5.1	46.2	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	232	13.2	6.8
Switzerland	247	10.0	27.6	46.8	33.8	...
Turkey	123	4.1	6.9	2.1	...	0.0
Ukraine	26	11.9	1.5	0.7
UK: England & Wales	81	7.9	17.3	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	118	13.0
<i>Mean</i>	65	9.6	5.0	16.5	39.8	0.0
<i>Median</i>	43	9.5	3.3	9.4	36.7	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0.8	0.1	0.7	17.5	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	247	18.0	27.6	46.8	73.0	0.0

Table 3.2.2.22 Percentage of women, minors, foreigners, and legal persons among convicted persons in 2015 – Drug trafficking

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citi- zens amongst foreigners	of which % of legal persons
Albania	4.6	0.0	0.0
Armenia	1.5	11.4	4.5	27.3
Austria	14.8	8.4
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia- Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	16.4	5.9	5.9	6.6	54.3	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	19.9	17.1	3.4	14.8	19.3	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	65.1	10.5	2.9	0.0
France	49.3	6.3	11.4	9.8
Georgia	3.2	1.7
Germany	10.9	9.5	1.3	28.8
Hungary	4.2	7.7	2.2	7.0	13.8	...
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	18.4	14.5	5.6	0.0
Luxembourg	31.6	3.4
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	4.7	5.2	0.9	3.5
Portugal	30.0	13.6	2.1	18.7	21.5	...
Romania	3.9	...	0.7	0.0
Russian Federation
Serbia	12.6	4.0	5.4	5.1	47.8	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	25.8	9.0	2.4
Switzerland	99.4	9.0	12.3	58.1	21.2	...
Turkey	69.3	5.9	5.2	3.6	...	0.0
Ukraine	3.7	13.5	2.5	0.8
UK: England & Wales	0.9	12.9	0.4	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	23.3	8.5	3.8	15.4	29.7	0.0
<i>Median</i>	14.8	8.7	2.7	8.4	21.4	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.8	13.8	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	99.4	17.1	12.3	58.1	54.3	0.0

 Notes on tables 3.2.2.1 to 3.2.2.22

In general, the notes for tables 3.2.1.1 to 3.2.1.22 also apply here.

Belgium	Only criminal offences committed by minors over the age of 16, who were convicted by jurisdiction that applies the criminal law for adults on decision of the juvenile court, are included. The others are excluded.
Bulgaria	Legal persons are not subject to criminal liability.
Finland	Some figures for foreigners include more crime types than other figures due to different grouping in data sources.
Portugal	EU citizens according to the present configuration of the EU. Criminal liability of legal persons was provided for in the Portuguese Criminal Code in 2007.
Romania	Data refer to 2016, not 2015.
Spain	Data on "Intentional homicide" includes only adults. Data on "sexual assault" includes only minors Data on "fraud" includes only adults. For the rest of the offences, both adults and minors are included.
Turkey	Number of women: for 179 cases (all crimes) gender of the offender is not known.
UK: Scotland	Data on foreigners is not held.

3.2.3 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015

Table 3.2.3.1. Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Criminal offences: Total

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % other measures
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	
Albania
Armenia	98	...	27.5	0.0	...	33.2	35.9
Austria	374	...	27.6	38.0	29.1	34.8	5.3
Azerbaijan
Belgium	1978	...	84.0	4.6	100.0	5.1	22.6	...	6.1	...	0.2
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	386	...	3.2	28.4	...	47.6	20.0	...	0.8
Croatia	308	1.5	3.4	1.8	...	71.4	9.7	10.4	21.8	15.3	...
Cyprus	6387	...	94.7
Czech Republic	622	1.8	3.6	13.2	88.8	66.8	9.7	...	14.5	...	0.1
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	3321	0.0	88.4	1.1	90.6	7.3	5.9	2.1	2.8	...	0.4
France	864	0.8	35.7	14.9	19.5	26.5	0.6	...	22.1	20.3	...
Georgia	406	...	19.9	45.7	...	10.9	29.3	...	0.1
Germany	922	1.2	75.8	7.3	...	10.9	4.8
Hungary	852	1.3	24.0	45.8	31.3	18.3	16.4	0.0	10.7	0.0	0.0
Iceland	644	67.1	32.9	57.2	11.5	21.8	...	24.9	23.1	11.0	0.0
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	504	...	1.6	34.1
Lithuania	636	0.5	27.2	32.8	21.1	7.2	28.4	...	1.3
Luxembourg
Moldova	314	100.0	33.2	78.9	24.9
Montenegro
Netherlands	527	...	28.0	29.2	95.6	14.3	...	52.3	28.5	34.1	...
North Macedonia
Norway	5649	...	0.6	2.8	3.7
Poland	684	...	23.6	12.0	100.0	51.2	29.1	...	13.1	...	0.1
Portugal	595	0.5	61.8	3.6	99.6	23.2	50.7	...	9.5	...	1.5
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	467	2.1	8.2	1.1	98.3	61.5	5.6	...	26.6	...	0.5
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	1379
Sweden	1095	0.0	53.8	4.6	20.5	11.4	...	31.3	10.2	1.4	19.9
Switzerland	1358	...	85.5	2.5	93.9	2.4	9.6	8.0	0.0
Turkey	1971	...	26.4	19.8	...	6.0	28.1	...	19.6
Ukraine	222	...	19.7	20.8	...	3.7
UK: England & Wales	2154	...	71.5	92.8	9.9	4.6	7.2	...	7.5
UK: Northern Ireland	1317	...	53.9	13.0	47.8	15.3	12.4	...	5.5
UK: Scotland	1860	17.3	49.2	19.0	88.6	0.0	19.0	0.0	...
Mean	1307	14.9	38.0	22.0	61.3	24.7	16.7	18.9	18.1	13.9	3.7
Median	684	1.3	27.8	13.1	88.6	16.8	9.7	10.9	19.5	11.0	0.7
Minimum	98	0.0	0.6	0.0	9.9	0.0	0.6	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0
Maximum	6387	100.0	94.7	92.8	100.0	71.4	50.7	52.3	35.9	34.8	19.9

Table 3.2.3.2 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Major road traffic offences

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % other measures	
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total		of which: % partially suspended
Albania	0.0	
Armenia	2.7	...	6.1	57.3	36.6	...	
Austria	
Azerbaijan	
Belgium	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	
Bulgaria	110.5	...	0.8	51.9	...	39.3	7.9	0.1	
Croatia	22.1	1.1	12.1	0.3	...	75.5	1.4	5.8	11.0	0.0	
Cyprus	
Czech Republic	152.3	0.4	10.1	11.6	87.4	71.3	3.8	...	6.5	0.0	
Denmark	
Estonia	
Finland	1929.9	0.0	92.2	1.1	89.0	5.4	3.0	0.1	1.2	0.1	
France	312.5	0.2	53.7	16.0	10.0	19.4	0.9	...	10.8	14.0	
Georgia	20.0	
Germany	186.7	0.4	90.5	3.3	...	4.5	1.3	...	
Hungary	259.8	0.1	40.4	53.3	10.0	4.8	7.5	0.0	1.3	0.0	
Iceland	
Italy	
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	
Latvia	
Lithuania	11.7	0.0	
Luxembourg	
Moldova	
Montenegro	
Netherlands	95.1	...	57.6	21.3	92.9	9.9	...	42.3	11.1	12.5	
North Macedonia	
Norway	12.0	...	28.0	5.0	0.0	...	
Poland	157.4	...	39.4	9.2	100.0	43.1	8.7	...	8.3	0.0	
Portugal	196.5	0.5	75.9	4.9	68.1	13.3	39.9	...	5.4	0.2	
Romania	
Russian Federation	
Serbia	36.5	0.4	15.2	0.7	83.3	70.4	6.7	...	12.6	0.7	
Slovak Republic	
Slovenia	
Spain	
Sweden	228.5	0.0	65.0	2.9	37.7	4.6	...	89.3	12.7	0.1	
Switzerland	614.4	...	96.9	2.0	99.3	0.7	0.4	10.3	
Turkey	47.2	...	55.4	13.3	...	3.4	18.4	9.5	
Ukraine	11.7	...	12.8	22.8	...	
UK: England & Wales	6.8	...	2.5	19.2	...	35.1	43.0	2.7	
UK: Northern Ireland	
UK: Scotland	132.3	1.4	83.5	11.7	11.7	...	
Mean	216.5	0.4	44.1	13.1	67.8	27.2	9.0	27.5	11.7	6.2	
Median	110.5	0.4	40.4	9.2	85.4	13.3	5.2	5.8	10.8	5.2	
Minimum	2.7	0.0	0.8	0.0	10.0	0.7	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Maximum	1929.9	1.4	96.9	53.3	100.0	75.5	39.9	89.3	43.0	14.7	

Table 3.2.3.3 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Intentional homicide: Total

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures	
				Total	of which: % community service	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
Albania
Armenia	0.9	...	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	100.0
Austria	0.5	0.0	...	0.0	100.0	5.0	0.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium	2.3	...	0.0	1.6	100.0	31.4	55.6	...	67.1	...	0.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.8	...	0.0	0.0	...	3.8	96.2	...	0.0
Croatia	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.3	...	5.1	0.0	0.0	93.6	17.8	...
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.9	100.0	2.6	33.3	...	97.4	...	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	2.1	66.7	33.3	87.6	...	10.3
France	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	1.7	0.0	...	98.3	3.6	...
Georgia	4.0	98.7	1.4	...
Germany	0.7	0.3	0.2	0.2	...	3.9	95.4
Hungary	2.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	0.0	5.5	18.2	0.0	89.0	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	4.5	3.1
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	0.0	10.3	31.7	5.4	...	84.8	84.0	38.5	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	1.5	...	0.0	0.2	100.0	3.6	85.0	...	96.3	...	0.0
Portugal	2.3	20.8	79.6	...	75.0	...	3.8
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	1.6	100.0	...	95.9	...	2.4
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	80.8	0.0	19.2
Switzerland	0.5	...	0.0	26.3	0.0	5.3	68.4	26.9	0.0
Turkey	19.8	...	0.2	36.6	...	0.3	51.0	...	11.9
Ukraine	1.9	89.6
UK: England & Wales	2.4	...	1.1	10.3	...	16.3	67.4	...	6.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	2.7	0.0	0.1	5.5	55.3	6.1	48.7	29.5	86.6	11.7	4.1
Median	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.2	65.9	3.7	55.6	16.7	91.6	4.3	1.2
Minimum	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	19.8	0.3	1.1	36.6	100.0	31.4	100.0	84.8	100.0	38.5	19.2

Table 3.2.3.4 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Intentional homicide: Completed

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % other measures	
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total		of which: % partially suspended
Albania	
Armenia	
Austria	0.2	0.0	...	0.0	100.0	5.0	0.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	4.1	95.9	...	0.0
Croatia	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	3.1	0.0	0.0	96.9	3.2	...
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	85.5	...	14.5
France	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	100.0	4.6	...
Georgia
Germany
Hungary	1.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	92.0	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland
Portugal	1.1	11.9	53.8	...	84.4	...	3.7
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.2
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland	0.2	...	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	0.5	...	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	100.0	...	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	1.6	1.2	4.8	16.7	0.0	0.0	77.4
Mean	0.8	0.2	0.6	7.1	0.0	2.0	17.9	0.0	89.2	2.6	2.6
Median	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	94.0	3.2	0.0
Minimum	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	1.6	1.2	4.8	40.0	0.0	11.9	53.8	0.0	100.0	5.0	14.5

Table 3.2.3.5 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Bodily injury

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.			of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
	Total	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures	
Albania	
Armenia	
Austria	49.9	...	45.0	33.8	17.2	22.4	4.0	
Azerbaijan	
Belgium	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	
Bulgaria	9.7	...	0.7	41.1	...	43.8	13.4	...	1.0	
Croatia	16.4	3.5	1.4	2.4	...	76.3	1.5	9.2	16.4	13.2	...	
Cyprus	
Czech Republic	27.0	1.6	1.5	9.3	95.5	75.7	9.7	...	11.8	...	0.0	
Denmark	
Estonia	
Finland	153.3	0.0	65.0	3.4	92.4	21.0	8.9	3.0	8.8	...	1.8	
France	87.2	1.2	6.4	13.0	22.3	47.8	0.8	...	31.6	21.1	...	
Georgia	45.3	...	29.0	52.7	4.7	
Germany	75.9	2.1	51.6	16.5	...	22.5	7.2	
Hungary	82.9	1.7	13.5	34.6	44.4	34.8	20.5	0.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	
Iceland	
Italy	
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	
Latvia	
Lithuania	172.0	1.7	
Luxembourg	
Moldova	
Montenegro	
Netherlands	64.8	...	20.9	46.6	96.9	16.1	...	60.3	16.4	53.5	...	
North Macedonia	
Norway	
Poland	67.2	...	10.8	11.5	100.0	65.4	60.1	...	12.3	...	0.2	
Portugal	62.4	0.3	52.3	2.4	100.0	36.5	50.3	...	5.1	...	3.4	
Romania	
Russian Federation	
Serbia	23.6	1.3	7.6	1.0	100.0	69.9	4.1	...	19.4	...	0.7	
Slovak Republic	
Slovenia	
Spain	
Sweden	64.6	0.1	15.1	13.3	31.3	34.2	...	66.1	19.2	2.8	18.1	
Switzerland	11.9	...	83.6	3.6	82.9	5.9	6.9	13.2	0.0	
Turkey	262.9	...	41.5	16.8	...	6.3	23.3	...	12.1	
Ukraine	17.3	
UK: England & Wales	23.3	...	1.2	43.3	...	56.3	88.0	...	14.9	
UK: Northern Ireland	
UK: Scotland	257.7	20.5	27.1	27.9	98.5	23.9	
Mean	78.8	3.2	26.3	17.9	78.6	41.1	19.5	27.7	18.9	18.0	4.4	
Median	63.5	1.4	18.0	13.2	95.5	36.5	9.3	9.2	15.9	13.2	1.7	
Minimum	9.7	0.0	0.7	1.0	22.3	5.9	0.8	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	
Maximum	262.9	20.5	83.6	46.6	100.0	76.3	60.1	66.1	88.0	53.5	18.1	

Table 3.2.3.6 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Aggravated bodily injury

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % other measures	
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total		of which: % partially suspended
Albania	0.0	
Armenia	3.0	...	3.3	0.0	...	18.9	...	75.6	
Austria	11.7	...	12.2	45.9	...	32.9	45.5	9.1	
Azerbaijan	
Belgium	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	
Bulgaria	
Croatia	8.8	3.2	0.0	2.4	...	71.0	1.5	13.2	23.3	16.1	0.0
Cyprus	
Czech Republic	4.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	...	66.3	22.7	...	33.5
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	9.9	0.0	0.2	0.7	100.0	47.9	12.0	17.8	49.9	...	1.3
France	12.7	0.6	3.4	8.1	22.8	42.1	0.6	...	45.8	48.0	...
Georgia	6.1	...	1.8	38.5	55.3
Germany	23.9	2.0	18.7	22.3	...	45.4	11.6
Hungary	45.3	0.4	11.2	24.6	54.0	43.4	17.1	0.0	20.4	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	6.3	1.1
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro	31.0
Netherlands	7.3	...	0.6	34.1	93.3	23.0	...	81.6	42.3	63.3	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	2.2	...	3.6	0.6	100.0	58.7	44.1	...	36.7	...	0.4
Portugal	9.6	...	36.2	8.0	100.0	45.3	48.0	...	8.6	...	1.8
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	9.8	0.3	1.0	0.3	100.0	71.1	8.3	...	26.6	...	0.7
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	6.2	0.2	0.0	5.3	25.0	3.5	...	85.7	71.8	3.5	19.2
Switzerland	2.5	...	65.8	3.5	57.1	18.3	12.4	36.0	0.0
Turkey	2.2	...	10.1	26.9	...	11.5	38.0	...	13.4
Ukraine	3.6	...	0.1	56.3
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	32.8	3.5	4.8	27.4	97.3	54.4
Mean	11.2	1.2	9.6	11.0	75.0	40.7	19.3	39.7	38.6	30.3	4.3
Median	7.5	0.4	3.3	5.3	95.3	44.3	14.5	17.8	37.3	36.0	1.1
Minimum	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.8	3.5	0.6	0.0	8.6	0.0	0.0
Maximum	45.3	3.5	65.8	34.1	100.0	71.1	48.0	85.7	75.6	63.3	19.2

Table 3.2.3.7 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Sexual assault

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.			of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
	Total	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures	
Albania	
Armenia	
Austria	4.2	...	13.9	20.2	55.1	41.2	10.8	
Azerbaijan	
Belgium	5.8	...	0.0	2.4	100.0	67.2	61.2	...	30.0	...	0.3	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	
Bulgaria	1.8	...	0.0	7.0	0.0	37.2	55.8	...	0.0	
Croatia	4.0	1.8	0.6	1.2	...	42.3	11.3	22.5	54.2	11.0	...	
Cyprus	3.9	...	21.2	
Czech Republic	4.9	4.1	0.0	0.6	66.7	73.6	9.5	...	21.4	...	0.4	
Denmark	
Estonia	
Finland	9.6	0.0	5.5	1.5	100.0	61.4	10.2	20.4	30.3	...	1.3	
France	13.5	0.6	2.4	10.4	2.3	47.9	0.4	...	38.7	37.7	...	
Georgia	3.2	25.0	263.3	...	
Germany	3.6	1.8	3.9	11.0	...	51.9	31.3	
Hungary	4.0	0.0	1.3	5.6	18.2	33.2	25.4	0.0	59.8	0.0	0.0	
Iceland	
Italy	
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	
Latvia	
Lithuania	9.0	1.9	
Luxembourg	
Moldova	
Montenegro	
Netherlands	6.0	...	1.0	12.9	86.9	20.3	...	60.8	65.8	64.6	...	
North Macedonia	
Norway	16.6	...	43.1	24.6	46.0	
Poland	3.7	...	0.6	1.3	100.0	52.9	65.0	...	44.8	...	0.4	
Portugal	4.7	...	2.0	0.8	100.0	56.9	66.9	...	38.0	...	2.2	
Romania	0.0	
Russian Federation	
Serbia	1.9	0.0	3.0	0.0	...	25.4	14.7	...	71.6	...	0.0	
Slovak Republic	
Slovenia	
Spain	
Sweden	4.1	0.0	0.0	5.7	47.8	8.5	...	64.7	65.7	1.1	20.1	
Switzerland	2.9	...	51.9	2.1	0.0	25.9	20.2	40.8	0.0	
Turkey	25.9	...	0.8	33.9	...	1.6	51.6	...	12.0	
Ukraine	0.4	...	0.0	74.5	
UK: England & Wales	9.3	...	0.8	16.0	76.5	...	4.4	
UK: Northern Ireland	
UK: Scotland	7.1	1.3	1.8	38.9	87.2	59.0	
Mean	6.5	1.1	7.3	8.5	54.5	37.1	29.4	33.7	48.4	57.5	3.9	
Median	4.1	0.6	1.3	4.0	66.7	35.2	14.7	22.5	51.6	39.3	0.9	
Minimum	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.4	0.0	20.2	0.0	0.0	
Maximum	25.9	4.1	51.9	38.9	100.0	73.6	66.9	64.7	76.5	263.3	20.1	

Table 3.2.3.8 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Rape

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % with community service		
Albania
Armenia	0.2	...	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	100.0
Austria	1.7	...	0.0	13.4	75.4	38.3	11.3
Azerbaijan
Belgium	3.4	...	0.0	0.3	100.0	65.6	59.1	...	34.1	...	0.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.0	...	0.0	4.2	...	18.1	77.8	...	0.0
Croatia	2.3	2.0	0.0	2.0	...	26.5	26.9	30.8	69.4	0.0	...
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.6	1.8	0.0	0.6	0.0	52.4	13.8	...	44.0	...	1.2
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	100.0	59.3	11.5	32.3	37.7	...	1.9
France	1.5	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	14.7	0.0	0.0	81.6	14.7	...
Georgia	0.3
Germany	0.7	1.0	0.3	2.8	...	37.7	58.1
Hungary	1.8	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	13.7	41.7	0.0	82.9	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	7.1	1.5
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro	0.5
Netherlands	0.6	...	0.0	4.8	0.0	7.7	...	87.5	87.5	51.6	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	1.9	...	0.3	0.5	100.0	42.9	58.5	...	55.6	...	0.7
Portugal	0.9	31.5	53.6	...	61.8	...	4.5
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	6.0	0.0	...	94.0	...	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	3.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	50.0	3.1	...	44.4	79.7	0.9	10.7
Switzerland	1.4	...	0.0	0.0	...	5.2	0.9	0.0	0.0
Turkey
Ukraine	0.2	79.8
UK: England & Wales	2.4	...	0.0	4.6	...	0.6	85.7	...	9.1
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	1.9	0.0	0.0	8.7	88.9	91.3
Mean	1.8	0.5	0.0	2.4	48.8	23.4	29.4	32.5	68.3	15.1	3.1
Median	1.6	0.0	0.0	2.1	50.0	14.7	26.9	31.5	77.8	0.9	1.2
Minimum	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0
Maximum	7.1	2.0	0.3	8.7	100.0	65.6	59.1	87.5	100.0	51.6	11.3

Table 3.2.3.9 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Sexual abuse of a child

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.			of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
	Total	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service		Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
					of which: % community service	of which: % with supervision						
Albania
Armenia
Austria	1.5	...	0.0	24.0	63.6	45.1	12.4
Azerbaijan
Belgium	3.2	...	0.0	2.5	100.0	...	70.4	68.8	...	26.8	...	0.3
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	0.4	5.6	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	37.5	...
Cyprus
Czech Republic	3.2	5.3	0.0	0.6	100.0	...	83.4	7.1	...	10.7	...	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	5.5	0.0	1.7	1.7	100.0	...	64.8	10.3	17.9	30.9	...	1.0
France	4.6	0.7	0.3	13.9	0.7	...	48.9	0.0	...	36.1	50.4	...
Georgia
Germany	1.9	2.2	3.0	15.5	50.4	28.9
Greece
Hungary	1.6	0.0	3.2	10.3	25.0	...	57.1	15.7	0.0	29.5	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	1.5	4.4
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	0.4	...	0.0	15.9	90.0	...	17.5	...	45.5	68.3	37.2	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	1.7	...	0.9	2.1	100.0	...	64.0	69.8	...	32.9	...	0.2
Portugal	3.3	...	2.0	61.5	70.6	...	33.8	...	2.0
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	...	89.5	...	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	1.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	53.3	...	22.0	...	72.7	28.0	3.6	35.0
Switzerland	5.4	...	22.8	0.7	66.7	...	7.1	2.2	50.0	0.0
Turkey
Ukraine	0.0	30.0
UK: England & Wales	4.8	...	0.1	19.7	9.8	60.7	...	9.7
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	2.4	1.7	2.3	7.5	70.6	...	42.8	26.9	27.2	38.5	32.0	5.4
Median	1.8	0.4	0.1	2.5	90.0	...	50.0	10.3	17.9	31.9	37.5	0.6
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	...	7.1	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
Maximum	5.5	5.6	22.8	19.7	100.0	...	83.4	70.6	72.7	89.5	50.4	35.0

Table 3.2.3.10 Total persons receiving sanctions/ measures in 2015 – Robbery

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.			of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
	Total	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures	
Albania	
Armenia	2.6	...	28.6	0.0	...	1.3	93.5	
Austria	8.7	...	0.4	70.6	30.7	3.1	
Azerbaijan	
Belgium	18.3	...	0.0	22.1	100.0	34.5	26.4	...	43.1	...	0.2	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	
Bulgaria	9.8	...	0.0	4.5	...	36.8	56.2	...	2.4	
Croatia	7.6	1.2	0.0	3.4	...	24.9	21.3	63.8	70.4	18.6	...	
Cyprus	
Czech Republic	9.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	...	49.5	25.5	...	49.5	...	0.1	
Denmark	
Estonia	
Finland	11.8	0.0	0.5	3.6	91.3	46.5	40.1	10.0	49.0	...	0.5	
France	5.2	...	3.6	81.1	
Georgia	10.6	...	4.1	25.1	70.9	
Germany	9.3	3.4	1.2	17.2	...	39.4	38.8	
Hungary	13.1	0.1	0.7	2.5	9.1	15.7	63.5	0.0	81.0	0.0	0.0	
Iceland	
Italy	
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	
Latvia	
Lithuania	28.5	0.1	
Luxembourg	
Moldova	
Montenegro	
Netherlands	13.4	...	0.7	19.7	84.8	11.9	...	72.5	67.8	51.5	...	
North Macedonia	
Norway	
Poland	13.5	...	0.8	1.8	100.0	44.6	69.2	...	51.7	...	1.1	
Portugal	22.1	...	2.5	5.0	97.4	58.5	78.5	...	33.0	...	1.0	
Romania	0.0	
Russian Federation	
Serbia	9.6	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.0	18.8	64.3	...	80.0	...	0.6	
Slovak Republic	
Slovenia	
Spain	
Sweden	6.6	0.0	0.0	7.9	39.2	1.9	...	83.3	59.0	9.4	31.3	
Switzerland	1.3	...	27.4	0.9	0.0	35.8	35.8	23.7	0.0	
Turkey	27.7	...	0.7	32.4	...	3.3	50.1	...	13.4	
Ukraine	11.2	...	8.2	46.1	
UK: England & Wales	8.2	20.8	...	7.7	68.2	...	3.2	
UK: Northern Ireland	
UK: Scotland	7.1	2.9	2.1	15.6	76.3	78.4	
Mean	11.6	1.0	4.1	9.3	54.4	26.8	48.6	45.9	60.7	22.3	4.1	
Median	9.7	0.3	0.7	4.5	76.3	25.1	51.8	63.8	59.0	21.1	0.8	
Minimum	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	21.3	0.0	33.0	0.0	0.0	
Maximum	28.5	3.4	28.6	32.4	100.0	58.5	78.5	83.3	93.5	51.5	31.3	

Table 3.2.3.11 Total persons receiving sanctions/asures in 2015 – Theft

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only		of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % other measures
		of which: % verdict	of which: % admonition only	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	
Albania
Armenia	9.7	...	76.8	0.0	...	37.9	60.8	...
Austria	81.3	...	22.8	29.3	45.3	38.1
Azerbaijan
Belgium	76.1	...	0.7	19.7	100.0	29.8	14.1	...	49.3	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	86.6	...	1.8	17.2	...	33.4	45.0	2.5
Croatia	73.3	2.5	0.3	4.0	...	66.8	7.9	13.6	26.4	12.6
Cyprus
Czech Republic	132.7	3.2	0.8	19.6	91.2	47.1	15.2	...	29.2	...
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	544.9	0.0	94.1	0.5	92.4	2.6	12.6	0.9	2.5	...
France	137.6	0.8	10.9	19.7	28.3	29.9	0.5	...	38.7	14.9
Georgia	80.8	...	1.5	41.5	58.5	...
Germany	164.5	0.7	67.0	10.1	...	13.2	9.0	...
Hungary	176.4	0.6	10.5	44.5	52.8	19.3	27.3	0.0	25.1	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	137.7	0.6
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	147.0	...	13.6	24.1	94.3	17.7	...	47.2	44.7	28.5
North Macedonia
Norway	149.6	...	70.8	0.0	...	0.0	16.9	...
Poland	103.6	...	7.4	16.7	100.0	54.0	40.7	...	21.7	...
Portugal	54.0	0.3	37.7	4.9	98.2	35.8	58.3	...	20.1	...
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	126.3	0.1	4.5	1.5	99.3	56.4	4.3	...	37.2	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	219.6	0.0	38.7	5.6	6.3	15.7	...	2.4	9.6	0.5
Switzerland	39.5	...	75.3	2.2	90.1	2.0	20.5	1.2
Turkey	225.8	...	9.3	26.9	...	6.7	43.9	...
Ukraine	96.2	...	14.9	22.1	...
UK: England & Wales	152.1	...	15.9	27.7	...	13.6	31.2	...
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	215.5	21.8	18.9	25.3	81.9	31.9	...
Mean	140.5	3.0	27.0	14.2	77.9	27.6	20.1	12.8	31.3	13.7
Median	132.7	0.6	14.2	16.7	91.8	29.6	14.1	2.4	30.2	12.6
Minimum	9.7	0.0	0.3	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.5	0.0	2.5	0.0
Maximum	544.9	21.8	94.1	44.5	100.0	66.8	58.3	47.2	60.8	38.1

Table 3.2.3.12 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Aggravated theft

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % other measures
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	
Albania
Armenia
Austria	47.5	...	1.8	0.0	67.1	44.0	3.3
Azerbaijan
Belgium	35.1	...	0.1	21.0	100.0	30.9	16.0	...	47.6	...	0.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	34.7	4.2	0.0	5.5	...	55.5	8.8	18.7	34.8	14.7	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	7.9	0.0	0.7	4.6	90.0	45.7	11.2	3.6	48.7	...	0.2
France
Georgia
Germany	29.6	1.3	20.8	13.7	...	38.5	25.7
Hungary	176.4	0.6	10.5	44.5	52.8	19.3	27.3	0.0	25.1	0.0	...
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro	66.4
Netherlands	65.1	1.3	8.2	27.9	95.3	18.0	...	66.6	45.9	31.8	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	35.3	...	1.2	5.9	100.0	63.2	52.2	...	29.1	...	0.5
Portugal	32.4	...	17.0	5.5	97.3	49.6	59.2	...	26.9	...	1.0
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	61.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	100.0	49.7	6.7	...	49.9	...	0.3
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland	1.8	...	36.9	0.7	100.0	25.5	36.9	10.9	0.0
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	49.4	1.2	8.8	12.9	91.9	36.0	25.9	22.2	39.8	20.3	0.7
Median	35.2	0.9	1.8	5.7	98.6	38.5	16.0	11.1	36.9	14.7	0.4
Minimum	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.1	52.8	0.0	6.7	0.0	25.1	0.0	0.0
Maximum	176.4	4.2	36.9	44.5	100.0	63.2	59.2	66.6	67.1	44.0	3.3

Table 3.2.3.13 Total persons receiving sanctions/asures in 2015 – Theft of a motor vehicle

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admission only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % other measures
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % partially suspended	
Armenia	0.1	...	0.0	0.0	...	50.0	...	50.0
Finland	5.9	0.0	53.6	3.7	75.0	17.1	25.5	0.0	21.2	4.4
Hungary	6.8	0.3	15.2	49.5	34.8	20.0	28.6	0.0	15.0	0.0
Portugal	0.9	...	52.3	6.8	83.3	17.0	33.3	...	19.3	4.5
Serbia	2.8	0.0	10.1	2.0	100.0	48.7	5.2	...	39.2	0.0
Sweden	3.2	0.0	2.2	17.1	0.0	15.9	...	6.0	14.9	49.8
Ukraine	5.7	...	2.9	33.6	...
UK: England & Wales	6.2	...	11.8	56.8	...	8.5	14.1	20.5
UK: Scotland	5.5	8.1	20.9	37.5	86.5	31.4	...
<i>Mean</i>	4.1	1.7	18.8	21.7	63.3	25.3	23.1	2.0	26.5	13.2
<i>Median</i>	5.5	0.0	11.8	12.0	79.2	17.1	27.0	0.0	21.2	4.5
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.5	5.2	0.0	14.1	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	6.8	8.1	53.6	56.8	100.0	50.0	33.3	6.0	50.0	49.8

Table 3.2.3.14 Total persons receiving sanctions/asures in 2015 – Theft by means of burglary

Austria	12.3	...	4.5	39.4	50.7	46.9	5.3
Croatia	32.7	4.3	0.0	5.4	...	55.3	8.8	18.8	35.0	14.3	...
Germany	15.2	1.6	17.5	16.7	...	38.5	25.6
Hungary	32.2	0.5	6.8	43.9	56.0	17.9	40.6	0.0	30.8	0.0	0.0
Poland	35.3	...	1.2	5.9	100.0	63.2	52.2	...	29.1	...	0.5
Portugal	2.1	...	7.0	5.6	100.0	47.2	67.3	...	38.3	...	1.9
Ukraine	32.3	...	0.6	33.8
UK: England & Wales	26.5	...	1.6	22.6	...	16.8	55.3	...	5.3
UK: Scotland	15.9	4.1	2.9	30.6	74.3	62.1
<i>Mean</i>	22.7	2.6	4.7	18.7	82.6	39.8	42.2	9.4	40.1	20.4	2.6
<i>Median</i>	26.5	2.9	2.9	16.7	87.2	39.4	46.4	9.4	35.0	14.3	1.9
<i>Minimum</i>	2.1	0.5	0.0	5.4	56.0	16.8	8.8	0.0	25.6	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	35.3	4.3	17.5	43.9	100.0	63.2	67.3	18.8	62.1	46.9	5.3

Table 3.2.3.15 Total persons receiving sanctions/asures in 2015 – Theft by means of domestic burglary

Germany	3.5	1.9	5.4	14.8	...	44.6	33.3
Hungary	1.9	2.6	7.9	54.5	41.3	13.6	34.6	0.0	21.5	0.0	0.0
Portugal	2.1	...	4.6	6.9	66.7	42.7	75.0	...	42.7	...	3.1
UK: England & Wales	14.9	...	0.5	17.5	...	15.7	64.1	...	2.6

Table 3.2.3.17 Total persons receiving sanctions/asures in 2015 – Cyber fraud

Hungary	3.9	1.3	17.1	34.9	32.3	24.1	21.7	0.0	22.6	0.0	0.0
Portugal	1.9	...	49.7	33.3	44.6	...	14.9	...	1.5
Serbia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	50.0	0.0	...	50.0	...	0.0
Switzerland	1.7	...	87.0	2.9	100.0	3.6	6.5	11.1	0.0

Table 3.2.3.16 Total persons receiving sanctions/ measures in 2015 – Fraud

	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures				
	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
Albania
Armenia	1.7	...	0.0	0.0	...	10.0	0.0	0.0	90.0	0.0	0.0
Austria	26.3	...	21.1	44.4	28.6	35.8	5.9
Azerbaijan
Belgium	20.6	...	2.6	17.2	100.0	37.1	7.0	...	40.4	...	2.8
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	7.8	0.0	1.8	9.3	0.0	60.6	28.3	0.0	0.0
Croatia	21.1	0.1	1.8	0.4	...	73.2	18.5	7.0	24.4	13.8	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	30.7	2.8	0.6	4.5	97.3	80.2	7.6	...	11.7
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	83.7	0.0	69.9	2.2	97.0	20.4	4.1	1.9	6.1	...	1.3
France	12.5	1.0	11.4	10.0	31.0	46.3	0.2	...	31.3	18.9	...
Georgia	12.2	...	5.7	44.1	50.2
Germany	111.8	1.9	81.2	2.7	...	11.0	3.2
Hungary	39.5	1.1	18.9	24.7	48.6	36.4	7.4	0.0	18.8	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	44.4	0.2
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	5.0	...	15.8	34.7	97.6	16.2	...	57.7	33.4	38.9	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	67.0	...	7.6	5.9	100.0	72.5	18.6	...	13.9	...	0.2
Portugal	11.1	...	42.9	0.9	100.0	37.4	39.5	...	17.9	...	0.9
Romania	0.0	0.0	...
Russian Federation
Serbia	10.3	0.0	4.2	0.3	100.0	65.8	7.3	...	29.2	...	0.4
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	12.4	0.0	8.4	13.0	16.5	37.4	...	9.3	22.0	1.5	19.1
Switzerland	17.5	...	85.5	3.6	98.1	5.7	5.2	13.3	0.0
Turkey	82.7	...	33.3	23.1	...	3.4	29.9	...	10.3
Ukraine	5.9	...	34.8	17.4
UK: England & Wales	20.4	...	11.2	33.2	...	11.9	18.8	...	36.2
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	10.1	9.6	23.0	31.3	90.0	30.3
Mean	29.8	1.7	22.9	12.1	69.7	37.6	11.0	12.6	26.2	12.2	5.1
Median	18.9	0.6	11.4	7.6	97.1	37.4	7.3	4.5	24.4	7.4	0.4
Minimum	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0
Maximum	111.8	9.6	85.5	34.7	100.0	80.2	39.5	57.7	90.0	38.9	36.2

Table 3.2.3.18 Total persons receiving sanctions/asures in 2015 – Forgery of documents

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only		of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures	
		of which: % verdict	of which: % admonition only	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
Albania
Armenia
Austria	9.5	...	19.3	0.0	5.5	8.9	1.6
Azerbaijan
Belgium	14.7	...	3.5	15.3	100.0	39.2	2.6	...	35.4	...	6.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	18.4	0.0	0.5	0.5	...	88.9	0.4	5.6	10.0	3.8	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	3.1	0.9	3.0	31.2	12.6	51.5	3.5	...	13.3	...	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	14.2	0.0	78.6	1.4	90.9	10.3	1.3	2.5	8.3	...	1.4
France	7.0	2.0	22.4	9.5	24.5	48.9	0.1	...	17.2	10.1	...
Georgia	3.1
Germany	19.5	1.4	77.9	4.3	...	12.3	4.2
Hungary	66.1	3.6	28.0	39.0	30.1	21.1	5.7	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	29.3	0.0
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	9.3	...	6.2	24.9	98.7	20.5	...	67.1	48.4	24.3	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	15.7	...	46.1	8.2	100.0	42.2	8.6	...	3.6	...	0.0
Portugal	7.7	2.4	74.1	1.8	100.0	14.9	26.3	...	5.9	...	0.9
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	15.3	0.1	1.6	11.8	97.7	70.0	2.6	...	16.3	...	0.2
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	7.4	0.0	6.7	7.9	8.8	60.4	...	2.1	17.5	1.6	7.5
Switzerland	9.9	...	94.9	2.1	100.0	0.2	2.8	4.3	0.0
Turkey	36.9	...	4.7	32.4	...	6.4	42.1	...	14.5
Ukraine	2.3	...	57.6	1.0
UK: England & Wales	1.0	...	7.6	11.4	...	13.8	20.4	...	54.4
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	15.3	1.2	31.3	13.4	69.4	31.3	5.7	15.5	15.3	7.6	6.2
Median	9.9	0.9	19.3	9.5	97.7	20.8	2.6	2.5	10.0	4.3	0.5
Minimum	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	8.8	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	66.1	3.6	94.9	39.0	100.0	88.9	26.3	67.1	48.4	24.3	54.4

Table 3.2.3.19 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Money laundering

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.			of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
	Total	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures	
Albania	
Armenia	
Austria	0.4	...	6.5	58.1	25.8	50.0	9.7	
Azerbaijan	
Belgium	5.5	...	20.8	11.5	100.0	31.3	1.6	...	33.1	...	3.2	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	
Bulgaria	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	78.3	21.7	...	0.0	
Croatia	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	87.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	100.0	...	
Cyprus	
Czech Republic	0.6	0.0	0.0	1.5	100.0	80.6	11.1	...	16.4	...	3.0	
Denmark	
Estonia	
Finland	1.8	0.0	2.1	5.2	100.0	83.3	2.5	1.3	20.8	...	2.1	
France	
Georgia	
Germany	1.0	7.9	70.4	2.0	...	17.7	2.0	
Hungary	0.2	6.7	13.3	26.7	50.0	46.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	
Iceland	
Italy	
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	
Latvia	
Lithuania	0.7	0.0	
Luxembourg	
Moldova	
Montenegro	
Netherlands	2.4	...	6.5	31.1	99.2	21.8	...	67.8	40.6	32.7	...	
North Macedonia	
Norway	
Poland	0.3	...	1.7	4.2	100.0	89.2	25.2	...	10.8	...	0.0	
Portugal	0.3	79.4	44.4	...	20.6	
Romania	
Russian Federation	
Serbia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	100.0	0.0	...	0.0	...	0.0	
Slovak Republic	
Slovenia	
Spain	
Sweden	1.7	0.0	8.0	15.4	8.0	42.0	...	8.8	24.7	0.0	9.9	
Switzerland	0.9	...	84.2	5.3	25.0	7.9	2.6	0.0	0.0	
Turkey	0.1	...	21.5	26.2	...	4.6	35.4	...	12.3	
Ukraine	0.0	...	0.0	40.0	...	0.0	
UK: England & Wales	1.9	...	5.4	22.4	...	36.3	43.8	...	0.0	
UK: Northern Ireland	
UK: Scotland	
Mean	1.0	1.8	15.0	10.8	72.8	54.0	10.6	15.6	21.0	30.5	2.9	
Median	0.5	0.0	5.9	5.2	99.6	52.4	2.0	1.3	20.8	16.4	0.0	
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Maximum	5.5	7.9	84.2	31.1	100.0	100.0	44.4	67.8	43.8	100.0	12.3	

Table 3.2.3.20 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Corruption in the public sector

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % partially suspended	
Albania
Armenia
Austria	1.5	...	10.7	64.9	...	6.9	66.7	17.6
Azerbaijan
Belgium	0.5	...	8.9	5.4	100.0	66.1	0.0	8.9	...	10.7
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	1.1	...	0.0	24.4	...	69.2	...	6.4	...	0.0
Croatia	5.1	0.9	0.9	0.0	...	59.1	4.7	42.5	39.1	13.1
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.9	0.0	12.6	0.0	...	73.7	5.7	12.6	...	1.1
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	0.1	0.0	33.3	0.0	...	66.7	0.0	0.0	...	0.0
France	0.3	2.0	13.6	23.6	27.7	15.1	0.0	36.2	4.2	...
Georgia	3.7	...	11.6	39.1	...	49.3	0.0	...
Germany	0.2	4.5	51.4	3.4	...	33.0	...	7.8
Hungary	1.8	22.2	15.3	9.1	18.8	37.5	0.0	15.9	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	26.8	0.4
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	0.0
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	4.6	...	6.9	0.4	100.0	86.9	7.8	5.8	...	0.1
Portugal	0.3	...	19.4	61.1	40.9	16.7
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.2	0.0	4.8	0.0	...	59.0	32.7	32.5	...	3.6
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	0.1	0.0	36.4	0.0	...	63.6	14.3	0.0	...	0.0
Switzerland	0.6	...	100.0	0.0	...	0.0	...	0.0	...	0.0
Turkey	1.1	...	3.1	32.6	...	2.1	...	41.5	...	20.7
Ukraine	0.9	...	47.6	15.8
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	2.7	3.7	22.2	7.6	61.6	49.8	10.2	17.4	16.8	4.5
<i>Median</i>	0.9	0.5	12.6	0.4	63.8	60.1	4.7	12.6	4.2	0.2
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	26.8	22.2	100.0	32.6	100.0	86.9	40.9	49.3	66.7	20.7

Table 3.2.3.21 Total persons receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Drug offences: Total

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict/ admonition only		of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
		of which: % verdict/ admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service		Total	of which: % with supervision		Total	of which: % partially suspended	
					of which: % community service	of which: % with supervision		of which: % with community service	of which: % partially suspended		of which: % other measures	
Albania
Armenia
Austria	51.5	...	23.7	32.5	39.5	37.7	4.3
Azerbaijan
Belgium	53.9	...	3.5	20.9	100.0	42.5	33.4	32.7	...	0.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	21.8	...	16.8	2.7	...	56.2	23.8	0.5
Croatia	16.4	2.2	0.1	4.9	...	44.2	8.8	41.2	48.6	22.6
Cyprus
Czech Republic	25.7	1.3	1.1	6.1	85.4	66.5	17.1	...	25.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	172.7	0.0	80.5	1.0	91.4	11.3	6.3	3.4	6.6	0.6
France	95.0	0.3	37.8	13.0	21.1	23.2	0.4	...	25.7	25.3
Georgia	110.2	...	27.8	48.6	20.7
Germany	69.6	1.1	60.0	13.1	...	17.6	8.2
Hungary	13.6	1.4	9.5	40.9	60.3	24.5	17.4	0.0	23.6	0.0	0.0	...
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	62.3	0.5
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	35.1	...	13.4	30.3	98.9	16.8	...	68.6	39.4	41.0
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	43.2	...	25.1	13.0	100.0	50.6	43.9	...	11.1	0.2
Portugal	38.3	0.6	23.8	3.5	100.0	44.0	63.8	...	27.4	0.7
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	41.3	0.0	16.6	1.7	98.0	41.8	7.2	...	38.4	1.4
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	231.7	0.0	63.3	3.8	20.9	3.2	...	56.6	6.4	1.5	23.3	...
Switzerland	50.3	...	65.7	3.6	99.3	13.8	16.9	25.5	0.0	...
Turkey	123.0	...	26.0	20.9	...	4.5	27.1	21.5
Ukraine	26.4	...	30.2	20.4
UK: England & Wales	79.9	...	35.6	14.5	...	12.3	18.6	19.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	133.1	17.7	47.7	20.5	84.0	14.1
Mean	71.2	2.5	30.4	12.6	80.0	30.8	22.0	33.9	23.7	21.9	5.2	...
Median	51.5	0.8	25.5	13.0	94.7	28.5	17.1	41.2	23.7	25.3	0.6	...
Minimum	13.6	0.0	0.1	1.0	20.9	3.2	0.4	0.0	6.4	0.0	0.0	...
Maximum	231.7	17.7	80.5	40.9	100.0	66.5	63.8	68.6	48.6	41.0	23.3	...

Table 3.2.3.22 Total persons receiving sanctions/asures in 2015 –Drug trafficking

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % admonition only		of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
		of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
Albania	
Armenia	1.5	...	4.3	0.0	...	4.3	0.0	0.0	95.7	0.0	0.0
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	16.4	2.2	0.1	4.9	...	44.2	8.8	41.2	48.6	22.6	...
Cyprus
Czech Republic	19.9	1.4	0.6	4.8	88.1	65.4	19.1	...	26.1	...	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	65.1	0.0	49.1	2.6	91.4	30.1	6.3	3.4	17.5	...	0.7
France	49.3	0.3	5.8	12.3	29.8	37.6	0.0	...	44.1	27.8	...
Georgia	3.2	100.0
Germany	11.0	1.1	3.5	2.9	...	59.1	33.5
Hungary	4.6	0.0	10.7	15.1	42.6	31.6	19.7	0.0	42.7	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	18.4	0.4
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	4.7	...	8.0	1.7	100.0	53.0	46.2	...	37.1	...	0.2
Portugal	29.4	0.1	5.2	3.4	100.0	54.8	64.1	...	35.7	...	0.8
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	11.9	0.0	0.0	1.1	100.0	13.9	33.1	...	81.9	...	3.1
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	25.8	0.0	34.4	13.0	24.7	13.1	...	60.5	32.3	1.6	7.1
Switzerland	23.2	...	56.3	1.4	100.0	19.7	22.7	31.1	0.0
Turkey	69.3	...	32.2	25.7	...	0.4	33.1	...	8.7
Ukraine	3.7	...	0.5	61.0
UK: England & Wales	0.9	...	4.7	2.7	...	8.8	82.5	...	5.9
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	21.1	0.6	14.4	6.5	75.2	31.1	21.9	21.0	49.7	13.8	2.2
Median	16.4	0.1	5.2	3.1	91.4	30.8	19.1	3.4	39.9	12.1	0.5
Minimum	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.7	0.4	0.0	0.0	17.5	0.0	0.0
Maximum	69.3	2.2	56.3	25.7	100.0	65.4	64.1	60.5	100.0	31.1	8.7

3.2.4 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015

Table 3.2.4.1 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Criminal offences: Total

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % other measures	
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % partially suspended		
Albania	
Armenia	2.7	61.3	0.0	0.0	66.3	0.0	33.8
Austria	16.5	...	22.0	52.9	22.0	59.2	3.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium	2.2	...	69.8	22.2	100.0	4.0	0.0	...	4.0	...	0.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	17.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	46.3	0.0	18.4
Croatia	9.9	38.1	...	36.9	0.0	10.7	44.4	...	14.3	...	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	13.3	15.0	0.0	19.2	97.4	60.0	13.3	...	5.4	...	0.4
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	159.6	0.0	93.1	0.1	100.0	5.3	52.7	5.0	0.4	...	1.2
France	67.3	2.7	3.1	57.9	...	25.8	10.5	31.1	...
Georgia	7.8	70.2	29.8
Germany	82.6	2.6	...	81.7	...	9.5	100.0	...	6.2
Hungary	46.1	1.7	1.5	66.5	30.8	19.3	84.9	0.0	11.0	0.0	0.0
Iceland	6.4	47.6	52.4	76.2	...	42.9	0.0
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	23.5	...	0.0	80.7	66.2	19.3
Lithuania	38.9	5.6	4.1	72.1	2.7	13.0	...	0.0	27.3	...	21.0
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	27.3	...	3.2	75.0	98.1	8.3	...	73.4	13.5	61.8	...
North Macedonia
Norway	75.0	39.7	0.3	6.2	0.6	...	1.2
Poland	32.2	91.8	...	1.1	7.1
Portugal	11.0	1.4	46.2	7.9	95.6	35.7	94.3	...	6.9	...	1.8
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	27.1	99.5	0.5
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	49.6
Sweden	195.4	0.0	47.1	3.6	18.1	5.9	...	31.6	3.0	9.2	40.4
Switzerland	191.1	21.5	15.2	56.2	61.4	3.2	2.0	18.5	0.0
Turkey	136.0	...	47.5	2.6	...	8.8	29.3	...	11.7
Ukraine	10.7	...	8.4	13.4
UK: England & Wales	168.3	...	10.7	65.7	...	0.0	6.0	...	28.3
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	56.7	13.5	23.6	48.2	60.9	22.2	48.7	18.3	14.4	22.5	10.7
Median	27.3	2.7	9.6	57.9	66.2	10.1	48.6	2.5	8.8	13.9	1.8
Minimum	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	195.4	47.6	93.1	99.5	100.0	70.2	100.0	73.4	66.3	61.8	40.4

Table 3.2.4.2 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Major road traffic offences

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.			of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
Albania
Armenia	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	...	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.6	0.0	0.0	43.9	0.0	41.5	0.0	14.6
Croatia	0.1	66.7	...	33.3	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	...	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.4	10.8	0.0	0.0	...	64.9	16.7	...	2.7	21.6
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	77.2	0.0	98.1	0.0	100.0	1.6	41.2	0.0	0.0	0.2
France	2.4	3.3	6.4	73.4	...	11.3	0.0	...	5.6	7.8
Georgia
Germany	6.5	0.9	...	95.2	...	2.6	100.0	...	1.4	...
Hungary	1.5	0.7	4.0	80.1	16.5	13.2	75.0	0.0	2.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	0.0
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	44.7	52.0	97.5	3.3	...	0.0	0.0	...
North Macedonia	0.9
Norway	24.1
Poland	0.5	98.0	...	0.5	1.5	...
Portugal	1.1	5.4	85.7	3.6	75.0	3.6	75.0
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.4	96.6	3.4	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	29.1	0.1	81.9	1.6	33.3	2.6	...	91.8	1.0	0.0
Switzerland
Turkey	0.3	...	78.1	1.3	...	3.1	9.8	7.6
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	0.3	...	2.7	77.5	...	0.0	17.6	4.8
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	8.6	9.8	36.5	43.8	46.0	15.9	44.0	18.4	6.2	1.9
Median	0.6	0.9	6.4	43.9	33.3	3.1	41.2	0.0	1.8	0.0
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	77.2	66.7	98.1	98.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	91.8	41.5	7.8

Table 3.2.4.3 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Intentional homicide: Total

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures			
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures	
											of which: % with community service
Albania	
Armenia	0.0	
Austria	0.1	...	0.0	0.0	100.0	16.7	0.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium	0.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Croatia	0.0	0.0	...	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	100.0	...	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	50.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	...	0.0
France	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	4.3	0.0	...	95.7	15.6	...
Georgia	0.2	85.7
Germany	0.1	0.0	...	2.0	...	10.0	100.0	...	88.0
Hungary	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	14.3	100.0	0.0	85.7	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	0.4
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	0.0	25.9	60.0	19.0	...	81.8	53.4	38.7	...
North Macedonia	0.3
Norway
Poland	0.0	11.1	...	33.3	55.6
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.1	80.0	20.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	73.9	0.0	26.1
Switzerland
Turkey	0.9	...	0.4	7.1	...	3.6	81.3	...	7.6
Ukraine	0.1	97.5
UK: England & Wales	0.1	...	0.0	42.6	...	0.0	55.3
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	0.2	0.0	0.0	20.7	30.0	11.2	75.0	43.9	71.4	11.8	4.2
Median	0.1	0.0	0.0	2.0	30.0	3.9	100.0	50.0	83.5	7.8	0.0
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	0.9	0.0	0.4	100.0	60.0	50.0	100.0	81.8	100.0	38.7	26.1

Table 3.2.4.4 Minors receiving sanctions/ measures in 2015 – Intentional homicide: Completed

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only		of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
		of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
Austria	0.0	100.0
Finland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	..	0.0	100.0	..	0.0
France	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	..	0.0	100.0	19.0	..
Hungary	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	..	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Serbia	0.1
UK: England & Wales	0.0	..	0.0	0.0	..	0.0	100.0	..	0.0

Table 3.2.4.5 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Bodily injury

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures			
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
Albania
Armenia	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	60.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0
Austria	3.3	...	41.5	49.3	7.4	42.9	1.8
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.0
Croatia	0.8	54.3	...	31.4	0.0	8.6	33.3	...	5.7	...	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.4	17.8	0.0	15.8	100.0	63.8	13.4	...	2.6	...	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	8.8	0.0	73.8	0.6	100.0	19.4	53.8	1.1	1.0	...	5.2
France	10.2	3.0	1.1	59.9	...	26.6	9.4	36.9	...
Georgia
Germany	16.1	3.4	...	77.8	...	11.6	100.0	...	7.2
Hungary	8.8	1.3	1.9	61.7	31.3	24.9	84.7	0.0	10.3	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	4.1
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	1.2	85.9	98.6	7.1	...	65.4	5.7	66.7	...
North Macedonia	4.3
Norway
Poland	5.2	93.0	...	0.9	6.1
Portugal	1.5	...	64.2	9.9	100.0	19.9	83.3	...	2.0	...	2.6
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	2.2	100.0	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	15.1	0.1	9.9	10.1	23.5	20.9	...	56.3	4.9	19.4	54.1
Switzerland
Turkey	12.7	...	70.5	2.2	...	6.7	9.6	...	10.9
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	8.9	...	0.7	76.4	...	0.0	18.2	...	5.5
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	6.5	10.0	24.1	44.6	56.7	22.8	52.6	24.6	8.7	27.6	8.0
Median	4.8	2.1	1.9	45.7	65.0	19.6	53.8	1.1	6.1	28.1	2.2
Minimum	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	16.1	54.3	73.8	100.0	100.0	63.8	100.0	65.4	40.0	66.7	54.1

Table 3.2.4.6 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Aggravated bodily injury

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % admonition only		of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures	
		of which: % verdict	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % partially suspended
Albania
Armenia	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	60.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
Austria	1.4	...	14.7	71.6	...	12.9	60.0
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	0.5	57.1	...	19.0	0.0	14.3	33.3	9.5	...
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	42.9	33.3	57.1	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	0.3	0.0	0.0	5.3	100.0	84.2	50.0	10.5	0.0
France	1.4	1.4	0.7	44.8	...	34.8	...	18.3	59.8
Georgia	0.1	80.0	...
Germany	7.5	4.1	...	71.1	...	15.5	100.0	9.2	...
Hungary	4.3	0.0	1.2	56.8	34.9	27.2	82.5	14.8	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	0.3
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	0.0	62.4	98.7	19.2	...	87.5	17.6
North Macedonia	0.7
Norway
Poland	0.1	75.7	...	5.4	...	18.9	...
Portugal	0.4	...	31.0	23.8	100.0	38.1	87.5	7.1	...
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.1	100.0	0.0	...
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	1.3	0.0	0.0	14.6	21.1	7.7	...	90.0	32.3
Switzerland
Turkey	0.1	...	49.2	5.1	...	8.5	...	27.1	10.2
Ukraine	0.1	...	2.1	46.8	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	1.2	7.8	9.0	36.8	59.1	33.0	55.2	36.8	25.1
Median	0.4	0.0	0.7	23.8	66.8	27.2	50.0	6.3	17.9
Minimum	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	7.5	57.1	49.2	100.0	100.0	84.2	100.0	90.0	80.0

Table 3.2.4.7 Minors receiving sanctions/ measures in 2015 – Sexual assault

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % with community service		
Albania
Armenia
Austria	0.3	...	0.0	63.3	30.0	66.7	6.7
Azerbaijan
Belgium	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	...	100.0	0.0	...	0.0	...	0.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.2	...	0.0	38.9	61.1	0.0	0.0
Croatia	0.2	37.5	...	0.0	...	37.5	100.0	...	25.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.2	11.9	0.0	0.8	100.0	81.0	9.8	...	4.8	...	1.6
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	0.7	0.0	7.7	0.0	...	76.9	43.3	23.3	12.8	...	2.6
France	2.5	1.3	0.1	41.5	...	43.0	14.0	61.9	...
Georgia
Germany	0.8	7.5	...	48.6	...	31.1	100.0	...	12.8
Hungary	0.5	0.0	0.0	21.3	0.0	31.9	80.0	0.0	46.8	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	1.3
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	0.0	40.9	80.6	26.1	...	65.2	33.0	51.7	...
North Macedonia	0.5
Norway	1.0
Poland	0.5	84.7	...	3.9	11.3
Portugal	0.1	78.6	90.9
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.2	100.0	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	1.2	0.0	0.0	9.9	50.0	13.2	...	87.5	31.4	5.3	45.5
Switzerland
Turkey	3.1	...	2.2	5.9	...	6.6	76.9	...	8.4
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	1.0	...	3.8	72.7	...	0.0	18.4	...	8.9
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	0.9	8.3	1.3	33.2	57.6	42.4	60.6	44.0	25.2	30.9	8.2
Median	0.6	1.3	0.0	30.1	65.3	34.7	80.0	44.3	18.4	28.5	2.6
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	3.1	37.5	7.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	87.5	76.9	66.7	45.5

Table 3.2.4.9 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Sexual abuse of a child

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.			of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
	Total	of which: % verdict/admition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures	
Albania	
Armenia	
Austria	0.2	...	0.0	82.4	11.8	0.0	5.9	
Azerbaijan	
Belgium	0.0	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	
Bulgaria	
Croatia	0.0	100.0	...	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	
Cyprus	
Czech Republic	1.1	13.5	0.0	0.0	...	82.0	8.8	...	3.6	...	0.0	
Denmark	
Estonia	
Finland	0.4	0.0	12.5	0.0	...	66.7	37.5	25.0	16.7	...	4.2	
France	1.4	1.4	0.0	39.4	...	47.6	11.6	70.3	...	
Georgia	
Germany	0.5	8.8	...	62.7	...	22.9	100.0	...	5.6	
Hungary	0.1	0.0	0.0	88.9	0.0	11.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	
Iceland	
Italy	
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	
Latvia	
Lithuania	0.1	
Luxembourg	
Moldova	
Montenegro	
Netherlands	0.0	
North Macedonia	0.0	
Norway	
Poland	0.4	91.4	...	2.6	6.0	
Portugal	0.1	90.9	100.0	
Romania	
Russian Federation	
Serbia	0.0	100.0	0.0	
Slovak Republic	
Slovenia	
Spain	
Sweden	0.5	0.0	0.0	17.4	50.0	26.1	...	83.3	2.2	0.0	54.3	
Switzerland	
Turkey	
Ukraine	
UK: England & Wales	0.4	...	0.0	100.0	...	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	
UK: Northern Ireland	
UK: Scotland	
Mean	0.3	17.7	1.8	50.0	25.0	39.3	69.3	36.1	5.2	23.4	10.7	
Median	0.2	1.4	0.0	51.0	25.0	26.1	100.0	25.0	3.6	0.0	2.1	
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Maximum	1.4	100.0	12.5	100.0	50.0	90.9	100.0	83.3	16.7	70.3	54.3	

Table 3.2.4.10 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Robbery

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % other measures	
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % partially suspended		
Albania	
Armenia	0.1	...	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	...	0.0	...	100.0	
Austria	2.9	...	1.2	52.8	...	40.8	59.8	5.2	
Azerbaijan	
Belgium	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	...	100.0	...	0.0	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	
Bulgaria	1.5	29.9	54.2	...	15.9	
Croatia	0.9	10.8	...	24.3	...	27.0	50.0	37.8	
Cyprus	
Czech Republic	1.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	...	78.7	26.2	18.4	...	1.5	
Denmark	
Estonia	
Finland	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.9	100.0	85.2	67.3	7.1	12.2	1.7	
France	1.6	
Georgia	1.2	32.6	
Germany	4.3	7.1	...	37.1	...	30.8	100.0	24.9	
Hungary	3.6	0.0	0.0	3.1	27.3	35.9	86.5	0.0	61.0	0.0	
Iceland	
Italy	
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	
Latvia	
Lithuania	7.9	
Luxembourg	
Moldova	
Montenegro	
Netherlands	0.0	38.7	94.2	14.7	...	82.4	46.5	74.7	
North Macedonia	3.4	
Norway	
Poland	1.2	64.6	...	11.1	...	24.2	
Portugal	3.2	...	6.0	8.4	96.4	69.3	91.3	15.1	...	1.2	
Romania	
Russian Federation	
Serbia	2.3	99.4	0.6	
Slovak Republic	
Slovenia	
Spain	
Sweden	3.3	0.0	0.0	11.7	44.7	3.1	...	80.0	38.2	19.4	47.1
Switzerland	
Turkey	4.6	...	2.2	3.7	...	18.7	...	62.0	...	13.4	
Ukraine	1.1	...	5.6	17.6	
UK: England & Wales	7.1	...	0.5	71.3	...	0.0	...	26.4	...	2.3	
UK: Northern Ireland	
UK: Scotland	
Mean	2.7	3.2	1.3	26.2	72.5	30.5	70.2	42.4	34.0	38.5	17.1
Median	2.2	0.7	0.0	11.7	94.2	22.9	76.9	43.6	29.5	39.6	2.3
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	0.0	26.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	7.9	10.8	6.0	99.4	100.0	85.2	100.0	82.4	100.0	74.7	100.0

Table 3.2.4.11 Minors receiving sanctions/ measures in 2015 – Theft

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.			of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
	Total	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % community service		of which: % with supervision		Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
				Total	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % with community service			
Albania
Armenia	1.5	...	0.0	0.0	...	73.9	0.0	8.7	0.0	17.4
Austria	6.0	...	17.0	56.4	...	23.8	66.4	2.7
Azerbaijan
Belgium	0.1	...	0.0	0.0	...	60.0	0.0	40.0	...	0.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	10.5	...	0.0	39.2	39.8	...	21.0
Croatia	5.0	36.5	...	41.7	...	5.7	33.3	16.1	...	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	5.0	14.1	0.0	24.1	100.0	55.3	14.9	6.3	...	0.4
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	39.3	0.0	96.0	0.0	100.0	3.3	52.1	0.1	...	0.5
France	29.9	2.4	2.4	56.1	...	27.3	...	11.9	26.6	...
Georgia	3.8	26.1
Germany	20.3	2.8	...	81.9	...	8.6	100.0	6.6
Hungary	22.5	1.4	1.0	68.1	37.1	18.3	86.5	11.1	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	20.8
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	1.6	77.4	98.4	8.9	...	65.4	12.1	50.3
North Macedonia	7.1
Norway	9.5
Poland	4.8	84.1	...	1.7	...	14.2
Portugal	2.6	1.5	43.1	9.9	92.6	38.3	71.4	5.5	...	1.8
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	12.3	99.5	0.5
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	49.6	0.0	22.9	4.1	5.6	9.4	...	2.6	2.8	60.8
Switzerland
Turkey	48.3	...	32.7	2.6	...	11.9	...	40.5	...	12.3
Ukraine	6.7	...	8.5	10.1
UK: England & Wales	39.1	...	3.3	77.5	...	0.0	...	7.4	...	15.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	16.4	7.3	16.3	41.6	72.3	25.3	44.8	14.7	14.9	11.0
Median	9.5	1.9	2.8	40.4	95.5	11.9	42.7	2.6	11.1	2.3
Minimum	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Maximum	49.6	36.5	96.0	99.5	100.0	73.9	100.0	65.4	40.5	60.8

Table 3.2.4.12 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Aggravated theft

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.			of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
	Total	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures	
Austria	4.4	...	8.4	59.8	29.9	71.1	1.8	
Belgium	0.1	...	0.0	0.0	...	62.5	0.0	...	37.5	...	0.0	
Croatia	3.8	38.4	...	39.6	...	6.3	40.0	...	15.7	...	0.0	
Finland	0.5	0.0	3.4	0.0	...	89.7	38.5	15.4	6.9	...	0.0	
Germany	6.3	5.1	...	64.5	...	17.1	100.0	...	13.2	
Hungary	22.5	1.4	1.0	68.1	37.1	18.3	86.5	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	
Netherlands	5.2	...	1.0	73.9	98.0	10.0	...	65.9	15.1	50.8	...	
Poland	2.0	80.6	...	2.7	16.8	
Portugal	1.9	...	25.3	12.9	92.0	52.6	71.6	...	6.7	...	2.1	
Serbia	8.1	99.3	0.7	
Mean	5.5	11.2	6.5	48.8	75.7	35.4	56.1	27.1	15.4	40.6	0.6	
Median	4.1	3.3	2.2	64.5	92.0	18.3	55.8	15.4	14.1	50.8	0.0	
Minimum	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.1	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	
Maximum	22.5	38.4	25.3	99.3	98.0	89.7	100.0	65.9	37.5	71.1	2.1	

Table 3.2.4.13 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Theft of a motor vehicle

Bulgaria	0.6	...	0.0	34.1	53.7	...	12.2
Finland	1.0	0.0	87.5	0.0	...	10.7	50.0	0.0	0.0	...	1.8
Hungary	0.7	0.0	3.0	56.7	47.4	31.3	90.5	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0
Portugal	0.1	...	66.7	20.0
Serbia	0.5	100.0	0.0
Sweden	1.7	0.0	3.7	12.3	0.0	11.0	...	11.1	0.6	0.0	72.4
Ukraine	1.2	...	1.8	17.8
UK: England & Wales	1.4	...	9.2	82.8	...	0.0	4.8	...	12.4

Table 3.2.4.14 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Theft by means of burglary

Austria	2.1	...	12.6	65.6	19.7	66.7	2.2
Croatia	3.5	39.9	...	39.2	...	5.4	25.0	...	15.5
Germany	4.0	5.5	...	64.1	...	16.9	100.0	...	13.5
Hungary	6.5	0.9	0.5	63.6	44.0	20.9	90.3	0.0	14.1	0.0	0.0
Poland	2.0	80.6	...	2.7	16.8
Portugal	0.2	...	22.2	16.7	...	50.0	55.6
UK: England & Wales	2.9	...	0.3	79.4	...	0.0	13.7	...	6.9

Table 3.2.4.15 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Theft by means of domestic burglary

Germany	0.9	6.3	...	54.0	...	22.2	100.0	...	17.6
Hungary	0.5	1.9	0.0	75.9	39.0	9.3	100.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	0.0
Portugal	0.1	50.0	60.0
UK: England & Wales	1.7	...	0.2	76.4	...	0.0	18.5

Table 3.2.4.16 Minors receiving sanctions/ measures in 2015 – Fraud

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
			of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
Albania
Armenia	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	...	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Austria	0.5	...	44.4	40.0	11.1	60.0	4.4
Azerbaijan
Belgium	0.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.1	...	0.0	20.0	80.0	...	0.0
Croatia	0.1	0.0	...	66.7	...	33.3	0.0	...	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.2	26.1	0.0	0.0	...	56.5	7.7	...	4.3	...	13.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	1.9	0.0	88.6	0.0	...	9.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	...	1.9
France	0.4	2.3	3.1	67.0	...	20.7	0.0	...	6.9	5.6	...
Georgia	0.2	33.3
Germany	3.8	4.1	...	80.3	...	10.3	100.0	...	5.3
Hungary	0.8	1.2	6.2	58.0	25.5	23.5	89.5	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	1.6
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	0.0	80.0	93.8	0.0	0.0
North Macedonia	0.1
Norway
Poland	0.2	90.4	...	2.4	7.2
Portugal	0.1	...	100.0
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.2	100.0	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	1.7	0.0	14.1	14.7	12.5	20.2	...	15.2	4.9	25.0	46.0
Switzerland
Turkey	0.5	...	51.5	2.2	...	10.1	19.5	...	16.7
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	0.7	...	3.7	81.5	...	0.0	3.5	...	15.1
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	0.7	4.8	26.0	47.2	43.9	25.1	35.3	3.8	11.7	22.6	10.8
Median	0.2	1.2	4.9	62.3	25.5	20.2	7.7	0.0	5.1	15.3	4.4
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	3.8	26.1	100.0	100.0	93.8	100.0	100.0	15.2	80.0	60.0	46.0

Table 3.2.4.17 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Cyber fraud

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % with community service		
Hungary	0.4	2.5	2.5	60.0	33.3	22.5	88.9	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
Serbia	0.0

Table 3.2.4.19 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Money laundering

Finland	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	..	0.0	0.0	..	0.0
Germany	0.0	8.7	..	69.6	..	17.4	100.0	..	4.3
Hungary	0.0
Latvia	15.4	62.1	15.0	0.3
Netherlands	0.0	..	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Sweden	0.2	0.0	4.5	22.7	0.0	31.8	..	28.6	4.5	0.0	36.4
UK: England & Wales	0.1	..	3.2	64.5	..	0.0	16.1	..	19.4

Table 3.2.4.20 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Corruption in the public sector

Austria	0.0	..	100.0	0.0	0.0	..	0.0
France	0.0	0.0	3.7	55.6	..	18.5	7.4	50.0	..
Germany	0.0	0.0	..	100.0	..	0.0	0.0
Hungary	0.0
Lithuania	0.1
Poland	0.0	100.0	..	0.0	0.0
Turkey	0.0	..	40.0	20.0	..	20.0	20.0	..	0.0

Table 3.2.4.18 Minors receiving sanctions/ measures in 2015 – Forgery of documents

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.			of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures			of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures		
	Total	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	of which: % with community service	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures
Albania
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	...	100.0	0.0	...	0.0	...	0.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	0.0	0.0	...	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	...	100.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	1.8	0.0	94.9	0.0	...	2.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	...	3.1
France	0.0	5.6	5.6	83.3	...	5.6	0.0
Georgia
Germany	1.0	3.2	...	80.4	...	10.8	100.0	...	5.5
Hungary	1.1	2.8	6.4	65.1	35.2	12.8	78.6	0.0	12.8	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	159.3	...
Lithuania	0.6
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	0.2	...	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	0.0
North Macedonia	0.0
Norway
Poland	0.3	95.2	...	0.0	4.8
Portugal	0.1	...	71.4
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.1	100.0	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	0.8	0.0	27.6	3.9	0.0	34.2	...	3.8	7.9	0.0	26.3
Switzerland
Turkey	0.1	...	28.2	7.7	...	11.5	41.0	...	11.5
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	0.0	...	0.0	90.0	...	0.0	0.0	...	10.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	0.4	1.6	23.4	48.1	11.7	14.8	57.1	1.3	5.5	53.1	21.6
Median	0.1	0.0	6.0	65.1	0.0	3.8	64.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	1.8	5.6	94.9	100.0	35.2	100.0	100.0	3.8	41.0	159.3	100.0

Table 3.2.4.21 Minors receiving sanctions/measures in 2015 – Drug offences:
Total

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures			
				Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % partially suspended		
							of which: % with community service		of which: % other measures		
Albania	
Armenia	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Austria	3.1	...	30.7	49.6	17.4	50.0	2.3
Azerbaijan
Belgium	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	...	66.7	0.0	...	33.3	...	0.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.8	...	0.0	48.2	37.5	...	14.3
Croatia	1.0	34.1	...	39.0	0.0	22.0	55.6	...	4.9
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.8	17.1	0.0	11.0	11.1	64.6	7.5	...	3.7	...	13.4
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	5.6	0.0	90.0	0.0	...	4.5	64.3	0.0	0.0	...	5.5
France	7.7	2.3	5.3	51.4	...	30.8	10.2	35.8	...
Georgia	0.5	16.7
Germany	10.8	3.5	...	84.1	...	8.7	100.0	...	3.7
Hungary	0.7	6.8	1.4	76.7	48.2	12.3	77.8	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	2.3
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	0.0	76.8	100.0	10.4	...	84.6	12.0	53.3	...
North Macedonia	0.7
Norway	15.6
Poland	3.5	94.6	...	0.5	4.9
Portugal	0.8	...	31.0	10.3	100.0	50.6	86.4	...	4.6
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	2.2	100.0	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	54.6	0.0	65.2	1.5	16.0	0.9	...	41.3	0.8	4.4	31.6
Switzerland
Turkey	8.5	...	47.8	2.6	...	6.2	21.8	...	21.6
Ukraine	0.4	...	30.5	4.3
UK: England & Wales	9.1	...	19.3	53.3	...	0.0	4.1	...	42.2
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	6.1	8.0	22.9	40.6	45.9	28.5	48.9	25.2	9.6	28.7	14.5
Median	2.2	2.9	12.3	43.6	32.1	12.3	59.9	0.0	4.6	35.8	13.4
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	54.6	34.1	90.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	84.6	37.5	53.3	42.2

Table 3.2.4.22 Minors receiving sanctions/ measures in 2015 – Drug trafficking

	Total sanctions and measures per 100 000 pop.			of which: % non-custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % suspended custodial sanctions and measures		of which: % un-suspended custodial sanctions and measures			
	Total	of which: % verdict / admonition only	of which: % fines	Total	of which: % community service	Total	of which: % with supervision	Total	of which: % partially suspended	of which: % other measures	
											of which: % with community service
Albania	
Armenia	0.1	...	0.0	0.0	...	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Austria	
Azerbaijan	
Belgium	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	
Bulgaria	
Croatia	1.0	34.1	...	39.0	...	22.0	55.6	...	4.9	...	
Cyprus	
Czech Republic	0.7	16.7	0.0	12.5	100.0	66.7	8.3	...	4.2	0.0	
Denmark	
Estonia	
Finland	1.9	0.0	84.8	0.0	...	13.3	64.3	0.0	0.0	1.9	
France	5.6	1.6	4.8	40.4	...	39.9	0.0	...	13.3	37.6	
Georgia	
Germany	0.9	9.0	...	36.7	...	41.1	100.0	...	13.1	...	
Hungary	0.1	0.0	0.0	77.8	57.1	22.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Iceland	
Italy	
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	
Latvia	
Lithuania	1.0	
Luxembourg	
Moldova	
Montenegro	
Netherlands	
North Macedonia	
Norway	
Poland	0.1	94.3	...	0.0	5.7	...	
Portugal	0.6	...	12.3	12.3	100.0	64.6	85.7	...	9.2	...	
Romania	
Russian Federation	
Serbia	0.7	100.0	0.0	...	
Slovak Republic	
Slovenia	
Spain	
Sweden	3.0	0.0	42.4	13.5	23.1	8.3	...	45.8	9.7	7.1	26.0
Switzerland	
Turkey	3.6	...	41.6	4.7	...	6.4	38.6	...	8.7
Ukraine	
UK: England & Wales	0.0	
UK: Northern Ireland	
UK: Scotland	
Mean	1.4	8.8	23.2	35.9	70.1	35.0	51.7	11.5	8.2	22.4	7.3
Median	0.8	1.6	8.6	25.1	78.6	22.2	59.9	0.0	5.3	22.4	1.9
Minimum	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0
Maximum	5.6	34.1	84.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	45.8	38.6	37.6	26.0

Notes on tables 3.2.3.1 to 3.2.4.22

Austria	"A conviction accompanied only by a simple warning without any further sanction." only applies for minors.
Belgium	Prison sentences for which the execution is partially suspended are only counted under "suspended custodial sanctions and measures", not under "unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures".
Bulgaria	Custodial sanctions include imprisonment, life imprisonment and life imprisonment without parole. Other sanctions include confiscation of property, revocation of the right to occupy certain state or public position, revocation of the right to practice a certain profession or activity, revocation of the right to received orders, honorary titles and insignia of honour, revocation of military rank, and public reprimand. Custodial sanctions imposed on minors include both the suspended and unsuspended custodial sanctions.
Czech Republic	Category other sanctions includes house confinement, confiscation of a thing or other asset value, prohibition of activity, prohibition of stay, prohibition of entering sport, cultural and other social events, loss of honorary titles or decorations, loss of military rank and banishment
Iceland	In the 'suspended custodial sanctions and measures column the term "of which under supervision" does not apply to the Icelandic legal system.
Lithuania	Other measures - Coercive medical treatment
Serbia	The data in tables 3.2.3. refer to adults only Non-custodial sentences include only two criminal sanctions: community services and revocation of driver's license, which could be pronounced both as principal and as secondary sanctions. Other measures include a number of persons found guilty but released from the punishment and education measures imposed on adults (18-21).
Sweden	Other measures include forensic psychiatric care, court-imposed care order, care of young persons, youth service, care under the Care of Abusers Act, abstention from prosecution (waivers of prosecution) and appointments. The data in tables 3.2.3. refer to adults only
Switzerland	
UK: Northern Ireland	Data is only available on principal offence level. It is not possible to provide a further breakdown of the data.

3.2.5 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015

Table 3.2.5.1 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Criminal offences: Total

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (/n months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia	51	...	31.8	15.0	43.1	8.7	1.4	...	0.0	...
Austria	109	14.5	8.7	19.1	4.1	2.7	0.1	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	121	29.4	28.3	24.1	14.1	3.0	1.0	0.1	0.1	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	261	52.9	25.4	18.2	2.0	1.1	0.5	...	0.0	...
Croatia	67	12.5	42.6	29.9	10.9	1.3	0.6	2.3
Cyprus
Czech Republic	90	0.0	59.9	34.5	0.0	5.1	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	93	60.2	10.2	13.7	12.2	2.7	0.7	0.2	0.3	...
France	190	54.6	24.0	16.5	3.0	1.7	0.1	0.0
Georgia	122	...	27.2	22.2	43.0	16.8	10.6	...	0.0	...
Germany	44	22.7	29.4	19.1	24.3	4.0	0.2	...	0.3	...
Hungary	91	2.1	16.3	35.8	32.3	10.8	2.3	0.3	0.4	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	172	21.9	34.9	27.3	9.0	5.6	1.3	...	0.0	...
Lithuania	181
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	150	84.4	7.3	5.4	3.4	0.8	0.3	0.0	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway	210	74.8	12.0	9.7	1.9	1.4	0.3
Poland	90	20.4	32.4	33.9	10.7	1.8	0.7	0.0	0.2	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	124	37.5	27.5	16.3	16.2	1.9	0.6
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	112	64.2	14.2	13.2	5.3	2.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	2.7
Switzerland	119	77.3	8.6	6.1	6.4	1.3	0.3	0.1	0.0	...
Turkey	555
Ukraine	46	...	8.1	16.4	59.3	14.3	1.6	...	0.2	...
UK: England & Wales	66	14.7	16.1	35.5	34.1	10.1	2.9	0.0	1.0	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	255	65.0	16.4	10.8	4.7	3.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	144	39.4	22.9	20.1	16.2	4.8	1.3	0.1	0.2	0.8
<i>Median</i>	119	33.4	24.0	18.2	10.7	2.7	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	44	0.0	7.3	5.4	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	555	84.4	59.9	35.8	59.3	16.8	10.6	0.3	1.0	2.7

Table 3.2.5.2 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Criminal offences: Major road traffic offences

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia	5.0	...	28.6	55.8	13.0	2.6	0.0	...	0.0	...
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	20.0	74.3	17.9	6.9	0.7	0.2	0.0	...	0.0	...
Croatia	3.6	7.8	44.7	30.1	17.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	10.9	...	76.2	22.6	...	1.2	0.1	1.2	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	25.5	91.1	5.9	2.9	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	...
France	17.7	77.8	19.1	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Georgia	1.6	...	20.3	47.3	29.7	2.7
Germany	5.4	44.6	44.7	6.8	3.7	0.2	0.0	...	0.0	...
Hungary	3.7	3.6	29.1	35.1	27.3	3.6	1.2	6.5	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	7.0	98.1	1.2	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway	0.2	99.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Poland	14.6	25.8	44.1	25.4	3.3	1.3	0.1	0.2	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	3.7	41.2	32.3	13.1	12.5	0.9	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	25.9	98.9	1.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	0.1
Switzerland	1.8	81.0	13.8	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	...
Turkey	1.6
Ukraine	5.8	...	0.5	2.1	73.9	23.3	0.2	...	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	3.2	56.3	34.6	7.1	1.8	0.2	...	1.8	0.0	0.0
Mean	8.7	61.5	24.4	15.5	11.5	2.1	0.1	1.5	0.0	0.0
Median	5.2	74.3	20.3	6.9	2.5	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
Minimum	0.2	3.6	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	25.9	99.5	76.2	55.8	73.9	23.3	1.2	6.5	0.0	0.1

Table 3.2.5.3 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Intentional homicide: Total

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia	1.5	...	13.0	8.7	8.7	39.1	30.4	...	0.0	...
Austria	0.4	2.6	7.9	71.1	18.4	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	1.3	0.0	0.6	2.3	12.1	30.6	48.0	93.3	6.4	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.7	0.0	0.8	9.2	8.5	35.4	46.2	...	1.5	...
Croatia	2.6	0.0	0.0	30.1	32.9	16.4	20.5	0.0	...	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.2	...	1.8	8.1	...	44.1	45.9	145.2	1.8	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	2.5	0.0	0.8	0.0	56.3	20.3	12.5	52.9	10.2	...
France	0.1	0.0	2.2	10.9	5.4	60.9	13.0	84.6
Georgia	2.8	...	0.8	3.2	16.0	40.8	39.2
Germany	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.9	50.1	7.9	...	16.2	...
Hungary	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	7.3	34.3	37.6	55.1	18.5	0.6
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	2.0	20.4	14.8	16.3	22.6	14.6	11.3	9.1	1.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	1.6	0.0	0.7	2.0	20.3	33.9	41.9	22.1	1.1	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.3	0.8	0.8	3.4	30.5	28.0	36.4
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.9	7.1	34.6	21.8	...	10.3	19.2
Switzerland	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.3	52.6	21.1	507.2	0.0	...
Turkey	1.8
Ukraine	4.0	...	0.4	2.2	3.9	52.9	34.9	...	5.7	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
Mean	1.6	1.8	2.3	6.0	18.2	38.8	29.3	107.7	7.0	4.9
Median	1.5	0.0	0.8	2.6	14.1	35.4	32.6	55.1	5.7	0.3
Minimum	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	14.6	7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	4.0	20.4	14.8	30.1	56.3	71.1	48.0	507.2	18.5	19.2

Table 3.2.5.4 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Intentional homicide: Completed

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Austria	50.0	...	0.0	5.3	...	63.2	31.6	...
Bulgaria	73.8	0.0	0.0	7.3	7.3	28.1	57.3	...	2.1	...
Croatia	42.5	0.0	0.0	12.9	19.4	29.0	38.7	0.0
France	31.5	0.0	3.4	13.8	3.4	75.9	3.4	254.1
Hungary	51.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	14.1	55.4	121.6	28.3	1.1
Switzerland	63.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	946.3	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales	...	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	100.0	0.0
UK: Scotland	...	1.6	1.6	6.6	6.6	39.3	...	104.9	44.3	0.0

Table 3.2.5.5 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Bodily injury

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia	6.3	...	10.3	5.2	73.2	11.3	0.0	...	0.0	...
Austria	6.1	71.9	13.7	12.8	1.4	0.2	0.0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	2.1	38.7	36.9	20.9	2.2	0.5	0.7	...	0.0	...
Croatia	4.0	19.3	50.0	21.1	7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	1.8
Cyprus
Czech Republic	3.5	...	18.1	65.9	...	15.4	0.6	11.6	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	14.6	49.8	11.7	23.9	13.2	1.3	0.0	1.6	0.0	...
France	14.4	44.9	30.8	20.4	2.6	1.1	0.0	0.2
Georgia	3.7	...	4.7	40.6	20.6	17.6	5.9
Germany	12.3	11.4	39.1	25.6	22.6	1.3	0.0	...	0.0	...
Hungary	14.0	0.9	9.7	35.7	35.4	14.7	3.2	2.8	0.5	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	7.1	88.5	8.6	2.1	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	9.3	13.6	41.2	37.8	6.2	1.1	0.0	0.5	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	3.7	50.9	32.5	8.0	7.4	1.2	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	11.9	48.8	15.3	22.7	5.5	0.9	0.0	...	0.0	6.7
Switzerland	0.6	62.7	13.6	11.9	11.9	0.0	0.0	17.0	0.0	...
Turkey	11.0
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	31.3	33.5	18.6	21.9	14.6	6.4	2.2	0.2	2.7	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	21.1	43.8	21.5	18.2	9.7	5.8	...	0.3	0.9	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	9.8	41.3	22.1	23.2	14.7	4.6	0.8	3.4	0.3	1.4
<i>Median</i>	8.2	44.3	18.1	21.1	8.8	1.2	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.6	0.9	4.7	2.1	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	31.3	88.5	50.0	65.9	73.2	17.6	5.9	17.0	2.7	6.7

Table 3.2.5.6 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Aggravated bodily injury

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia	85.6	...	1.2	2.4	84.3	12.0	0.0	...	0.0	...
Austria	31.6	23.9	30.6	40.6	4.4	0.6	0.0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	76.3	14.9	50.6	23.0	9.2	0.0	0.0	2.3
Cyprus
Czech Republic	44.2	...	0.7	69.8	...	28.2	1.3	39.1	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	36.3	3.7	4.5	51.7	36.4	3.7	0.0	9.4	0.0	...
France	20.7	22.3	28.6	35.4	8.1	4.6	0.1	2.2
Georgia	54.7	19.4	37.6	32.3	10.8
Germany	50.5	2.5	29.0	31.4	34.9	2.3	0.0	...	0.0	...
Hungary	72.6	0.5	6.6	33.4	36.3	18.4	4.1	4.4	0.7	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	29.0	70.2	22.1	5.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	9.7	4.6	15.7	36.4	32.8	10.2	0.3	10.3	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	56.7	43.8	35.1	10.8	8.1	2.2	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	35.4	4.6	8.9	61.3	15.7	2.6	0.0	...	0.0	6.3
Switzerland	27.1	37.5	12.5	12.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	140.6	0.0	...
Turkey	1.4
Ukraine	0.2	1.5	36.6	61.6	0.1	...	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	35.1	5.2	15.1	37.3	23.5	16.2	...	3.0	2.7	0.0
Mean	41.7	19.5	17.4	29.5	27.2	12.2	1.2	26.2	0.3	1.7
Median	35.9	10.1	15.1	32.4	32.8	4.2	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0
Minimum	1.4	0.5	0.2	1.5	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0
Maximum	85.6	70.2	50.6	69.8	84.3	61.6	10.8	140.6	2.7	6.3

Table 3.2.5.7 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Sexual assault

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia
Austria	1.2	5.1	0.9	48.7	14.5	30.8	0.0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	4.8	0.5	1.1	5.9	10.4	9.9	2.0	8.1	0.3	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.6	2.5	11.7	54.2	19.2	10.8	1.7	...	0.0	...
Croatia	3.2	1.1	34.1	24.2	30.8	4.4	2.2	3.3
Cyprus
Czech Republic	1.2	...	5.5	61.8	...	30.9	1.8	52.7	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	3.2	5.0	4.3	30.4	47.2	11.8	1.2	21.4	0.0	...
France	2.6	12.7	15.3	35.2	12.4	9.7	0.5	1.4
Georgia	0.7	...	14.7	50.0
Germany	2.6	0.0	2.2	9.5	63.9	23.4	1.1	...	0.0	...
Hungary	2.6	0.4	0.9	5.6	32.5	45.7	15.0	30.6	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	2.6	47.5	17.3	15.2	17.3	2.6	0.0	1.7	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway	0.1	42.8	12.7	18.2	14.7	11.6	0.0
Poland	1.8	0.6	1.4	31.3	48.6	15.4	2.7	...	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	1.1	14.6	10.4	10.4	43.8	17.7	3.1
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	2.5	2.9	10.4	34.5	31.7	11.2	0.4	...	0.0	5.0
Switzerland	0.3	0.0	10.3	27.6	41.4	20.7	0.0	140.8	0.0	...
Turkey	2.4
Ukraine	0.7	...	1.4	4.9	34.3	47.6	11.9	...	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales	11.0	9.3	6.9	13.8	32.5	22.8	12.4	1.5	0.9	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	1.6	4.2	8.3	16.2	15.3	56.0	...	31.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	2.3	9.3	8.9	26.2	30.0	21.3	3.5	32.1	0.1	1.4
<i>Median</i>	2.1	3.5	8.3	24.2	31.7	16.5	1.7	21.4	0.0	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	0.0	0.9	4.9	10.4	2.6	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	11.0	47.5	34.1	61.8	63.9	56.0	15.0	140.8	0.9	5.0

Table 3.2.5.8 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Rape

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Austria	56.4	0.0	0.0	57.6	9.1	33.3	0.0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	20.1	0.8	0.8	9.1	35.6	43.2	9.1	49.7	1.5	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	57.5	0.0	7.2	53.6	23.2	13.0	2.9	...	0.0	...
Croatia	74.7	0.0	23.5	22.1	41.2	5.9	2.9	0.0	...	4.4
Cyprus
Czech Republic	71.8	...	3.8	55.7	...	30.4	2.5	75.8	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	37.9	0.0	3.3	42.6	34.4	16.4	3.3	63.6	0.0	...
France	18.3	0.0	2.9	13.4	7.6	47.0	3.6	6.3
Georgia	32.4	45.5	36.4	18.2
Germany	36.3	0.0	0.6	5.4	59.3	32.9	1.8	...	0.0	...
Hungary	62.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.7	50.3	20.0	55.9	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	13.7	17.6	8.8	24.2	42.9	6.6	0.0	24.7	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	65.1	0.2	1.2	27.3	48.3	19.2	3.7	11.8	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	49.0	2.1	4.3	6.4	51.1	31.9	4.3
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	88.1	0.8	4.1	36.7	35.9	12.2	0.4	...	0.0	5.3
Switzerland	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	5401.0	0.0	...
Turkey
Ukraine	49.7	...	0.0	2.8	26.8	57.7	12.7	...	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	44.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	3.2	95.8	...	89.5	0.0	0.0
Mean	45.9	1.5	9.4	21.1	34.9	29.6	5.3	525.3	0.1	1.9
Median	49.0	0.0	2.9	13.4	35.6	31.1	3.1	49.7	0.0	0.0
Minimum	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	88.1	17.6	100.0	57.6	100.0	95.8	20.0	5.401.0	1.5	5.3

Table 3.2.5.9 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Sexual abuse of a child

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia
Austria	38.5	2.2	0.0	42.2	24.4	31.1	0.0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	14.5	2.1	2.1	20.0	32.6	35.8	6.3	56.0	1.1	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	8.8	0.0	12.5	87.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	32.7	...	8.3	63.9	...	27.8	0.0	143.6	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	57.8	5.4	4.3	23.7	57.0	9.7	0.0	35.3	0.0	...
France	35.1	4.2	13.8	43.6	15.3	13.3	1.1	8.6
Georgia
Germany	47.9	0.0	1.8	6.4	67.0	23.9	0.9	...	0.0	...
Hungary	19.7	0.0	4.3	23.9	28.3	37.0	6.5	116.5	0.0	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	6.5	86.0	11.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	34.9	1.4	1.8	38.5	49.1	8.3	0.9	16.7	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	17.7	0.0	11.8	11.8	58.8	11.8	5.9
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	10.4	13.8	62.1	20.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	3.4
Switzerland	17.2	0.0	60.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	202.0	0.0	...
Turkey
Ukraine	2.1	...	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	24.6	9.6	13.9	30.2	33.3	14.2	1.7	72.8	0.1	0.9
<i>Median</i>	18.7	1.7	6.3	23.8	28.3	10.7	0.0	45.6	0.0	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	57.8	86.0	62.1	87.5	100.0	37.0	6.5	202.0	1.1	3.4

Table 3.2.5.10 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Robbery

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia	4.7	...	5.5	9.6	32.9	4.1	0.0	...	0.0	0.0
Austria	3.9	2.2	3.0	37.6	21.4	35.7	0.0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	6.5	1.6	13.8	39.0	31.0	11.0	3.1	3.7	0.3	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	3.5	11.3	20.1	38.8	16.7	10.0	3.0	...	0.0	...
Croatia	7.9	0.9	29.6	28.3	27.9	6.6	0.0	6.6
Cyprus
Czech Republic	5.2	...	1.6	76.1	...	21.5	0.8	10.3	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	6.7	15.2	17.6	31.4	35.2	0.6	0.0	5.7	0.0	...
France	1.5	30.1	26.4	31.3	8.9	3.3	0.1
Georgia	6.2	17.1	22.9	35.0	27.9
Germany	8.2	0.2	8.8	27.1	52.4	11.0	0.5	...	0.0	...
Hungary	11.7	0.1	0.1	6.4	44.0	42.0	6.7	5.8	0.8	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	6.0	57.9	15.3	10.2	12.8	3.6	0.3	0.7	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	7.8	1.6	3.7	36.5	54.1	4.1	0.0	1.3	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	6.2	10.6	19.9	26.8	37.8	4.7	0.2
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	3.6	10.5	9.7	50.4	18.2	4.1	0.5	...	0.0	2.3
Switzerland	0.3	17.2	17.2	17.2	31.0	17.2	0.0	117.8	0.0	...
Turkey	2.5
Ukraine	11.1	...	1.9	5.3	87.9	5.0	0.0	...	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales	8.6	2.5	9.4	21.5	45.3	17.6	2.2	1.3	0.3	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	2.2	9.1	18.5	39.1	26.9	13.1	...	8.4	0.0	0.0
Mean	5.7	11.4	12.3	28.9	33.7	13.2	2.7	17.2	0.1	1.3
Median	6.1	9.1	11.8	28.3	31.0	10.0	0.3	5.7	0.0	0.0
Minimum	0.3	0.1	0.1	5.3	8.9	0.6	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
Maximum	11.7	57.9	29.6	76.1	87.9	42.0	27.9	117.8	0.8	6.6

Table 3.2.5.11 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Theft

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia	18.0	...	1.4	17.2	68.5	12.9	0.0	...	0.0	...
Austria	20.9	25.5	17.9	47.4	8.0	1.2	0.0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	31.0	18.3	29.9	34.0	15.2	2.1	0.4	0.4	0.0	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	26.0	39.1	34.2	24.6	1.7	0.2	0.1	...	0.0	...
Croatia	28.8	12.9	47.5	29.4	5.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	...	4.4
Cyprus
Czech Republic	42.8	...	63.4	35.5	...	1.1	0.1	0.6	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	14.5	74.0	12.0	10.4	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	...
France	28.1	53.7	25.3	17.1	2.9	1.1	0.0	0.0
Georgia	24.6	0.0	1.8	35.4	45.7	17.0
Germany	33.4	29.6	36.9	20.3	12.6	0.7	0.0	...	0.0	...
Hungary	48.6	13.6	18.2	39.8	24.7	3.3	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	43.7	94.7	3.4	1.2	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway	0.4	36.8	26.4	23.8	1.5	0.2	0.0
Poland	25.1	17.4	27.9	49.6	4.8	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	37.9	35.1	33.0	25.3	6.3	0.3	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	18.9	68.8	21.1	7.0	1.7	0.3	0.0	...	0.0	1.0
Switzerland	6.7	88.4	10.0	1.2	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	...
Turkey	17.9
Ukraine	46.0	...	11.1	21.3	65.7	1.9	0.0	...	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales	72.0	72.2	7.8	8.2	11.2	0.6	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	27.0	74.9	14.4	7.9	2.4	0.3	...	0.2	0.0	0.0
Mean	29.2	44.4	22.2	22.8	14.9	2.2	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.9
Median	27.0	36.8	19.6	22.6	5.6	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0
Minimum	0.4	0.0	1.4	1.2	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	72.0	94.7	63.4	49.6	68.5	17.0	0.4	0.8	0.1	4.4

Table 3.2.5.12 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Aggravated theft

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions /measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions /measures
Austria	76.6	5.3	22.5	60.6	10.0	1.5	0.0	...
Belgium	44.5	5.0	22.9	42.7	24.9	3.6	0.8	1.1	0.1	...
Croatia	62.3	7.1	46.1	34.5	7.1	0.2	0.0	5.1
Germany	51.6	6.5	37.8	31.9	22.5	1.3	0.0	...	0.0	...
Hungary	100.0	13.6	18.2	39.8	24.7	3.3	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.0
Netherlands	45.5	89.6	6.4	2.5	1.4	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	...
Poland	45.8	3.0	4.8	82.1	9.7	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	...
Serbia	64.7	16.8	38.3	36.1	8.4	0.5	0.0
Switzerland	7.5	30.6	59.2	6.1	4.1	0.0	0.0	17.3	0.0	...
Mean	52.7	19.7	28.5	37.4	12.5	1.2	0.2	3.9	0.0	2.5
Median	48.7	7.1	22.9	36.1	9.7	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	2.5
Minimum	7.5	3.0	4.8	2.5	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Maximum	100.0	89.6	59.2	82.1	24.9	3.6	0.8	17.3	0.1	5.1

Table 3.2.5.13 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Theft of a motor vehicle

Armenia	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	...	0.0	...
Bulgaria	...	36.4	44.4	17.3	1.9	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	...
Finland	32.4	92.6	4.4	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	...
Hungary	2.3	1.0	8.0	33.0	51.0	5.0	2.0	29.7	0.0	0.0
Serbia	3.6	50.0	30.8	14.1	5.1	0.0	0.0
Sweden	...	89.6	6.3	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	2.1
Ukraine	0.5	1.6	71.8	26.0	0.1	...	0.0	...
UK: Scotland	...	64.2	25.3	9.5	1.1	0.0	...	7.4	0.0	0.0

Table 3.2.5.14 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Theft by means of burglary

Austria	18.9	12.3	32.7	53.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	...
Croatia	94.9	7.2	46.5	33.7	7.4	0.2	5.0
Germany	51.1	4.5	34.7	35.3	24.6	0.8	0.0	...	0.0	...
Hungary	22.4	14.3	20.8	36.5	25.3	3.0	0.0	2.2	0.2	0.0
Poland	100.0	3.0	4.8	82.1	9.7	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	...
Ukraine	1.3	2.4	94.1	2.2	0.0	...	0.0	...
UK: Scotland	...	26.6	27.2	34.2	11.7	0.4	...	2.6	0.0	0.0

Table 3.2.5.15 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Theft by means of domestic burglary

Germany	15.1	1.3	23.9	39.0	34.3	1.5	0.0	...	0.0	...
Hungary	0.9	19.5	34.1	24.4	17.1	4.9	0.0	50.2	0.0	0.0

Table 3.2.5.16 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Fraud

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia	3.2	...	6.0	8.0	64.0	20.0	2.0	...	0.0	...
Austria	4.4	32.1	19.3	37.2	9.4	1.9	0.0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	6.9	12.4	30.4	33.5	19.9	3.2	0.5	1.8	0.0	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	2.6	21.5	33.0	41.6	2.6	1.2	0.0	...	0.0	...
Croatia	7.7	11.0	41.3	39.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	4.0	...	18.7	66.2	...	15.0	0.0	12.1	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	7.2	65.2	18.6	13.2	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	...
France	2.1	38.7	28.5	27.4	4.6	0.7	0.0	0.4
Georgia	4.6	...	13.9	35.4	7.2	30.1
Germany	8.0	16.9	30.2	23.5	28.0	1.4	0.0	...	0.0	...
Hungary	9.0	3.1	10.9	34.4	44.5	6.6	0.4	3.6	0.1	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	1.1	80.9	9.9	6.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	10.4	4.4	52.6	35.8	6.6	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	2.4	38.3	32.2	16.4	12.6	0.5	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	2.5	30.6	21.0	31.7	13.7	0.7	0.0	...	0.0	1.5
Switzerland	0.7	72.3	13.8	4.6	9.2	0.0	0.0	11.9	0.0	...
Turkey	4.5
Ukraine	2.2	...	21.2	40.0	31.3	7.3	0.0	...	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales	6.0	34.1	21.3	22.5	21.6	0.4	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	1.2	50.9	27.9	11.5	7.9	1.8	...	6.7	0.0	0.0
<i>Mean</i>	4.5	34.2	23.7	27.8	16.5	4.8	0.2	4.1	0.0	0.2
<i>Median</i>	4.2	32.1	21.2	31.7	9.3	1.2	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.7	3.1	6.0	4.6	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	10.4	80.9	52.6	66.2	64.0	30.1	2.0	12.1	0.1	1.5

Table 3.2.5.18 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Forgery of documents

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia
Austria	0.4	82.9	17.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	4.3	14.0	28.4	29.6	23.9	3.8	0.3	3.1	0.0	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	2.7	30.8	51.3	15.4	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic	0.5	...	43.2	43.2	...	13.6	0.0	78.4	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	1.3	89.6	7.5	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	0.0	...
France	0.6	62.9	24.9	11.6	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.7
Georgia
Germany	1.8	15.5	48.2	23.3	12.2	0.8	0.0	...	0.0	...
Hungary	6.0	1.5	10.6	35.8	42.5	9.0	0.4	5.5	0.2	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	3.0	85.4	7.5	3.9	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	0.6	47.7	42.6	8.3	1.4	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	2.0	66.1	20.9	7.9	4.5	0.6	0.0
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	1.2	63.5	12.7	19.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	0.0
Switzerland	0.2	90.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.4	0.0	...
Turkey	2.8
Ukraine	0.1	...	0.0	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	...	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	1.8	54.2	23.1	14.4	14.3	2.7	0.1	13.2	0.0	0.0
<i>Median</i>	1.3	63.2	19.0	9.9	3.2	0.1	0.0	4.1	0.0	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.1	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	6.0	90.9	51.3	43.2	90.0	13.6	0.4	78.4	0.2	0.0

Table 3.2.5.17 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Cyber fraud

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Hungary	10.7	1.2	9.3	27.9	52.3	7.0	1.2	39.1	1.2	0.0
Switzerland	10.8	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.3	0.0	...

Table 3.2.5.19 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Money laundering

Austria	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	...
Belgium	1.5	7.4	17.2	36.8	30.9	6.9	1.0	11.4	0.0	...
Croatia	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Czech Republic	0.1	...	9.1	72.7	...	45.5	0.0	387.3	0.0	0.0
Germany	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	...
Hungary	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	400.0	0.0	0.0
Netherlands	0.6	42.0	22.2	19.8	13.6	3.1	0.0	7.2	0.0	...
Poland	0.0	0.0	0.0	92.3	7.7	0.0	0.0	152.3	0.0	...
Sweden	0.4	29.3	22.0	29.3	17.1	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	0.0
Switzerland	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	225.0	0.0	...
Ukraine	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	...	0.0	...
<i>Mean</i>	0.2	31.0	15.5	36.4	9.4	16.4	0.1	197.2	0.0	0.0
<i>Median</i>	0.0	29.3	9.1	25.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	188.7	0.0	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.2	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	1.5	100.0	50.0	100.0	30.9	100.0	1.0	400.0	0.0	0.0

Table 3.2.5.20 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Corruption

Austria	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Belgium	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	654.0	0.0	...
Bulgaria	0.3	44.1	18.6	37.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	...
Croatia	3.0	32.1	38.1	25.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	...	0.0
Czech Republic	0.1	...	8.3	41.7	...	50.0	0.0	566.7	0.0	0.0
France	0.1	43.1	26.4	25.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	12.9
Georgia	1.5	0.0	5.8	73.9	21.7
Germany	0.0	14.3	14.3	14.3	57.1	0.0	0.0	...	0.0	...
Hungary	0.3	3.6	3.6	14.3	67.9	7.1	3.6	129.3	0.0	0.0
Poland	0.3	1.0	5.9	84.3	7.8	1.0	0.0	19.5	0.0	...
Serbia	0.3	18.5	40.7	25.9	14.8	0.0	0.0
Turkey	0.1
Ukraine	0.3	...	1.7	5.1	71.2	22.0	0.0	...	0.0	...
<i>Mean</i>	0.4	19.0	15.3	34.5	28.3	9.1	0.4	230.4	0.0	0.0
<i>Median</i>	0.1	16.4	11.3	25.5	14.8	0.0	0.0	74.4	0.0	0.0
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	3.0	44.1	40.7	84.3	71.2	50.0	3.6	654.0	0.0	0.0

Table 3.2.5.21 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Drug offences: Total

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia
Austria	11.6	24.0	26.5	40.1	7.3	2.1	0.0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium	14.6	12.6	18.7	28.5	36.1	4.0	0.2	1.1	0.0	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	6.7	29.4	33.7	33.7	2.5	0.6	0.1	...	0.0	...
Croatia	11.9	5.3	40.1	35.0	18.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	...	0.6
Cyprus
Czech Republic	7.1	...	11.9	70.9	...	17.1	0.0	8.1	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	12.3	31.7	9.6	19.4	24.0	12.7	2.6	4.5	0.0	...
France	12.9	42.1	26.5	24.8	4.9	1.6	0.1	0.1
Georgia	20.8	0.0	16.4	32.8	41.3	9.5
Germany	12.9	14.8	12.6	17.0	48.0	7.5	0.1	...	0.0	...
Hungary	3.5	2.2	7.6	17.0	45.1	26.2	1.6	13.5	0.3	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands	9.2	60.5	19.6	9.8	8.8	1.4	0.0	0.3	0.0	...
North Macedonia
Norway	1.4	83.1	5.0	8.0	1.8	1.8	0.3
Poland	5.3	15.3	10.4	42.3	28.4	3.5	0.1	1.3	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	12.8	27.6	13.6	4.5	48.9	4.8	0.5
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	13.2	48.4	18.7	14.4	11.4	6.7	0.1	...	0.0	0.2
Switzerland	5.3	68.9	7.9	7.7	12.7	2.9	0.0	2.1	0.0	...
Turkey	6.0
Ukraine	11.6	...	8.7	25.4	41.5	24.3	0.1	...	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales	18.8	18.7	14.8	20.6	35.5	7.5	2.9	0.5	0.0	0.0
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	7.4	39.7	18.7	22.2	13.5	5.9	...	1.8	0.0	0.0
Mean	10.3	30.9	16.9	24.9	23.9	7.4	0.5	3.0	0.0	0.1
Median	11.6	27.6	14.8	22.2	21.1	4.8	0.1	1.3	0.0	0.0
Minimum	1.4	0.0	5.0	4.5	1.8	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum	20.8	83.1	40.1	70.9	48.9	26.2	2.9	13.5	0.3	0.6

Table 3.2.5.22 Persons convicted by length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed in 2015 – Drug trafficking

	Total unsuspended custodial sanctions	of which: % under 6 months	of which: % 6 months and less than 12 months	of which: % 12 months and less than 24 months	of which: % 24 months and less than 60 months	of which: % 60 months and less than 120 months	of which: % 120 months and over	Average length of custodial sanctions / measures (in months)	of which: % Life	of which: % Indeterminate sanctions / measures
Albania
Armenia	2.5	47.5	22.5	17.5	0.0	...	0.0	...
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Croatia	100.0	5.3	40.1	35.0	18.1	0.9	0.0	0.6
Cyprus
Czech Republic	86.1	...	7.4	73.1	...	19.5	0.0	9.7	0.0	0.0
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	100.0	31.7	9.6	19.4	24.0	12.7	2.6	4.5	0.0	...
France	89.1	36.1	29.0	27.6	5.5	1.8	0.1	0.1
Georgia	6.3	41.7	25.0	33.3
Germany	64.7	0.1	3.0	16.5	69.1	11.2	0.1	...	0.0	...
Hungary	60.6	1.0	2.1	10.9	49.0	34.4	2.1	26.1	0.5	0.0
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Moldova
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	36.6	0.6	3.0	35.7	52.8	7.8	0.1	5.4	0.0	...
Portugal
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	61.5	2.4	9.8	3.9	75.2	7.8	0.9
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	56.7	33.5	18.4	19.3	16.8	11.4	0.1	...	0.0	0.4
Switzerland	57.4	63.9	7.7	7.4	17.7	3.3	0.0	4.4	0.0	...
Turkey	68.8
Ukraine	41.4	...	0.7	4.4	40.0	54.6	0.2	...	0.0	...
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	63.8	19.4	11.1	26.3	34.6	16.6	0.5	8.4	0.1	0.2
<i>Median</i>	61.5	5.3	7.5	19.4	24.5	11.4	0.1	4.9	0.0	0.2
<i>Minimum</i>	6.3	0.1	0.7	3.9	5.5	0.9	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	100.0	63.9	40.1	73.1	75.2	54.6	2.6	26.1	0.5	0.6

Notes on tables 3.2.5.1 to 3.2.5.22

Bulgaria	Bulgaria: Custodial sanctions include both the suspended and unsuspended custodial sanctions. Separate statistics on the length of suspended custodial sanctions are not available. Statistics in the category '12 months and less than 24 months' include statistics on custodial sanctions of 12 months and less than 36 months. Statistics in the category '24 months and less than 60 months' include statistics on custodial sanctions of 36 months and less than 60 months.
Finland	Finland: In this table, some crime categories include more offence types due to different grouping in data sources.
France	France: Only for Robbery statistics in the category '12 months and less than 24 months' include statistics on custodial sanctions of 12 months and less than 36 months, statistics in the category '24 months and less than 60 months' include statistics on custodial sanctions of 36 months and less than 60 months.
Poland	Poland: In category "12 months and less 24 months" Polish data refers to 12-24 months (Incl.).
Serbia	Serbia: Data refer only to the length of the prison sentence imposed to adult offenders by an irrevocable court verdict. The data do not include the length of the juvenile prison and institutional educational measures for minors.
Switzerland	Switzerland: Data refer to adults only.

3.2.6 Persons held in pre-trial detention (at least temporarily) among persons convicted in 2015

Table 3.2.6 Persons held in pre-trial detention (at least temporarily) among persons convicted in 2015 – Criminal offences: Total

	Total of persons convicted	<i>of which: % held in pre-trial detention (at least temporarily)</i>
Czech Republic	622	5.1
Finland	3321	1.2
France	864	5.6
Georgia	256	10.6
Germany	1137	2.9
Poland	737	2.1
Serbia	465	12.2
Switzerland	1505	22.0
UK: England & Wales	2158	0.9

3.2.7 Judges in criminal courts per 100 000 population - 2015

Table 3.2.7.1 Judges in criminal courts per 100 000 population - 2015

	Continental law countries		Number of lay judges (in criminal courts) per 100 000 pop	Common law countries		
	Number of professional judges: Total per 100 000 pop	of which: % of criminal court judges		Number of professional judges: Total per 100 000 pop	Number of Magistrates per 100 000 pop	Number of Clerks per 100 000 pop
Albania
Armenia	7.7
Austria
Azerbaijan	5.3
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	33.7	15.1
Croatia	44.5
Cyprus
Czech Republic	28.7	25.2
Denmark
Estonia	17.5
Finland
France	11.1
Georgia	10.2	35.5
Germany	25.0	20.6	47.3
Hungary	29.4	35.8
Iceland
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	21.9
Lithuania	26.1
Luxembourg
Moldova	12.2
Montenegro
Netherlands	13.8
North Macedonia
Norway	16.9
Poland	25.4	38.0
Portugal	13.1
Romania
Russian Federation
Serbia	38.7
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Spain	11.5	6.8
Sweden	11.7	69.7	4.7
Switzerland
Turkey	9.9
Ukraine	18.7
UK: England & Wales	5.6	33.9	...
UK: Northern Ireland	3.2	7.2	21.2
UK: Scotland	4.9
<i>Mean</i>	19.7	30.8	26.0	4.6	20.6	21.2
<i>Median</i>	17.2	30.4	26.0	4.9	20.6	21.2
<i>Minimum</i>	5.3	6.8	4.7	3.2	7.2	21.2
<i>Maximum</i>	44.5	69.7	47.3	5.6	33.9	21.2

Notes on tables 3.2.6 and 3.2.7

Netherlands	The number of judges refers to 2016.
Portugal	Includes judges in first instance common courts only.

3.3 Technical information

3.3.1 Technical comments

What is recorded?

Next to court convictions, the conviction statistics in this chapter include sanctions imposed by the prosecutor (or by the court, but on application of the prosecutor and without a formal court hearing) that lead to a formal verdict and count as a conviction (e.g., *penal order*, *Strafbefehl*) in 11 countries: Austria, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, and UK: Scotland. All countries except France and UK: England & Wales exclude sanctions imposed by the prosecutor that do not lead to a formal verdict and do not count as a conviction (e.g., conditional disposals).

Only Denmark includes sanctions/measures imposed by the police as convictions. Both the principal offence and the principal sanction rule are applied in most countries. Recording is based on the main conviction.

Most countries have written rules regarding the way they record sanctions and measures, except Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Italy, Latvia, Montenegro, and Slovenia.

Differences between Chapters 1 and 3 with regard to offence definitions

The offence definitions used in Chapter 1 reflect the definitions that are used in the national police statistics. They are usually based on concepts that are close to everyday life experience, e.g., theft by means of burglary, armed robbery, and car theft.

On the other hand, the definitions used for convictions reflect different legal traditions and criminal codes. For this reason, in some countries there are no separate conviction statistics for some offences, such as car theft, drug trafficking, theft by means of burglary, robbery, and sexual abuse of minors.

Differences in convictions and sanctions/measures

Countries have different rules for counting sanctions and measures and non-custodial sanctions.

The sentence length of unsuspended custodial sanctions and measures imposed upon adults or minors in many countries differs from the standard used in this publication. In addition, the time of publication of the statistics varies among countries. Romania provided figures for 2016 instead of 2015.

3.3.2 Minors in conviction statistics

Age brackets used in the Tables

All countries count minors as persons who are under 18 years. The exception is Poland where only those under 17 years are included.

The lower 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 convictions statistics (regardless of the ‘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 1.3.3).

For the offences considered here, the following age limits were indicated. For the countries not in this table, the same minimum age is used as in chapter 1.

Table 3.3.1 Minimum age for consideration in conviction statistics 2015

	Minimum age
Armenia	14
Azerbaijan	14
Belgium	16
Cyprus	14
Czech Republic	15
Denmark	15
Finland	15
Georgia	14
Germany	14
Hungary	12
Netherlands	12
Poland	15
Slovenia	14

The transition from the status of minor to adult raises difficult legal and statistical questions as to how a person is treated who, having committed an offence as a minor, is dealt with in court once they have reached the age of adulthood. Some countries apply rules for minors, and count them as such, whereas others treat and count them as adults. For example, in Germany young adults aged 18-20 years are often sanctioned according to juvenile law so that this age group is partially included in the sentencing tables for minors and partially in adults.

3.4 Sources

Austria	Statistics Austria- STATCUBE: http://www.statistik.at/web_de/services/statcube/index.html Service Public Fédéral Justice - Direction générale,
Belgium	Législation, Libertés et Droits fondamentaux - Direction Droit pénal - Service de la Politique criminelle : Casier judiciaire central, données non publiées. Source: National Statistical Institute: Crimes, Accused and Persons Convicted 2011-2016, available only in Bulgarian at: https://infostat.nsi.bg/infostat/pages/module.jsf?x_2=56
Bulgaria	National Statistical Institute, Crimes and Persons Convicted 2015, available at: http://www.nsi.bg/sites/default/files/files/publications/CRIMES2015.pdf Source related to the figures concerning "aggravated bodily injury", "sexual abuse of a child", "aggravated theft" and "money laundering": Supreme Judicial Council, Activities of the Courts: Annual Summarised Statistical Tables 2011-2016, available only in Bulgarian at: http://www.vss.justice.bg/page/view/1082
Cyprus	Ministry of Finance, Statistical Service, available online: https://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/cystat/statistics.nsf/populationcondition_27main_n/populationcondition_27main_en?OpenForm&sub=7&sel=2
Czech Republic	Central Information System for Statistical Lists and Reporting of the Ministry of Justice Statistical sheet, overview No. 2, counting unit a person
Denmark	Tables bought by the Ministry of justice at Statistics Denmark
Finland	Statistics Finland, Syytetyt, tuomitut ja rangaistukset 7.8.2018 http://pxnet2.stat.fi/PXWeb/pxweb/fi/StatFin/StatFin_oik_syyttr/
Georgia	Report of Supreme Court of Georgia 201- 2016 The judiciary in Georgia - statistical data for the year 2015, "Dynamic of quantity of convicted minors according to the types of crimes-
Hungary	National Office for the Judiciary – Database of juvenile and adult convicts, acquitted or other accused persons with definitive sentences Hungarian Prison Service Headquarters, Department of Central Transfer and Registry
Iceland	Annual reports for the years 2009-2016 from the Prison and Probation Administration
Italy	Italian Institute of statistics - http://www.istat.it - Ministry of Justice. Department of Statistics
Latvia	The Court Administration Data provided by National Courts Administration upon request. Statistics were collected from two produced reports: 1) Report on the Criminal Proceedings. Types of sanctions and amnesty application (1 Instance Courts), and 2) Report on the Criminal Proceedings. Persons (1 Instance Courts). Data is not accessible publicly.
Lithuania	Ministry of Justice / WODC
Netherlands	Ministry of Justice, Department of Statistics.
Poland	Directorate-General for Justice Policy – Ministry of Justice
Portugal	Superior Council of Magistracy (www.csm1909.ro) – Human Resources and Organization Office, Statistics Bureau (Directia Resurse Umane si Organizare – Serviciul de Formare Profesionala si Statistica Judiciara)
Romania	Statistical Office of The Republic of Serbia / SORS
Serbia	National Institute of Statistics (INE)
Spain	State Statistical Office
North Macedonia	Ministry of Justice, General Directorate for Judicial Records and Statistics.
Turkey	Judicial Statistics Archive http://www.adlisicil.adalet.gov.tr/en/statarchive2.html http://www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/criminal-justice/criminal-justice-statistics
UK: England & Wales	The data have been obtained by using pivot table analysis from the tool available on this web site. Addition of Tables A3.4 and A3.6 from annual published statistical bulletin. The Scottish Government Justice Statistics Unit Criminal proceedings in Scottish courts to be found at
UK: Scotland	https://beta.gov.scot/publications/criminal-proceedings-scotland-2015-16/pages/11/ The Scottish Government Justice Analytical Services Criminal proceedings in Scottish courts

4 Prison Statistics

4.1 General Comments

4.1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides indicators of the use of imprisonment across Europe. These include the annual number of entries into *penal institutions* (prisons or any other detention facility) and the annual number of releases from them during the years 2011 to 2016 (known respectively as the *flow of entries* and the *flow of releases*), as well as the number of persons actually held in these institutions on 1st September of each of these years (*stock of inmates*) and the staff working in them on 1st September 2016. Inmates include *pre-trial detainees* and *sentenced prisoners*, and the latter are also presented according to the offence for which they were convicted. Further information on the use of imprisonment can be found in the *Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics* (SPACE) available online at www.unil.ch/space.

Prisons are placed near the end of the criminal justice process, but pre-trial detention can take place near the beginning of it, which implies that the relationship between prison population rates (number of inmates per 100,000 population) and crime rates is indirect and complex. This relationship exists because, in a democratic society, only suspects or persons prosecuted or convicted for a crime can be deprived of freedom; however, the actual number of inmates is primarily influenced by the efficiency of a criminal justice system (the percentage of cases solved or

clearance rate, the length of the procedures, etc.) and its punitiveness, which can be measured by the length of the sentences imposed and actually served. Research suggests that high prison population rates (number of inmates per 100,000 population) tend to be correlated with long lengths of imprisonment and high homicide rates, but not necessarily with large numbers of entries³⁰.

In addition, cross-national comparisons of prison populations are not as straightforward as they may seem because there are differences across countries regarding the categories of persons included under the total number of persons held in penal institutions. For example, some countries include minors and others do not include them, and the same is true for mentally ill offenders held in psychiatric institutions or persons held as fine defaulters. Basic information on such differences is presented under the heading *Technical information* (4.3).

Some countries have more than one Prison Administration. That is the case the United Kingdom, whose data is presented separately for (a) England and Wales, (b) Northern Ireland, and (c) Scotland. Spain has two prison administrations (The State Administration and Catalonia), but both are presented together in the Tables of this chapter. Bosnia and Herzegovina has three prison administrations, but the few data available are presented together; the metadata, on the contrary, corresponds to the rules applied in the Republika Srpska.

The 'stock' and 'flow' perspectives

Generally speaking, data on prison populations can be described from two perspectives, which generate different but equally important results. The first perspective refers to 'how many persons are held in penal institutions on a given day' (*stock*). The second perspective refers to 'how many persons have been admitted into penal institutions during the course of the year' (*flow of entries*) and to 'how many people have left penal institutions during the course of the year' (*flow of exits*). Both perspectives are also interrelated, in such a way that the stock of inmates on 1st September of a given year is influenced by the flows of entries and releases during that year, but also by the number of persons that entered into penal institutions during the previous years and are still deprived of freedom. For example, an inmate that serves ten years of imprisonment will be counted as an entry during the first year, but will appear in the stock of inmates every year during the next decade. This is a major difference with most of the data presented in the first three chapters of the Sourcebook, which usually correspond to a flow perspective (for example, the annual number of offences recorded by the police, of cases treated by the prosecution services, or of persons convicted).

³⁰ Aebi, M.F., Linde, A. & Delgrande, N. (2015). Is There a Relationship Between Imprisonment and Crime in Western Europe? *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 21(3): 425-446.

Regarding prison populations, the following data were requested:

- Number of persons held in penal institutions on 1 September 2011 to 2016: *stock of inmates* (including pre-trial detainees and sentenced prisoners) and its breakdown in the following categories: pre-trial detainees, women, minors, foreigners, and the subcategory of foreigners who are EU citizens (see Tables 4.2.1).
- Convicted prison population on 1 September 2015: *stock of sentenced prisoners* (*i.e.*, excluding pre-trial detainees) and its breakdown by the type of offence for which the prisoner was convicted: *major road traffic offences*; *intentional homicide* (including attempts); *bodily injury* and its subcategory *aggravated bodily injury*; *sexual assault* and its subcategories *rape* and *sexual abuse of a child*; *robbery*; *theft*; and *drug offences* (see Tables 4.2.2.1 and 4.2.2.2).
- The convicted prison population on 1st September 2015 for each of the offences listed above is also broken down into the following sub-categories: pre-trial detainees, women, minors, foreigners, and the subcategory of foreigners who are EU citizens (see Tables 4.2.2.3–4.2.2.14).
- Annual number of entries into penal institutions during the years 2011 to 2016: *flow of entries* (including entries of pre-trial detainees and entries of sentenced prisoners) and its breakdown in the following categories: entries of *pre-trial detainees*, of *women*, of *minors*, of *foreigners*, and the subcategory of *EU citizens* among foreigners (see Tables 4.2.3). The counting unit is the person entering a penal institution but, as the same person can be counted multiple times if (s)he is admitted in institutions more than once during the same year, this indicator is referred to as the *flow of entries* (instead of the flow of persons entering penal institutions).
- Annual number of exits from penal institutions during the years 2011 to 2016: *flow of exits* (including exits of pre-trial detainees and exits of sentenced prisoners) and its breakdown in two main categories: *releases* and *deaths*. For the *deaths*, it was also required to indicate those that were due to *suicides* as well as the subcategory of *suicides in pretrial detention*. Regarding *releases*, it was required to provide their breakdown in the following categories: releases of *pre-trial detainees*, releases of *sentenced prisoners*, *transfers to another country* and its subcategory of *transfers to an EU country* (see Tables 4.2.4). As in the case of entries, the counting unit is the person released from a penal institution but, as the same person can be counted multiple times if (s)he is released more than once during the same year, this indicator is referred to as the *flow of releases* and, consequently, the overarching category is referred to as the *flow of exits*.
- Prison staff including a distinction among those employed by the prison administration and those not employed by it. The latter category has gained in importance since the 1980s as some tasks that were traditionally performed by persons employed by the prison administrations (perimeter

guards, cleaning personnel, persons responsible for workshops or vocational training) are currently performed by private companies in some countries, and also by the rise of private prisons, mainly in the United Kingdom, and prisons working in public private partnership.

4.1.2 Quality of the data

Most of the prison data included in this edition of the *European Sourcebook* come from the *Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics* (SPACE)³¹. The data validation procedure did not reveal inconsistencies, which can partly be due to the fact that the SPACE data for the period 2005 to 2015 had been consolidated in the framework of a project funded by the European Union and the Council of Europe³². In that context, it was also decided to change the date of reference for stock indicators from 1 September to 31 January in order to allow faster publication of the SPACE annual reports. A collateral effect of that change is that flow data for the year 2016 were not collected. As a consequence, whenever such data are included in the following Tables, they have been estimated using linear interpolation from the data for the years 2015 and 2017, and they are presented in grey coloured cells.

4.1.3 Results

Cross-sectional analysis

On 1st September 2016, the average European prison population rate was 139 inmates per 100,000 population, but there are considerable differences across countries. In particular, the rates range from 37 inmates per 100 000 population in Iceland to 444 in the Russian Federation. In general, the lowest prison population rates (less than 75 inmates per 100,000 inhabitants) are distributed across the Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands, Slovenia, and Croatia, while the highest (more than 225 inmates per 100,000 inhabitants) are found in Azerbaijan, Lithuania, Turkey, Georgia, and the Russian Federation.

Roughly 20% of the inmates are not serving a final sentence and can thus be considered as pre-trial detainees, who are also known as detainees on remand. Although intuitively one may hypothesize that a large percentage of pre-trial detainees may contribute to increase artificially the prison population rate, data show that this is not necessarily the case. The Nordic countries have very low prison population rates, but roughly one fourth of their inmates are pre-trial detainees, and the

³¹ See www.unil.ch/space.

³² *Aebi, M.F., Berger-Kolopp, L., Burkhardt, C. & Tiago, M.M.* (2019). Prisons in Europe: 2005-2015. Volume 1: Country Profiles. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing (Vol. 1: Country profiles; Vol. 2: Sourcebook of Prison Statistics); *Aebi, M.F., Berger-Kolopp, L., Burkhardt, C., Chopin, J., Hashimoto, Y.Z. & Tiago, M.M.* (2019). Foreign offenders in prison and on probation in Europe: Trends from 2005 to 2015 (inmates) and situation in 2015 (inmates and probationers). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing. Available in open access at www.unil.ch/space.

Netherlands have the second lowest prison population of the continent, but one third of its inmates are pre-trial detainees.

The percentage of women in penal institutions remains very low (5% on average), as it has been the case from the beginning of the Sourcebook series in 1990. In 2016, the highest percentages are found in Latvia (8.4%), Malta (8.3%) and Cyprus (8.1%), while the lowest were in Albania (1.9%), Georgia, (2.8%) and North Macedonia (3%).

The percentage of foreigners in penal institutions differs considerably across regions of the continent. In some Western and Mediterranean countries, it represents more than 25% of the prison population, while in Central and Eastern Europe it remains under 5% of it. These differences reflect diverse factors such as geographical location, economic development, and immigration policies. The highest percentages were found in Switzerland (72%), Greece (55%) and Austria (54%), while the lowest (around 1% or less) were in Georgia, Poland, Romania, and Moldova. Roughly one third of the foreigners held in European prisons come from member states of the European Union (EU). The highest percentages are found in other EU countries. For example, approximately three quarters of the foreign inmates held in Iceland, Ireland and Northern Ireland are EU citizens.

Minors (i.e., persons under the age of 18) do not usually enter the prison system and sometimes are not included in the total prison population (see the Technical information in chapter 4.3). When they are included, on average they account for about 1% of the prison populations.

Trend analysis

The period 2011 to 2016 is characterized by a decrease of prison population rates in the vast majority of European countries. This decrease takes place during the financial crisis that started in 2008, refuting thus the already classical hypothesis — proposed by Rusche & Kirchheimer— of a negative correlation between imprisonment and the state of the labour market. The state of the latter got worst across the continent but, instead of leading to an increase of prison population rates, that led to a decrease of imprisonment throughout the continent. As can be seen in Table 4.A, in 28 out of the 46 prison administrations that provided the necessary data, the 2016 prison population rate (stock) was more than 5% lower than in 2011. In nine prison administrations the rates were comparable (the 2016 was up to 5% lower or higher than that of 2011), and only in nine prison administrations, the 2016 rate was more than 5% higher than that of 2011.

Similarly, in 28 out of the 35 prison administrations that provided the necessary data, the 2016 rate of entries (flow of entries) was more than 5% lower than in 2011. In three prison administrations the rates were comparable (the 2016 flow of entries was up to 5% lower or higher than that of 2011), and only in four prison administrations, the 2016 flow of entries was more than 5% higher than that of 2011.

The decrease also concerned the rate of releases (flow of releases). In 20 out of the 30 prison administrations that provided the necessary data, the 2016 flow of releases was more than 5% lower than in 2011. In three prison administrations the rates were comparable (the 2016 flow of releases was up to 5% lower or higher than that of 2011), and in seven prison administrations, the 2016 flow of entries was more than 5% higher than that of 2011.

In times of decreasing prison population rates, the interpretation of changes in the percentages of specific categories of inmates is particularly hazardous. For example, if the number of foreign inmates decreases at a slower pace than that of national inmates, the percentage of the former will increase even if their absolute number is decreasing. Several examples of that pattern were found in an analysis of prison and probation rates in Europe from 2005 to 2015 (Aebi et al., 2019; quoted in the previous footnote). For that reason, the slight variations in the percentages of women (4.9% in 2011 and 5.2% in 2016) and foreign inmates (16.4% in 2011 and 16.7% in 2016) should be considered as reflecting a relative stability in the composition of prison populations.

Table 4.A Percentage change (2016 compared to 2011) for three key indicators of imprisonment

	Stock (PPR)	Flow of entries	Flow of releases
Albania	28	114	51
Armenia	-6	...	-34
Austria	-3	-6	-10
Azerbaijan	-7	-4	37
Belgium	-4
Bosnia-Herzegovina	13
Bulgaria	-13	-22	...
Croatia	-37	-36	-34
Cyprus	-27	-38	-40
Czech Republic	-4	-32	-30
Denmark	-16	-19	-18
Estonia	-20	-33	-22
Finland	-7	-13	-14
France	-8	4	11
Georgia	-53	-53	2
Germany	-12	-16	...
Greece	-20
Hungary	6	-9	29
Iceland	-20	-39	-19
Ireland	-16	-26	-26
Italy	-20	-40	-39
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	16
Latvia	-33
Lithuania	-22	-17	...
Luxembourg	0	-20	-13
Malta	-14
Moldova	21	-49	145
Montenegro	-19	8	-25
Netherlands	-26	-14	-16
Norway	3	-22	-24
Poland	-13	-12	-12
Portugal	11	-13	13
Romania	-5	-14	23
Russia	-18
Serbia	0	-21	-24
Slovakia	-6	15	-1
Slovenia	2	-32	-35
Spain	-15	-25	-23
Sweden	-18
Switzerland	8	-5	...
North Macedonia	32	-6	1
Turkey	46	119	...
Ukraine	-55
UK: England and Wales	-4	1	...
UK: Northern Ireland	-14	-38	-33
UK: Scotland	-9

4.1.4 Recidivism

As in previous editions, data on recidivism were not collected. The reason is that the *European Sourcebook* aims to provide data as comparable as possible for the largest possible number of countries, but that goal cannot be reached for recidivism studies yet, because the methodology applied to measure recidivism differs considerably from one country to another. Some countries simply count the number of inmates that had been previously incarcerated, which provides a weak measure of the concept. Some countries conduct a follow up of the inmates released from prisons, which provide a robust measure of recidivism. However, some Western European countries have a relatively large number of foreign inmates who, upon release, are expelled from the country, something that affects the validity of the recidivism measure. For that reason, there are countries that do not include foreigners when measuring recidivism, but that also affects the validity of the measure of recidivism. Furthermore, there are countries that conduct cohort studies in which they collect data on the imprisonment of all persons born in the country in a given year throughout their life. Similarly, a few countries have built up large databases of offender histories, which enable reconviction rates and criminal careers to be studied on a regular basis. At the same time, it must be mentioned that some countries measure recidivism through reincarceration while others measure it through reconviction, and that several countries do not make a distinction between specific recidivism (the new offence is the same or similar to the previous one) and general recidivism (reconviction or reincarceration for any kind of offence).

For all these reasons, only a brief account of some of the main methodological issues and some common features in the results from available reconviction studies are presented here.

In general, results depend heavily on the size of the sample under study, 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, etc.?), the length of the follow-up period, and the definition of recidivism (reconviction or reincarceration? all offences or only specific offences?).

In fact, by choosing different offender characteristics, follow-up periods, or recidivism definitions, it is possible to increase or decrease artificially the recidivism rates. This means that readers must be particularly cautious when interpreting such rates, even within a single country, and even more so when comparing recidivism rates across countries. It is also important to keep in mind that recidivism rates are in fact “rates of recapture”, which means that they depend on the efficiency of each criminal justice systems.

Although the magnitude of reconviction rates varies considerably between countries, there are some common features in the results, namely:

- Past criminal history is the most important predictor of recidivism. The highest recidivism rates are found among the offenders with the longest criminal history.

- Reconviction rates are higher for men than for women. This is mostly explained by differences in criminal history, with men being convicted for violent offence much more often than women
- Younger persons tend to have higher recidivism rates than older persons.
- Recidivism rates are highest during the first year after 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.
- There is no simple relationship between the type of sentence and the recidivism rate

The SPACE website includes a page dedicated to recidivism studies:
<http://www3.unil.ch/wpmu/space/publications/recidivism-studies/>

4.2 Tables

4.2.1 Prison population: Stock of inmates on 1 September

Table 4.2.1.1 Prison population rate per 100 000 population (stock of inmates)

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	160	168	172	188	207	206	28
Armenia	138	144	162	137	129	130	-6
Austria	105	104	104	104	105	101	-3
Azerbaijan	255	228	217	238	252	236	-7
Belgium	107	111	114	118	114	103	-4
Bosnia-Herzegovina	72	75	80	78	83	81	13
Bulgaria	134	130	121	109	105	117	-13
Croatia	119	111	102	89	79	74	-37
Cyprus	108	108	94	79	77	79	-27
Czech Republic	221	216	155	177	198	213	-4
Denmark	71	69	73	64	57	60	-16
Estonia	255	258	247	225	211	203	-20
Finland	61	59	58	57	55	57	-7
France	111	117	119	117	114	103	-8
Georgia	541	516	219	228	275	256	-53
Germany	89	84	80	81	78	78	-12
Greece	112	113	120	110	89	89	-20
Hungary	174	166	185	185	180	185	6
Iceland	47	48	47	47	44	37	-20
Ireland	93	94	88	83	80	78	-16
Italy	113	111	105	88	86	90	-20
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	80	96	97	102	82	93	16
Latvia	316	303	257	240	221	213	-33
Lithuania	311	334	324	305	275	244	-22
Luxembourg	126	126	134	119	118	126	0
Malta	144	149	137	133	130	123	-14
Moldova	178	186	187	201	220	216	21
Montenegro	214	198	184	170	177	174	-19
Netherlands	70	68	63	59	53	51	-26
Norway	72	71	72	73	71	74	3
Poland	214	221	220	205	192	187	-13
Portugal	120	129	136	134	137	133	11
Romania	148	159	165	159	144	141	-5
Russian Federation	542	498	474	467	446	444	-18
Serbia	151	153	140	144	141	151	0
Slovakia	195	201	180	185	183	184	-6
Slovenia	62	67	66	74	68	63	2
Spain	154	149	146	142	138	131	-15
Sweden	72	68	61	61	58	58	-18
Switzerland	77	83	88	85	84	83	8
North Macedonia	122	123	138	151	169	162	32
Turkey	174	183	191	208	229	255	46
Ukraine	348	332	324	204	172	157	-55
UK: England & Wales	152	152	147	149	149	146	-4
UK: Northern Ireland	94	98	100	101	91	81	-14
UK: Scotland	156	153	149	147	144	142	-9
<i>Mean</i>	160	159	149	144	142	139	
<i>Median</i>	130	129	136	134	130	128	
<i>Minimum</i>	47	48	47	47	44	37	
<i>Maximum</i>	542	516	474	467	446	444	

Note: Ukraine: Since 2014, figures do not include inmates held in Crimea and Sebastopol and in areas of Donetsk and Luhansk (areas that held more than one third of the prisons of the country) that are not under the control of the Ukrainian authorities.

Table 4.2.1.2 Percentage of pre-trial detainees in the prison population

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	40	41	40	33	31	50	27
Armenia	27	25	36	28	27	32	20
Austria	20	21	21	21	23	20	2
Azerbaijan	73	14	18	17	18
Belgium	23	22	21	20	21	23	0
Bosnia-Herzegovina	15	12	12	13	15	16	8
Bulgaria	24	16	9	9	9	11	-55
Croatia	18	16	22	22	22	25	41
Cyprus	38	40	42	15	17	17	-56
Czech Republic	11	10	14	12	9	8	-23
Denmark	28	29	30	30	29	27	-2
Estonia	23	24	24	20	22	23	-1
Finland	20	20	19	21	20	18	-11
France	23	22	21	22	24	26	15
Georgia	7	5	14	16	14	15	121
Germany	15	17	17	17	18	18	16
Greece	34	34	23	22	24	24	-28
Hungary	28	30	29	28	24	22	-20
Iceland	4	13	6	5	10	12	200
Ireland	14	12	14	15	16	16	10
Italy	20	19	18	18	16	17	-16
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	43	44	32	31	25	25	-41
Latvia	27	27	24	25	25	9	-65
Lithuania	12	12	11	10	8	9	-22
Luxembourg	38	39	45	43	43	47	25
Malta	30	29	23	30	30	24	-21
Moldova	21	21	23	21	20	21	2
Montenegro	20	23	22	30	30	31	51
Netherlands	49	48	46	43	43	33	-32
Norway	25	27	29	27	27	26	4
Poland	11	9	8	9	6	7	-30
Portugal	15	14	13	11	12	12	-15
Romania	12	11	11	8	8	8	-31
Russian Federation	15	16	17	17	18	17	16
Serbia	27	25	19	91	15	16	-40
Slovakia	13	12	12	13	14	14	8
Slovenia	25	24	19	18	17	16	-39
Spain	17	16	15	13	13	13	-20
Sweden	24	25	25	26	25	26	8
Switzerland	28	31	30	27	27	25	-10
North Macedonia	4	3	4	7	7	7	65
Turkey	28	23	20	14	15	36	30
Ukraine	24	21	...	20
UK: England & Wales	15	13	13	14	14	10	-33
UK: Northern Ireland	38	37	32	30	29	29	-23
UK: Scotland	19	19	19	21	21	18	-9
<i>Mean</i>	24	22	21	22	20	20	
<i>Median</i>	23	21	20	20	20	18	
<i>Minimum</i>	4	3	4	5	6	7	
<i>Maximum</i>	73	48	46	91	43	50	

Table 4.2.1.3 Percentage of women in the prison population

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.6	2.0	1.9	7
Armenia	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.8	4.4	4.0	-5
Austria	6.5	6.6	6.3	6.1	5.9	5.5	-16
Azerbaijan	2.9	2.4	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.1	10
Belgium	4.2	4.6	4.2	4.6	5.0	4.3	4
Bosnia-Herzegovina	2.4	2.3	2.3
Bulgaria	3.3	3.2	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.1	-7
Croatia	4.9	4.4	4.5	5.0	4.9	4.0	-20
Cyprus	5.7	5.7	5.5	6.2	6.1	8.1	41
Czech Republic	6.4	6.4	5.6	6.3	6.9	7.3	13
Denmark	4.2	3.9	4.6	4.0	3.7	4.4	5
Estonia	5.4	5.2	5.0	5.3	5.2	5.5	2
Finland	7.5	7.2	7.3	8.0	7.6	7.5	0
France	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.7	2.8	3.3	-5
Georgia	5.0	5.1	3.3	2.2	3.1	2.8	-44
Germany	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.9	5.9	6
Greece	4.5	4.5	5.2	4.8	5.4	5.3	18
Hungary	7.0	7.6	7.6	7.7	7.4	7.4	5
Iceland	5.4	8.6	3.3	1.9	4.1	6.5	20
Ireland	3.3	3.7	4.0	3.8	3.4	3.9	18
Italy	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.2	0
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	6.5	6.8	6.7	7.0	7.7	8.4	28
Lithuania	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.3	...	4.6	7
Luxembourg	5.6	4.4	4.6	4.0	5.8	5.0	-11
Malta	6.5	6.4	7.3	6.1	0.0	8.3	27
Moldova	6.2	6.2	6.3	6.2	...	6.2	-1
Montenegro	2.8	3.0	2.3	1.8	3.4	3.1	13
Netherlands	6.0	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.4	5.3	-12
Norway	6.3	5.3	5.1	5.1	13.2	5.8	-7
Poland	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	10
Portugal	5.6	5.6	6.0	6.0	6.1	6.3	12
Romania	4.5	4.6	4.5	5.0	3.0	5.0	11
Russian Federation	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.1	8.1	7.9	-3
Serbia	3.5	3.9	4.1	3.2	3.6	3.8	7
Slovakia	6.0	6.3	6.4	6.8	6.5	6.9	15
Slovenia	4.5	5.1	4.7	5.8	5.8	8.0	78
Spain	7.6	7.6	7.6	7.6	7.7	7.6	1
Sweden	5.9	6.0	5.8	5.7	5.7	6.0	2
Switzerland	5.3	4.9	5.2	4.7	5.4	5.6	4
North Macedonia	2.6	2.4	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.0	16
Turkey	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.9	11
Ukraine	4.5	6.3	5.4	5.4	3.7
UK: England & Wales	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	-7
UK: Northern Ireland	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.1	3.6	14
UK: Scotland	5.6	5.8	5.8	5.4	5.3	5.2	-9
<i>Mean</i>	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.1	5.2	
<i>Median</i>	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.9	5.1	5.2	
<i>Minimum</i>	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.6	2.0	1.9	
<i>Maximum</i>	8.2	8.6	8.2	8.1	13.2	8.4	

Table 4.2.1.4 Percentage of minors in the prison population

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	2.6	2.8	2.1	1.7	1.5	1.1	-58
Armenia	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	-56
Austria	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.7	6
Azerbaijan	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	268
Belgium	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Bosnia-Herzegovina	0.5	0.4	0.2	1.0	0.7	0.4	-21
Bulgaria	0.6	0.7	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.1	-80
Croatia	1.1	1.4	0.8	1.1	0.7	0.7	-35
Cyprus	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.4	1.4	0.3	-32
Czech Republic	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	-61
Denmark
Estonia	1.1	1.6	1.2	0.5	0.9	0.7	-38
Finland	0.3
France	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.0	1.0	254
Georgia	0.9	1.0	0.2	0.8	0.5	0.2	-80
Germany	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.3	-10
Greece	0.3	0.3	3.8	3.3	2.8	0.1	-60
Hungary	4.5	...
Iceland
Ireland	1.5	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.5	0.2	-84
Italy	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	14
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	3.0	3.2	2.3	2.2	2.8	3.6	20
Latvia	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.7	-12
Lithuania	2.0	1.2	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.0	-52
Luxembourg	...	0.2	0.1	0.8	0.1	0.3	...
Malta	0.7	0.6	0.7	1.9	...	0.4	-46
Moldova	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.8	0.2	0
Montenegro
Netherlands	4.8	4.9	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.8	0
Norway	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	-72
Poland
Portugal	0.2	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	-81
Romania	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.6	-22
Russian Federation	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	-31
Serbia	2.3	2.0	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.9	26
Slovakia	0.9	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.5	-47
Slovenia	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	...
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland	0.5	0.8	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.5	420
North Macedonia	1.0	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.6	0.0	-97
Turkey	1.6	0.5	1.2	1.1	1.4	0.5	-67
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	1.9	1.5	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7	-60
UK: Northern Ireland	0.8	2.1	1.5	2.0	1.4	1.5	78
UK: Scotland	1.5	1.2	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.9	-37
<i>Mean</i>	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	
<i>Median</i>	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.5	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
<i>Maximum</i>	4.8	4.9	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.8	

Table 4.2.1.5 Percentage of foreigners in the prison population

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	1.5	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.5	1.5	2
Armenia	3.7	2.7	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.9	8
Austria	45.9	46.7	48.2	50.1	53.3	53.9	17
Azerbaijan	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.5	2.3	-29
Belgium	42.0	42.3	42.8	40.6	40.1	40.7	-3
Bosnia-Herzegovina	2.4	3.8	2.8	1.7	2.0	1.8	-27
Bulgaria	2.3	1.9	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.2	38
Croatia	5.7	5.8	6.3	6.1	3.2	6.1	8
Cyprus	40.9	39.5	38.8	37.7	38.2	41.8	2
Czech Republic	7.5	7.5	8.8	8.3	8.0	8.0	8
Denmark	21.2	24.6	26.0	28.0	27.0	28.0	32
Estonia	7.6	7.0	7.0	7.6	7.5	7.6	1
Finland	14.3	14.8	14.5	16.0	15.1	17.5	22
France	17.2	17.9	18.1	18.9	19.3	21.5	25
Georgia	1.5	1.3	1.8	2.4	3.0	0.3	-76
Germany	27.0	28.5	30.0	29.8	31.3	35.6	32
Greece	63.2	63.2	60.4	59.3	54.5	55.2	-13
Hungary	3.6	3.9	3.5	3.5	4.6	5.0	37
Iceland	18.8	24.3	15.1	14.3	20.5	16.9	-10
Ireland	12.3	12.9	13.8	13.3	12.4	12.7	4
Italy	36.1	35.8	34.9	32.6	33.2	34.1	-6
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	4.2	5.5	7.0	6.9	6.0	5.5	29
Latvia	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.7	3.5	3.9	198
Lithuania	1.2	1.5	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5	22
Luxembourg	68.6	68.9	72.2	72.7	73.6	38.4	-44
Malta	34.7	33.4	38.5	42.2	38.9	41.7	20
Moldova	1.6	1.4	0.9	1.3	1.1	1.1	-31
Montenegro	11.4	14.4	14.9	18.0	15.5	18.8	65
Netherlands	20.8	19.5	20.3	18.5	19.1	18.2	-12
Norway	30.5	32.0	32.9	33.6	33.4	33.9	11
Poland	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.9	24
Portugal	20.1	19.1	18.5	17.6	17.5	16.7	-17
Romania	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.1	52
Russian Federation	3.4	3.7	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.6	35
Serbia	2.2	2.0	3.5	2.9	3.5	3.4	56
Slovakia	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.9	2.1	15
Slovenia	10.4	11.5	10.7	10.7	9.4	9.0	-14
Spain	35.4	33.6	32.0	30.5	29.2	28.5	-19
Sweden	21.0	23.0	23.6	22.6	23.3	21.3	1
Switzerland	71.4	74.2	74.5	73.0	71.0	72.0	1
North Macedonia	6.0	2.7	3.1	3.8	5.7	5.4	-10
Turkey	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.2	26
Ukraine	1.7	1.7	...	2.0
UK: England & Wales	12.6	12.6	12.9	12.7	12.2	11.6	-8
UK: Northern Ireland	8.5	7.1	7.1	6.7	8.1	9.1	7
UK: Scotland	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.9	15
<i>Mean</i>	16.4	16.7	17.2	16.8	17.1	16.7	
<i>Median</i>	8.0	7.3	8.8	8.0	8.1	9.0	
<i>Minimum</i>	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.3	
<i>Maximum</i>	71.4	74.2	74.5	73.0	73.6	72.0	

Table 4.2.1.6 Percentage of EU citizens among foreigners in the prison population

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	...	26	60	35	31	9	...
Armenia	4	4	10	10	...
Austria	12	40	42	44	42	39	211
Azerbaijan	0.4	0	0.5	1	1	1	43
Belgium	28	30	29	31
Bosnia-Herzegovina	6	1	9
Bulgaria	20
Croatia	6	16	16	14	29	16	193
Cyprus	35	39	48	43	49	44	26
Czech Republic	48	47	44	51	47	48	1
Denmark	33	33	31	30	32	26	-23
Estonia	16	21	17	8	16	5	-67
Finland	55	56	56	52	50	49	-10
France	24	24	26	26
Georgia	3	2	3	24	613
Germany	33	34	38
Greece	20	20	13	17	-11
Hungary
Iceland	71	46	78	73	57	76	7
Ireland	66	62	63	63	74	76	16
Italy	38	40	42	42	42	38	0
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	26	15	41	15	17	22	-17
Lithuania	18	55	15	29	25	26	47
Luxembourg	57	56	21	58	57
Malta	41	43	...	174	...
Moldova	22	...	21	34	...
Montenegro	3	6	5	0	2	3	30
Netherlands	38	41	44	43	42	41	9
Norway	47	49	51	40	41	49	5
Poland	33	...
Portugal	22	23	22	22	26	19	-12
Romania	31	34	34	27	34	34	8
Russian Federation
Serbia	29	25	19	13	14	31	6
Slovakia	42	48	56	44	48	60	44
Slovenia	23	26	24	21	9	18	-21
Spain	19	21	22	23	24	24	28
Sweden	38	35	36	34	36	35	-6
Switzerland
North Macedonia	2	0	20	24	4	1	-72
Turkey	10	15	13	11	10
Ukraine	3	3	...	2
UK: England & Wales	6	35	37	39	39	43	610
UK: Northern Ireland	35	57	53	60	66	72	108
UK: Scotland	39	45	51	55	56	58	50
<i>Mean</i>	27	31	33	31	32	37	
<i>Median</i>	27	34	33	30	32	33	
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	0	0	1	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	71	62	78	73	74	174	

4.2.2 Convicted prison population by type of offence on 1 September 2015

4.2.2.1 Convicted prison population in 2015 by type of offence, in percentages

	<i>of which %:</i>											
	Total criminal offences per 100 000 pop.	Major road traffic offences	Intentional homicide	Bodily injury	Aggravated bodily injury	Sexual	Rape	Sexual abuse of a child	Robbery	Theft	Fraud	Drug offences
Albania	105	5	32	3	...	2	3	...	13	9	3	15
Armenia	95
Austria	71	...	6	2	...	16	31	...	16
Azerbaijan	206	...	13	5	1	...	5	18	...	28
Belgium	76
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	96	...	26	3	4	...	20	44	...	7
Croatia	60	...	14	4	4	...	15	22	5	12
Cyprus	57	5	11	5	7	...	8	17	...	27
Czech Republic	179	1	9	...
Denmark	36	...	10	16	5	...	10	12	...	24
Estonia	164	...	21	7	4	...	14	14	...	28
Finland	44	8	24	16	...	5	5	...	7	10	...	19
France	88	5	9	...	3	5	...
Georgia	237	...	13	5	...	2	1	...	19	29	...	31
Germany	63	4	8	12	7	7	3	4	13	23	8	13
Greece	67	29
Hungary	135	2	9	8	3	0	2	0	20	25	6	3
Iceland	39	...	10	16	7	...	3	6	...	28
Ireland	67	...	14	14	5	...	4	19	...	13
Italy	56	...	19	28	...	7	6	2	48	35	4	52
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	159	...	16	9	4	...	27	22	...	13
Lithuania	241	...	26	6	...	4	5	...	14	16	5	13
Luxembourg	68	...	16	12	6	...	8	15	...	26
Malta
Moldova	174	...	24	10	...	10	5	...	8	21	...	5
Montenegro	118	...	19	8	0	...	9	10	0	25
Netherlands	29	...	16	3	4	...	13	14	...	15
Norway	52	...	7	14	8	...	8	4	...	25
Poland	175	7	8	3	...	16	26	...	3
Portugal	112	...	9	3	2	3	13	13	...	20
Romania	132	...	22	2	6	...	17	23	...	5
Russian Federation	366	...	28	11	2	2	7	15	2	24
Serbia
Slovakia	161	...	7	4	2	...	14	19	...	11
Slovenia	55	...	10	4	...	9	2	...	19	23	...	21
Spain	120	...	8	5	3	...	31	4	...	23
Sweden	44	...	13	10	5	...	10	8	...	20
Switzerland	45	2	12	5	3	10	4	2	9	21	2	20
North Macedonia	151	...	9	4	1	...	23	15	...	17
Turkey	175	...	18	15	9	...	14	26	...	17
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	126	...	9	16	8	...	11	16	...	14
UK: Northern Ireland	65	...	16	18	5	...	10	10	...	7
UK: Scotland	114
Mean	113	5	15	9	4	6	4	2	14	18	4	19
Median	96	5	13	8	3	7	4	2	13	17	5	18
Minimum	29	2	6	2	3	0	0	0	3	4	0	3
Maximum	366	8	32	28	7	10	9	4	48	44	9	52

Note: Grey coloured cells correspond to countries that do not apply the principal offence rule.

4.2.2.2 Convicted prison population in 2015 by type of offence, in rates per 100,000 population

	Rates per 100 000 population											
	Total criminal offences	Major road traffic offences	Intentional homicide	Bodily injury	Aggravated bodily injury	Sexual assault	Rape	Sexual abuse of a child	Robbery	Theft	Fraud	Drug offences
Albania	105	5	34	3	...	2	3	...	13	9	4	15
Armenia	95
Austria	71	...	4	2	...	11	22	...	11
Azerbaijan	206	...	26	10	2	...	11	38	...	58
Belgium	76
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	96	...	25	3	4	...	19	43	...	7
Croatia	60	...	8	2	2	...	9	13	3	7
Cyprus	57	3	6	3	4	...	5	10	...	16
Czech Republic	179	2	15	...
Denmark	36	...	3	6	2	...	4	4	...	9
Estonia	164	...	34	11	7	...	22	24	...	46
Finland	44	4	11	7	2	...	3	4	...	8
France	88	4	8	...	3	4	...
Georgia	237	...	31	12	...	5	3	...	45	68	...	73
Germany	63	2	5	8	5	4	2	2	8	14	5	8
Greece	67	20
Hungary	135	2	13	11	3	0.02	3	0.3	28	33	8	4
Iceland	39	...	4	6	3	...	1	2	...	11
Ireland	67	...	9	9	3	...	3	13	...	9
Italy	56	...	11	16	...	4	3	1	27	19	2	29
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	159	...	25	14	7	...	43	35	...	21
Lithuania	241	...	64	14	...	11	12	...	35	40	13	31
Luxembourg	68	...	11	8	4	...	5	10	...	18
Malta	0	...
Moldova	174	...	42	17	...	18	9	...	14	36	...	9
Montenegro	118	...	22	10	0.5	...	10	12	0	30
Netherlands	29	...	5	1	1	...	4	4	...	4
Norway	52	...	4	7	4	...	4	2	...	13
Poland	175	12	14	5	...	28	45	...	6
Portugal	112	...	10	4	2	3	14	14	...	22
Romania	132	...	29	2	9	...	23	30	...	6
Russian Federation	366	...	103	41	8	6	24	55	6	89
Serbia	...	2	10	2	...	4	3	1	16	26	2	24
Slovakia	161	...	11	7	2	...	22	30	...	18
Slovenia	55	...	6	2	...	5	1	...	11	12	...	11
Spain	120	...	9	6	4	...	37	4	...	27
Sweden	44	...	6	5	2	...	4	4	...	9
Switzerland	45	1	5	2	1	4	2	1	4	9	1	9
North Macedonia	151	...	14	6	2	...	35	23	...	26
Turkey	175	...	32	26	16	...	25	46	...	30
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	126	...	12	20	11	...	14	20	...	18
UK: Northern Ireland	65	...	10	12	3	...	7	6	...	5
UK: Scotland	114
Mean	113	4	19	9	3	6	4	2	16	22	5	21
Median	96	3	11	7	3	4	3	2	14	17	4	15
Minimum	29	1	3	1	1	0.02	0.5	0.3	1	2	0	4
Maximum	366	12	103	41	5	18	16	6	45	68	15	89

Note: Grey coloured cells correspond to countries that do not apply the principal offence rule.

Table 4.2.2.3 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Total Criminal offences

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	105	3.8	0.4	1.4	...
Armenia	95	6.0	0.2	4.4	10
Austria	71
Azerbaijan	206	3.5	0.4	3.1	1
Belgium	76
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	96	3.5	1.2	3.4	20
Croatia	60	6.4	1.9	4.2	29
Cyprus	57	8.3	2.4	51.7	49
Czech Republic	179	7.6	0.5	8.8	47
Denmark	36
Estonia	164
Finland	44	9.5	0.4	19.0	50
France	88	3.6	1.3	2.0	23
Georgia	237	3.6	0.6	3.5	3
Germany	63	6.1	0.9	26.1	36
Greece	67
Hungary	135	7.2	2.0	2.2	...
Iceland	39
Ireland	67
Italy	56	6.2	1.3	51.1	42
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	159	10.8	1.2	4.9	17
Lithuania	241	3.8	0.8	1.1	29
Luxembourg	68	10.5	0.5	135.1	...
Malta
Moldova	174	7.8	1.1	1.4	21
Montenegro	118	2.9	0.5	12.7	0
Netherlands	29
Norway	52	18.0	0.1	45.6	41
Poland	175
Portugal	112	5.6	0.1	15.7	...
Romania	132	3.3	2.7	1.0	34
Russian Federation	366	8.3	0.3	5.4	...
Serbia	14
Slovakia	161
Slovenia	55	7.1	1.6	11.5	9
Spain	120
Sweden	44	5.3	...	30.9	36
Switzerland	45	4.8	...	64.1	...
North Macedonia	151
Turkey	175
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	126	5.4	1.0	14.5	39
UK: Northern Ireland	65	4.4	1.9	11.5	66
UK: Scotland	114	6.6	8.5	4.8	56
<i>Mean</i>	113	6	1	19	
<i>Median</i>	96	6	1	7	
<i>Minimum</i>	29	3	0	1	
<i>Maximum</i>	366	18	8	135	

Table 4.2.2.4 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Major road traffic offences

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	5	0	0	0	...
Cyprus	3	8.3
Finland	4	5.1	0	2.0	100
France	4	1.3	0.1	9.8	22
Germany	2	1.8	0.0	18.0	45
Hungary	2	0.9	0.4	3.5	...
Serbia	2	0.7	0	0	NAP
Switzerland	1	1.2	...	55.3	...

Table 4.2.2.5 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Intentional homicide

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	34	1.9	0.1	0.2	...
Finland	11	10.3	...	5.7	27.3
Germany	5	6.5	0.2
Hungary	13	9.5	1.5	2.6	...
Italy	11	3.8	0.8
Moldova	42	...	0.9
Montenegro	22	0.7	...	8.0	...
Russian Federation	103	7.7	0.2	2.4	...
Serbia	10	5.8	4.5	0.0	NAP
Switzerland	5	8.1	...	48.8	...

Table 4.2.2.6 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Bodily injury

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst Foreigners
Albania	3	1.1	0	0	NAP
Finland	7	7.9	0	4.1	44
Georgia	12
Germany	8	3.3	1.1
Hungary	11	3.6	1.5	1.1	...
Italy	16	2.4	1.9	0	NAP
Lithuania	14	2.2	0.2	0.7	...
Montenegro	10	1.6	...	1.6	...
Portugal	4	3.4	...	11.6	...
Russian Federation	41	...	0.3
Serbia	2	2.2	1.4	0.7	...
Switzerland	2	2.8	...	52.2	...

Table 4.2.2.7 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Aggravated bodily injury

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Germany	5	3.3	1.2
Hungary	3	2.6	3.5	0.3	...
Switzerland	1	0.9	...	48.6	...

Table 4.2.2.8 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Sexual assault

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	2	...	0	1.5	...
Finland	2	0.8	0	16.8	20.0
France	8	1.1	0	12.9	21.4
Germany	4	0.6	0.6
Hungary	0.02	0	0	0	NAP
Italy	4	3.2
Lithuania	11	0	0.3	0.3	...
Malta	102.7
Moldova	18	...	1.4
Serbia	4	1.0	1.3	2.9	...
Switzerland	4	1.4	...	38.6	...

Table 4.2.2.9 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Rape

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	3	...	0
Croatia	2	0
Germany	2	0.6	1.1
Hungary	3	1.0	1.7	3.4	...
Italy	3	3.0
Montenegro	0	66.7	...
Portugal	2	18.1	...
Russian Federation	8	0.4	0.4
Serbia	3	0	0.5	3.8	...
Switzerland	2	0	...	53.3	...

Table 4.2.2.10 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Sexual abuse of a child

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Czech Republic	2	3.5
France	3	1.1	0.2	7.9	30
Germany	2	0.7	0.2
Hungary	0.3	3.2	6.5	3.2	...
Italy	1	3.0
Portugal	3	15.1	...
Russian Federation	6	0.6	2.4
Serbia	1	0	0	2.4	...
Switzerland	1	1.4	...	40.3	...

Table 4.2.2.11 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Robbery

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	13	0.3	0	0.3	...
Finland	3	3.8	1.3	9.4	33
Germany	8	3.0	2.8	29.2	28
Hungary	28	7.7	4.3	2.0	...
Italy	27	2.9	3.4
Lithuania	35	1.4	2.6	0.7	...
Moldova	14	...	2.0	...	NAP
Portugal	14	4.6	0.3	15.9	...
Russian Federation	24	3.8	0.7	5.8	...
Serbia	16	2.3	3.7	1.4	...
Switzerland	4	3.8	...	63.8	...

Table 4.2.2.12 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Theft

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	9	...	3.5	3.5	100
Finland	4	6.2	0	11.1	70
Georgia	68
Germany	14	7.3	1.0	30.3	48
Hungary	33	6.3	2.3	8.6	...
Italy	19	4.5	4.6
Lithuania	40	3.1	2.1	0.4	...
Moldova	36	...	0.6
Montenegro	12	1.3	...	18.7	...
Portugal	14	4.7	...	7.2	...
Russian Federation	55	7.2	0.3	2.8	...
Serbia	26	3.6	3.7	0.9	...
Switzerland	9	3.9	...	79.9	...

Table 4.2.2.13 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Fraud

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	4	1.9	0
Croatia	3	11.5
Czech Republic	15	10.5
France	4	4.2	0.6	20.2	31
Germany	5	13.4	0.2
Hungary	8	12.5	0	1.0	...
Italy	2	7.1
Lithuania	13	6.8	0	1.1	...
Russian Federation	6	19.9	0	3.8	...
Serbia	2	7.6	0.8	2.3	...
Switzerland	1	15.0	...	48.3	...

Table 4.2.2.14 Convicted prison population in 2015 – Drug offences

	Rate per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners	% of EU citizens amongst foreigners
Albania	15	1.3	0	5.2	...
Finland	8	5.5	0	27.4	50
Germany	8	6.1	0.1	34.0	31
Hungary	4	5.9	0	18.5	...
Italy	29	3.9	0.8	35.4	...
Lithuania	31	7.1	0	3.1	...
Montenegro	30	1.6	...	1.6	...
Portugal	22	11.2	...	27.0	...
Russian Federation	89	13.0	0.1	8.3	...
Serbia	24	3.7	0.2	4.1	...
Switzerland	9	3.6	...	81.9	...

Notes on Tables 4.2.1 (4.2.1.1 to 4.2.1.6) and 4.2.2 (4.2.2.1 to 4.2.4.14)

	Also see the notes under 4.4.1 regarding the reference date (<i>different from 1st September</i>), the standard definition for inmates, minors, foreigners, and offences
Bulgaria	The number of the convicted but not yet sentenced detainees includes those who have appealed or who are within the statutory limit for doing so. The number of sentenced detainees who have appealed or who are within the statutory limit for doing so is not registered as a separate item in the source of data that has been used.
Germany	Table 4.2.1: Data refer to 31 st March of the respective year. Data on minors serving a prison sentence after conviction stems from a different source than the rest. The data on minors included in SPACE I refers to persons in youth prisons, which are usually are young adults, not minors. This has been amended in the data included in this chapter of the Sourcebook.
Netherlands	In order to be consistent with SPACE, total numbers exclude juveniles and persons in psychiatric institutions. Where figures are given for these, they must not be seen as "of which ..."
Poland	Minors, convicted according to Penal Code, are included in the tables as convicts. Minors, convicted according to Act of Juvenile Treatment, are not included in the tables. Data as of 31 August (Table 4.2.1) except the numbers of aliens, data as of 31 December. Number of total prison population consists of: pre-trial detainees, sentenced persons and persons sentenced according to Code of misdemeanours (Table 4.2.1, 4.2.3).
Switzerland	The number of detainees who have not received a final sentence yet, but who have started serving a prison sentence in advance includes untried detainees, convicted but not yet sentenced detainees, and sentenced detainees who have appealed or who are within the statutory limit for doing so.
Turkey	Tables 4.2.1: Stock data for 2016 refers to 1 st November 2016 instead of 1 st September 2016. Data on foreigners comes from the UNCTS database. Tables 4.2.2.: The data on minors provided for SPACE included inconsistencies that have been amended in the data included here. However, the new data refer to 31 st December from 2011 to 2015, and to 1 st November in 2016 instead of 1 st September. Tables 4.2.3.: The data provided for SPACE included inconsistencies that have been amended in the data included here. Tables 4.2.4 The data provided for SPACE included inconsistencies that have been amended here. The new data provided allows a breakdown by gender, age, and citizenship. However, it does not include pre-trial detainees.
UK: England and Wales	The date used for the information in table 4.2.1 is the same of the Offender Management Statistics quarterly publication and refers to 30 th June.

4.2.3. Prison population: Flow of entries into penal institutions

Table 4.2.3.1 Flow of entries into penal institutions per 100 000 population

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	121	141	157	223	216	260	114
Armenia
Austria	141	137	141	135	133	132	-6
Azerbaijan	91	93	95	104	99	87	-4
Belgium	172	165	167	173	166
Bosnia-Herzegovina	99	110
Bulgaria	102	84	98	74	70	80	-22
Croatia	294	273	259	216	185	187	-36
Cyprus	337	366	312	265	228	209	-38
Czech Republic	158	136	87	101	110	108	-32
Denmark	251	249	257	223	211	204	-19
Estonia	210	200	163	134	143	141	-33
Finland	120	112	107	105	104	104	-13
France	136	139	136	138	140	142	4
Georgia	541	516	219	228	275	256	-53
Germany	140	126	119	117	115	118	-16
Greece	123	110	118	104	...
Hungary	253	243	324	311	220	231	-9
Iceland	105	101	95	85	86	64	-39
Ireland	383	376	345	354	368	283	-26
Italy	130	106	100	83	75	78	-40
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	741	738	606	626	645
Lithuania	322	309	297	288	263	268	-17
Luxembourg	213	159	147	173	169	170	-20
Malta	175	164	159	140	120
Moldova	413	434	277	238	308	209	-49
Montenegro	392	506	411	384	364	424	8
Netherlands	241	233	237	254	228	207	-14
Norway	218	207	198	175	176	169	-22
Poland	235	251	234	223	207	207	-12
Portugal	59	63	59	52	54	52	-13
Romania	74	76	79	63	64	63	-14
Russian Federation	214	222	222	218	...
Serbia	370	378	361	325	313	293	-21
Slovakia	138	167	148	166	156	159	15
Slovenia	167	186	189	159	166	113	-32
Spain	98	112	93	98	75	73	-25
Sweden	414	411	392	401	423
Switzerland	673	725	670	645	646	637	-5
North Macedonia	109	115	114	153	118	102	-6
Turkey	109	155	214	223	217	238	119
Ukraine	108
UK: England & Wales	215	199	188	211	197	218	1
UK: Northern Ireland	349	349	239	219	207	215	-38
UK: Scotland	700	658	627	605	583
<i>Mean</i>	246	250	225	220	214	184	
<i>Median</i>	193	186	189	193	180	170	
<i>Minimum</i>	59	63	59	52	54	52	
<i>Maximum</i>	741	738	670	645	646	637	

Note: Grey coloured cells are interpolations.

Table 4.2.3.2 Percentage of pre-trial detainees in the flow of entries

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	79	89	89	79	82
Armenia
Austria	71	73	72	73	74	73	2
Azerbaijan	94	90	90	99	99	99	5
Belgium	65	63	63	61	59
Bosnia-Herzegovina	35	30
Bulgaria	41	36	31	35	35	31	-26
Croatia	...	26	31	33	38	41	...
Cyprus	50	53	50	49	51	57	13
Czech Republic	37	38	58	46	38	38	2
Denmark
Estonia	65	74	74	62	60	61	-6
Finland	32	36	34	34	36	34	6
France	54	51	53	54	55	56	5
Georgia	7	4	8	11	14	11	58
Germany	47	46	12
Greece	36	33	35	...
Hungary	48	47	39	31	33	29	-40
Iceland	34	38	44	42	48	63	84
Ireland	27	22	21	22	19	26	-5
Italy	88	85	85	84	80	78	-11
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	67	67	65	64	66
Lithuania	65	65	67	65	66	64	0
Luxembourg	63	85	81	71	68	67	6
Malta	...	60	56	59	61
Moldova	17	26	38	50	40	37	114
Montenegro	26	24	26	27	33	30	15
Netherlands	45	44	40	33	36	39	-14
Norway	34	38	40	41	40	39	16
Poland	24	19	18	19	15	16	-34
Portugal	43	43	41	43	44	43	0
Romania	10	32	10	10
Russian Federation	64	64	64	61	...
Serbia	32	32	32	29	35	41	28
Slovakia	40	32	36	36	35	37	-7
Slovenia	29	23	22	26	20	37	25
Spain	55	64	66
Sweden	76	76	76	77	79
Switzerland	27	28	28	26	26	26	-3
North Macedonia	4	5	15	3	4	5	40
Turkey	...	50	36	31	32
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	78	53	77	45	46	42	-46
UK: Northern Ireland	74	71	69	...
UK: Scotland	57
<i>Mean</i>	46	46	47	46	47	45	
<i>Median</i>	43	43	41	43	42	39	
<i>Minimum</i>	4	4	8	3	4	5	
<i>Maximum</i>	94	90	90	99	99	99	

Note: Grey coloured cells are interpolations.

Table 4.2.3.3 Percentage of women in the flow of entries

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Croatia	...	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.7	5.7	...
Cyprus	5.3	4.9	4.8	5.9	6.3	6.0	15
Czech Republic	9.0	10.2	10.5	11.0	12.3	14.5	61
Finland	8.4	8.0	9.5	8.7	9.7	10.6	26
France	4.8	5.0	4.9	...	4.9	5.0	5
Georgia	5.0	5.1	...	2.5	3.1	2.8	-44
Hungary	10.0	9.5	10.2	10.1	8.6	9.1	-8
Italy	7.7	7.8	7.6	7.4	7.3	7.2	-7
Moldova	4.2
Portugal	6.9	7.1	7.8	7.3	7.8	7.6	9
Serbia	1.5	4.0	4.2	3.8	3.9	3.7	152
Turkey	4.2	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.8	-8

Table 4.2.3.4 Percentage of minors in the flow of entries

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Croatia	0.3
Cyprus	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.2	0.1	6
Czech Republic	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.0	0.8	0.7	-39
Finland	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.6	15
France	3.5	3.5	3.5	...	3.3	3.5	-2
Georgia	0.9	0.6	...	0.8	0.5	0.2	-76
Italy	1.6	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.3	2.4	49
Moldova	0.5
Montenegro	0.3	0.4	0.8	...
Netherlands	4.6	4.8	3.7	3.2	3.7	4.1	-10
Portugal	0.9	1.1	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	-24
Serbia	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.5	15
Turkey	2.1	2.7	3.8	4.4	5.3	4.9	136

Table 4.2.3.5 Percentage of foreigners in the flow of entries

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Czech Republic	10.4	12.0	10.5	11.0	12.3	14.5	39
Finland	14.1	16.0	15.8	16.7	15.7	17.0	21
France	20.1	21.0	22.1	...	20.5	21.6	8
Georgia	1.5	2.4	3.0	3.5	139
Italy	43.3	42.9	43.5	45.3	44.8	44.6	3
Montenegro	27.9	26.9	24.0	23.0	...
Portugal	19.2	18.8	16.9	16.7	17.7	16.0	-17
Serbia	19.3	18.6	16.4	13.4	10.1	6.6	-66
Turkey	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.5	49

Table 4.2.3.6 Percentage of foreigners with EU citizenship in the flow of entries

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Czech Republic	47.6	46.4	69.2	60.0	54.2	52.5	10
Finland	58.8	59.5	58.0	55.1	55.8	52.2	-11
France	27.6	27.7	28.8	28.4	27.0	24.8	-10
Georgia	2.4	2.9	2.4	...
Serbia	6.7	4.9	6.9	10.0	14.9	19.1	187

4.2.4. Prison population: Flow of exits from penal institutions

Table 4.2.4.1 Flow of exits from penal institutions per 100 000 population*

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	110	142	124	155	193	166	51
Armenia	84	54	88	52	50
Austria	141	139	140	137	133	127	-10
Azerbaijan	56	65	80	64	76	75	35
Belgium	164	155	166	179	164
Bosnia-Herzegovina	106	111
Bulgaria	94	92	93	86	75
Croatia	275	265	256	214	183	182	-34
Cyprus	256	268	242	197	163	154	-40
Czech Republic	146	141	146	80	89	102	-30
Denmark	152	157	160	145	138	125	-18
Estonia	198	202	178	159	158	154	-22
Finland	120	114	110	106	103	103	-14
France	125	135	135	136	138	139	11
Georgia	201	246	384	171	275	206	2
Germany
Greece	82	86	106	93	...
Hungary	172	177	316	241	215	222	29
Iceland	104	105	107	90	90	84	-19
Ireland	386	379	366	365	373	285	-26
Italy	141	124	116	108	88	86	-39
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	164	184	186	178	185
Lithuania	163	...
Luxembourg	202	225	147	167	155	175	-13
Malta	163	157	153	...	120
Moldova	40	85	68	110	79	95	139
Montenegro	543	487	460	360	329	407	-25
Netherlands	245	236	242	258	230	206	-16
Norway	215	209	196	175
Poland	234	243	248	228	225	205	-12
Portugal	50	54	53	55	52	56	13
Romania	61	69	71	79	72	75	23
Russian Federation	...	178	201	195
Serbia	371	390	365	322	314	283	-24
Slovakia	128	129	138	127	128	128	0
Slovenia	181	187	156	163	130	117	-35
Spain	101	115	98	89	83	78	-23
Sweden
Switzerland
North Macedonia	102	147	124	154	119	103	1
Turkey	...	161	335	220	213
Ukraine	124	125	118
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland	330	350	234	225	220	222	-33
UK: Scotland	311
<i>Mean</i>	175	179	181	163	160	154	
<i>Median</i>	149	156	150	157	138	133	
<i>Minimum</i>	40	54	53	52	50	56	
<i>Maximum</i>	543	487	460	365	373	407	

Note: The flow of exits is estimated by adding the flows of releases and deaths.

Table 4.2.4.2 Flow of releases from penal institutions per 100 000 population*

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	109	142	123	155	193	165	51
Armenia	83	54	87	50	49	55	-34
Austria	141	138	140	136	133	127	-10
Azerbaijan	54	63	79	63	74	74	37
Belgium	164	155	165	179	164
Bosnia-Herzegovina	106	111
Bulgaria	94	92	92	86	75
Croatia	275	264	256	214	183	181	-34
Cyprus	256	268	242	197	163	154	-40
Czech Republic	146	140	146	80	88	102	-30
Denmark	138	125	...
Estonia	197	202	178	158	158	153	-22
Finland	120	114	109	106	103	102	-14
France	125	135	134	136	137	139	11
Georgia
Germany
Greece	86	106	92	...
Hungary	167	172	309	236	207	215	29
Iceland	104	105	106	90	90	84	-19
Ireland	386	379	366	365	372	285	-26
Italy	141	123	116	108	88	86	-39
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	162	182	185	176	184
Lithuania	161	...
Luxembourg	202	224	147	167	155	175	-13
Malta	162	156	152	...	119
Moldova	38	84	67	108	78	93	145
Montenegro	542	487	459	359	328	406	-25
Netherlands	245	236	242	258	230	206	-16
Norway	215	209	196	175	175	163	-24
Poland	234	243	248	227	225	205	-12
Portugal	49	54	52	55	52	56	13
Romania	60	69	70	79	72	74	23
Russian Federation	...	175	198	192
Serbia	370	389	364	322	313	282	-24
Slovakia	128	129	138	127	128	127	-1
Slovenia	181	187	156	163	130	117	-35
Spain	100	114	97	89	82	77	-23
Sweden
Switzerland
North Macedonia	101	146	123	153	118	103	1
Turkey	...	161	335	220	212	234	...
Ukraine	122	122	116
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland	330	349	234	225	220	222	-33
UK: Scotland	310
<i>Mean</i>	174	177	178	163	157	151	
<i>Median</i>	143	151	147	156	138	133	
<i>Minimum</i>	38	54	52	50	49	55	
<i>Maximum</i>	542	487	459	365	372	406	

Table 4.2.4.3 Percentage of pre-trial detainees in the flow of releases

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	58	55	64	67	76
Armenia	27	24	22	33	35	34	26
Austria	28	22	27	27	30	31	10
Azerbaijan	...	11	12	18	16	21	...
Belgium	44	43	40	38	43
Bosnia-Herzegovina	31	27
Bulgaria	15	10	10	10
Croatia	37	28	30	35	38	41	10
Cyprus
Czech Republic	13	13	12	16	15	16	24
Denmark
Estonia	10	20	19	15	15	15	44
Finland	18	20	19	19	20	19	8
France	13	12	14	22	65
Georgia
Germany
Greece	28	16	19	...
Hungary	27	25	18	18	19	17	-39
Iceland	20	23	21	22	20	25	28
Ireland	29	25	22	22	21	28	-1
Italy	50	41	41	41	37	37	-28
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	34	32	34	37	35
Lithuania
Luxembourg	31	35	48	55	47	43	36
Malta	28	47	31	...	47
Moldova	33	53	39	33	54	54	65
Montenegro	28	16	23	27	33	30	7
Netherlands	27	26	25	21	22	24	-11
Norway	18	20	19	18	22	22	19
Poland	18	16	14	15	13	10	-43
Portugal	21	21	19	...
Romania	13	10	10	9	19	13	0
Russian Federation	...	28	3	19
Serbia	33	33	34	30	35	41	27
Slovakia	17	16	17	17	17	18	6
Slovenia	22	23	27	25	34	27	19
Spain	53	31	35	...	22
Sweden
Switzerland
North Macedonia	19	27	37	25	20	16	-16
Turkey	28
Ukraine	26	26	17
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland	40	37	49	49	48	49	25
UK: Scotland	43
<i>Mean</i>	28	27	26	27	30	27	
<i>Median</i>	27	25	22	25	22	23	
<i>Minimum</i>	10	10	3	9	13	10	
<i>Maximum</i>	58	55	64	67	76	54	

Table 4.2.4.4 Percentage of sentenced prisoners in the flow of releases

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	41	45	36	33	22
Armenia	73	75	77	64	61	63	-13
Austria	63	63	64	69	70	69	9
Azerbaijan	99	91	88	80	83	73	-26
Belgium	47	50	53	54	49
Bosnia-Herzegovina	65	69
Bulgaria	85	90	90	91	92
Croatia	26	29	28	29	30	44	73
Cyprus	55	47	53	49	45	41	-26
Czech Republic	82	10	79	76	77	77	-6
Denmark	100	100	...
Estonia	90	327	81	85	85	86	-5
Finland	81	78	79	79	79	79	-2
France	87	88	86	78	-11
Georgia
Germany
Greece	72	82	80	...
Hungary	71	74	81	81	80	82	15
Iceland	79	76	78	78	79	75	-6
Ireland	71	75	78	78	79	72	0
Italy	49	57	59	58	62	63	29
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	66	68	66	64	65
Lithuania	100	...
Luxembourg	40	52	48	41	49	53	31
Malta	72	44	69	...	50
Moldova	71	48	63	68	48	46	-34
Montenegro	72	84	77	73	66	69	-3
Netherlands	70	72	73	76	74	72	3
Norway	68	70	71	75	66	66	-2
Poland	70	71	69	60	59	60	-15
Portugal	79	81	...
Romania	87	91	91	91	81	87	-1
Russian Federation	...	62	97	81
Serbia	67	67	66	70	65	59	-13
Slovakia	82	84	83	83	83	82	0
Slovenia	25	27	34	31	66	63	147
Spain	47	69	79	...	78
Sweden
Switzerland
North Macedonia	81	72	63	75	78	82	1
Turkey	...	91	62	81	84	108	...
Ukraine	74	74	83
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland	60	62	48	48	49	49	-19
UK: Scotland	58
<i>Mean</i>	67	73	69	67	68	72	
<i>Median</i>	71	70	72	73	70	73	
<i>Minimum</i>	25	10	28	29	22	41	
<i>Maximum</i>	99	327	97	91	100	108	

Table 4.2.4.5 Percentage of inmates transferred to another country in the flow of releases (2015-2016)

	% of inmates transferred to another country in the flow of releases		of which: % transferred to an EU member state	
	2015	2016	2015	2016
Albania	1.5	...	16	...
Armenia	2.2	2.2
Austria	1.3	1.6
Azerbaijan	0.6	0.7	3	2
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	0.3
Croatia	0.01	0.1	100	33
Cyprus	1.0	1.8	100	78
Czech Republic	5.1	5.3
Denmark
Estonia	0.3	0.3
Finland	1.3	1.4
France
Georgia
Germany
Greece	0.5	0.6	71	47
Hungary	1.3	1.4	0	0
Iceland	0.3	0.2	100	100
Ireland	0.02	0.03	100	100
Italy
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	0.1	...	0	...
Lithuania
Luxembourg	3.2	3.3	100	93
Malta	3.1	...	0	...
Moldova	0	1.0	...	6
Montenegro	0.1	1.3	0	6
Netherlands	1.1	1.4
Norway	0.7	0.7	97	96
Poland
Portugal
Romania	0.1	0.1	77	88
Russian Federation
Serbia	0.1	0.2	41	38
Slovakia	0.5	0.3
Slovenia	0.1	0.1	100	100
Spain	1.1	2.9	31	14
Sweden
Switzerland
North Macedonia
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland	2.3
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	1.0	1.2	55	53
<i>Median</i>	0.5	0.8	71	47
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0.03	0	0
<i>Maximum</i>	5.1	5.3	100	100

Table 4.2.4.6 Percentage of “other” releases in the flow of releases

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	0	0	0	0	0
Armenia	25	2	1	3
Austria	9	15	9	4
Azerbaijan	4	...	2	4	2	6	60
Belgium	9	8	7	8	8
Bosnia-Herzegovina	4	4
Bulgaria	1	1	9
Croatia	37	44	42	37	32
Cyprus	1	0	0	0	0	0	-93
Czech Republic	5	7	8	8	1	1	-74
Denmark	0
Estonia	0	0	0	0	0	0	...
Finland	1	1	2	2	0	0	-91
France	0	0	0	0
Georgia
Germany
Greece	1	1	...
Hungary	3	2	2	2	3	3	7
Iceland	1	1	1	0	0	0	-100
Ireland	0
Italy	1	1	1	1	1	1	-19
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	1	1	1	0	1
Lithuania	1	...
Luxembourg	28	14	4	3	2	3	-89
Malta	0	9	0	...	0
Moldova	0	0	0	...	0	0	...
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	...
Netherlands	3	2	2	3	3	3	19
Norway	14	10	10	7	11	11	-17
Poland	8	0
Portugal	26	29	30	0	0	7	-74
Romania	8	0	1	1	1
Russian Federation
Serbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Slovakia	1	0	0	0	0	0	-100
Slovenia	52	49	39	44	0	2	-96
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
North Macedonia	0	0	0	0	1	1	391
Turkey	0
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland	0	2	3	3	1
UK: Scotland
<i>Mean</i>	8	7	6	5	3	2	
<i>Median</i>	1	1	1	1	1	1	
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<i>Maximum</i>	52	49	42	44	32	11	

Table 4.2.4.7 Rate of deaths in prison per 10 000 inmates

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Average 2011-2016
Albania	19	17	26	26	26	36	25
Armenia	71	62	42	84	62	...	64
Austria	42	38	43	24	39	38	37
Azerbaijan	63	57	44	53	59	53	55
Belgium	44	44	55	50	37	...	46
Bosnia-Herzegovina	22	40	31
Bulgaria	53	32	32	29	44	40	38
Croatia	26	26	31	31	22	22	26
Cyprus	0	0	22	33	22	22	17
Czech Republic	16	21	11	13	19	19	16
Denmark	33	13	20	10	10	16	17
Estonia	35	15	15	24	12	12	19
Finland	28	12	15	28	9	28	20
France	23	23	21	18	32	27	24
Georgia	60	...	10	11	5	5	18
Germany	18	17	17	21	21	23	19
Greece	50	21	66	23	32	22	36
Hungary	24	32	37	42	35	37	34
Iceland	0	67	134	0	0	0	34
Ireland	14	12	21	19	33	27	21
Italy	25	23	23	14	16	17	20
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	41	47	23	43	26	22	34
Lithuania	40	40
Luxembourg	31	47	16	16	16	31	26
Malta	33	17	83	...	33	...	42
Moldova	77	49	43	71	77	72	65
Montenegro	38	30	38	53	45	34	40
Netherlands	35	22	12	22	28	22	23
Norway	17	17	34	17	21
Poland	16	13	13	13	13	15	14
Portugal	50	52	49	58	53	54	53
Romania	30	39	34	41	38	32	35
Russian Federation	...	53	54	53	53
Serbia	58	82	63	34	56	44	56
Slovakia	14	22	11	17	17	22	17
Slovenia	31	47	31	47	39	24	37
Spain	28	27	23	22	29	23	25
Sweden	21	24	19	24	12	9	18
Switzerland	16	48	16	25	40	28	29
North Macedonia	48	32	52	40	52	58	47
Turkey	21	27	24	30	33	...	27
Ukraine	64	64	50	59
UK: England & Wales	22	22	25	28	30	32	27
UK: Northern Ireland	23	41	18	6	12	18	20
UK: Scotland	29	22	29	29	29	32	28
<i>Mean</i>	33	33	34	30	30	28	32
<i>Median</i>	29	27	26	26	30	27	28
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	10	0	0	0	14
<i>Maximum</i>	77	82	134	84	77	72	65

Table 4.2.4.8 Percentage of suicides among inmates who died in prison

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Average 2011-2016
Albania	22	0	33	25	8	6	16
Armenia	19	11	11	11	11	...	12
Austria	35	36	16	38	18	25	28
Azerbaijan	8	3	2	2	5	8	5
Belgium	23	25	22	31	36	...	27
Bosnia-Herzegovina	17	9	13
Bulgaria	12	13	13	0	16	11	11
Croatia	15	0	0	0	9	0	4
Cyprus	NAP	NAP	100	100	0	0	63
Czech Republic	24	33	27	41	30	33	31
Denmark	38	80	38	50	50	46	50
Estonia	25	0	40	13	0	13	15
Finland	78	50	40	22	67	22	46
France	59	58	63	58	43	49	55
Georgia	4	...	24	26	17	67	27
Germany	41	48	41	39	45	47	44
Greece	5	21	13	9	12
Hungary	22	14	11	8	8	14	13
Iceland	NAP	0	50	NAP	NAP	NAP	25
Ireland	0	20	22	25	7	...	15
Italy	38	37	27	47	36	37	37
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	26	23	20	18	18	21	21
Lithuania	37	37
Luxembourg	100	67	100	0	0	0	44
Malta	50	0	20	...	0	...	18
Moldova	14	16	...	18	10	9	13
Montenegro	60	25	0	0	17	11	19
Netherlands	38	40	29	56	34	42	40
Norway	67	67	92	100	81
Poland	17	17	17	24	22	20	20
Portugal	13	24	21	30	16	13	20
Romania	10	19	19	11	10	11	13
Russian Federation	11	10	10
Serbia	6	8	9	5	16	17	10
Slovakia	47	26	33	33	28	32	33
Slovenia	25	33	75	0	0	0	22
Spain	8	16	24	20	14	20	17
Sweden	50	44	46	44	38	33	42
Switzerland	60	31	20	60	42	29	40
North Macedonia	17	0	8	0	8	10	7
Turkey	11	11	14	14	10	...	12
Ukraine	5	5	8	6
UK: England & Wales	30	31	35	37	35	29	33
UK: Northern Ireland	50	0	0	17
UK: Scotland	...	6	21	13	8	9	11
<i>Mean</i>	30	24	30	27	20	21	25
<i>Median</i>	24	20	21	22	16	18	20
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
<i>Maximum</i>	100	80	100	100	67	67	81

Note: NAP = Not applicable because there were no deaths among inmates in prison (see Table 4.2.4.7)

Table 4.2.4.9 Percentage of suicides in pre-trial detention among inmates who committed suicide in prison

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Average 2011-2016
Albania	...	NAP	25	67	46
Armenia	0	0	0
Austria	50	88	100	82	80
Azerbaijan	100	0	57	42	50
Belgium	71	71
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	50	NAP	29	44	41
Croatia	NAP	NAP	0	NAP	0
Cyprus	0	NAP	NAP	0
Czech Republic	43	50	62	29	46
Denmark	67	100	100	100	92
Estonia	100	100	NAP	100	100
Finland	86	100	50	100	0	50	64
France	34	0	47	47	32
Georgia
Germany	57	47	48	42	55	49	49
Greece	20	20	20
Hungary	44	25	29	50	40	33	37
Iceland	0	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Ireland	0	0	0	...	0
Italy	62	49	49	55	54
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	67	20	100	83	68
Lithuania	25	9	25	14	18
Luxembourg	100	NAP	NAP	NAP	100
Malta	0	...	NAP	...	0
Moldova	0	0
Montenegro	NAP	NAP	0	0	0
Netherlands	50	50	55	71	56
Norway	100	0	50
Poland
Portugal
Romania	16	0	18	30	16
Russian Federation
Serbia
Slovakia	50	17	40	60	42
Slovenia	0	NAP	NAP	NAP	0
Spain	28	19	17	15	20
Sweden	67	57	33	50	52
Switzerland	33	33	0	44	90	40	40
North Macedonia
Turkey	39	0	19
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland	NAP
UK: Scotland	20	33	100	...	51
<i>Mean</i>	55	51	43	34	45	48	38
<i>Median</i>	51	40	45	27	40	47	41
<i>Minimum</i>	33	25	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Maximum</i>	86	100	100	100	100	100	100

Note: NAP = Not applicable because there were no deaths among inmates in prison (see Table 4.2.4.7)

Notes on Tables 4.2.3 (4.2.3.1 to 4.2.3.6) and 4.2.4 (4.2.4.1 to 4.2.4.9)

	Also see the notes under 4.4.1 regarding the standard definition for entries (4.2.3), the standard definition for exits (4.2.4), minors and foreigners.
France	Tables 4.2.3. and 4.2.4: These are entries and exits from prison (not only from detention, i.e., work releases and electronic bracelets are included).
Lithuania	According to the Prisons Department, there was a mistake in the data provided for the flow of entries in SPACE, which has been amended in the figures published here.
Serbia	Comment to Table 4.2.3 (women): Until 2012, only entries of convicted women were recorded (i.e., the figures did not include entries of women in pre-trial detention nor women detained for misdemeanours). In 2011, the total number of entries of convicted women was 396, in 2012: 318; in 2013: 295; in 2014: 256; in 2015: 230; and in 2016: 227. Since 2012, the numbers included in the Tables of the Sourcebook include all women imprisoned (pre-trial detainees, convicted and incarcerated for misdemeanours).
Switzerland	Table 4.2.2. Entry following a transfer from one penal institution to another in the same country includes entry following the detainee's removal from the institution in order to appear before a judicial authority and entry following a prison leave or a period of absence by permission. Table 4.2.4: only Data for Deaths is available.
Turkey	The flow data provided in this chapter allows a breakdown by gender, age, and citizenship. However, it does not include pre-trial detainees. The SPACE data, on the contrary, includes pre-trial detainees, but does not allow that breakdown.
UK: Scotland	Flow of entries is measured using prison receptions which are not equivalent to persons received. If a person enters prison on remand or having been sentenced by one court, this is counted as one reception. Where a person subsequently receives a custodial sentence after a period on remand or while serving another custodial sentence, this constitutes a further reception. If several custodial sentences are imposed on the same person by two or more courts in one day, this counts as several receptions. Individuals may enter the prison system more than once on different types of custody (remand or sentenced) and charged with different crimes, so receptions are the main unit of analysis as this allows highly disaggregated analyses by type of custody and crime type.

4.2.5 Prison staff

Table 4.2.5.1 Prison staff employed and not employed by the prison administration in 2016

	Total prison staff per 100 000 pop.	Ratio of inmates per one member of prison staff	% of staff <u>employed</u> by the prison admin.	% of staff <u>not em- ployed</u> by the prison admin.
Albania	145		100	...
Armenia	73	1.8	100	0
Austria	46	2.2	94	6
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	48	2.4	100	...
Croatia	63	1.2	100	...
Cyprus	48	1.7	95	5
Czech Republic	104	2.0	100	0
Denmark	78	0.8	100	...
Estonia	100	2.0	94	6
Finland	42	1.3	100	...
France	57	1.8	96	4
Georgia	101	2.5	100	0
Germany	46	1.7	100	...
Greece	42	2.1	100	0
Hungary	86	2.2	100	...
Iceland	35	1.1	100	...
Ireland	69	1.1	100	...
Italy	73	1.2	100	0
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	146	1.5	92	8
Lithuania	134	1.8	88	12
Luxembourg	76	1.6	100	...
Malta	58	2.1	99	1
Moldova	73	2.9	100	0
Montenegro	75	2.3	100	0
Netherlands	59	0.9	100	0
Norway	81	0.9	91	9
Poland	77	2.4	100	...
Portugal	61	2.2	100	...
Romania	62	2.3	100	...
Russian Federation	205	2.2	100	...
Serbia	57	2.6	98	2
Slovakia	101	1.8	100	...
Slovenia	40	1.6	100	0
Spain	52	2.5	100	...
Sweden	74	0.8	100	...
Switzerland	52	1.6	95	5
North Macedonia	41	3.9	100	...
Turkey	73	3.5	100	...
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	NA
UK: Northern Ireland	84	1.0	100	...
UK: Scotland	127	1.1	82	18
<i>Mean</i>	77	1.9	98	4
<i>Median</i>	73	1.8	100	2
<i>Minimum</i>	35	0.8	82	0
<i>Maximum</i>	205	3.9	100	18

Note: UK: England and Wales: The number of members of the prison staff not employed by the prison administration (i.e., the staff working in private prisons) is unavailable.

Table 4.2.5.2 Distribution of the staff employed and not employed by the prison administration

	Staff em- ployed by the prison admin. per 100 000 pop.	Of which:		Staff not em- ployed by the prison admin. per 100 000 pop.	Of which:	
		Percentage working out- side penal institutions	Percentage working in- side penal institutions		Percentage working out- side penal institutions	Percentage working in- side penal institutions
Albania	145	16	84
Armenia	73	8	92
Austria	43	1	...	3	0	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	48	...	100
Croatia	63	...	98
Cyprus	45	0	100	2	0	100
Czech Republic	104	11	89	0.05	100	0
Denmark	78	28	72
Estonia	94	...	100	6	32	68
Finland	42	10	90
France	55	18	82	2	38	62
Georgia	101	17	95
Germany	46	1	95
Greece	42	1	99
Hungary	86	5	95
Iceland	35	19	81
Ireland	69	9	91
Italy	73	6	88	0.03	0	100
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	133	7	93	12	0	100
Lithuania	118	12	88	16	...	100
Luxembourg	76	1	99
Malta	58	2	98	1	0	100
Moldova	73	10	85
Montenegro	75	6	94
Netherlands	59	18	82
Norway	74	6	94	7	0	100
Poland	77	4	96
Portugal	61	...	79
Romania	62	5	95
Russian Federation	205	12	88
Serbia	56	2	98	1	0	100
Slovakia	101	10	90
Slovenia	40	7	93
Spain	52	3	120
Sweden	74	17	83
Switzerland	50	...	10	2
North Macedonia	41	3	97
Turkey	73	1	92
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	74	28	72
UK: Northern Ireland	84	7	93
UK: Scotland	104	78	71	23	1	99
Mean	75	11	89	6	16	84
Median	73	7	92	2	0	100
Minimum	35	0	10	0	0	0
Maximum	205	78	120	23	100	100

Table 4.2.5.3 Ratio of inmates per one member of staff employed by the prison administration on 1st September 2016, according to different categories of staff

	Inmates per one staff member working as...					
	Custodial staff dedicated solely to the custody of inmates	Custodial staff <u>not</u> dedicated solely to the custody of inmates	Medical and paramedical staff	Staff responsible for assessment and psychologists	Staff responsible for educational activities	Other staff responsible for workshops or vocational training
Albania	2.8	6.0	23	739	42	...
Armenia	2.9	6.0	24	80	103	...
Austria	2.9	...	102	150	4412	...
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	3.5	25.8	73	278	58	334
Croatia	2.0	...	25	345	15	14
Cyprus	1.8
Czech Republic	3.9	144.1	53	17	...	201
Denmark	1.6	...	31	...	24	11
Estonia	5.5	28.4	33	128	381	...
Finland	2.3	15	17
France	2.5	20	1215
Georgia	3.3	...	18	59
Germany	...	4.2	43	86	176	18
Greece	2.5	...	108	370	137	...
Hungary	5.3	4.1	39	45	649	37
Iceland	1.6	54	62	12
Ireland	1.7	25.8	29	169	...	10
Italy	1.5	...	667	1952	63	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	2.4	...	34	22	127	523
Lithuania	3.7	...	25	176	34	641
Luxembourg	2.3	...	724	138	39	24
Malta	2.4	185	556	70
Moldova	10.1	...	32	268	65	124
Montenegro	8.6	3.5	68	360	57	27
Netherlands	4.4	2.7	35	106	45	14
Norway	1.4	7.3
Poland	5.0	44.8	44	26	336	...
Portugal	3.5	90.1	51	...
Romania	13.0	14.0	43	335	60	...
Russian Federation	3.4	...	22	211	103	41
Serbia	4.6	...	40	36	...	24
Slovakia	3.3	...	34	169	384	...
Slovenia	2.6	...	101	187	19	15
Spain	3.3	...	48	75	32	74
Sweden	1.3	...	56	180	25	18
Switzerland	3.3	...	26	11
North Macedonia	21.1	8.7	186	99	84	223
Turkey	7.4	21.2	289	297	151	30
Ukraine
UK: Eng. & Wales	4.8	18.2	...	162	70	...
UK: Northern Ireland	1.2	...	2778	76	84	...
UK: Scotland	78.9	2.4	139	...
<i>Mean</i>	6	25	183	223	253	155
<i>Median</i>	3	11	42	156	64	29
<i>Minimum</i>	1	2	18	11	15	10
<i>Maximum</i>	79	144	2778	1952	4412	1215

Table 4.2.5.4 Distribution of the staff not employed by the prison administration on 1st September 2016, according to different categories of staff, in percentage
Inmates per one staff member working as...

	Custodial staff dedi- cated <u>solely to</u> the <u>custody</u> of inmates	Custodial staff <u>not</u> dedicated <u>solely to</u> the custody of inmates	Medical and para- medical staff	Staff re- sponsible for assess- ment and psycholo- gists	Staff re- sponsible for educa- tional activ- ities	Other staff responsible for work- shops or vocational training (
Austria	0	0	41	15	17	...
Cyprus	0	0	0	16	53	11
Czech Republic	0	0	0	0	...	0
Estonia	24	8
Italy	0	0	0	0	0	0
Latvia	0	0	0	0	100	0
Lithuania	0	...	56	31
Malta	0	0	43	0	57	0
Norway	0	0	33	0	67	0
Serbia	0	0	67	0	0	15
UK: Scotland	55	...	25	...

Notes on Tables 4.2.5 (4.2.5.1 to 4.2.5.6)

See the notes under 4.4.1 regarding the standard definition for staff (Tables 4.2.5).

4.3 Technical information

The information concerning what is and is not counted refer primarily to data collected by SPACE I in 2015. To provide a complete picture, information from other editions of SPACE I have also been used. Categories are considered as *included* when the prison administrations which have provided the relevant data reported *including* these categories, and as *excluded* either when the prison administrations reported *excluding* these categories, or that the category is *not applicable* (does not exist) in their penal system.

4.3.1 Stock

The standard definition of **stock** used in SPACE refers to the total number of inmates (including pre-trial detainees), which corresponds to the total number of persons effectively deprived of freedom in any kind of penal institution. Compliance with that definition was distributed as follows:

- Most prison administrations (39 out of 45) *exclude* persons held in police stations or other similar types of investigative institutions before trial. Exceptions: Bulgaria, Cyprus, Georgia, Montenegro, Switzerland, and Turkey.
- Most prison administrations (30 out of 45) *include* persons held in custodial institutions/units for juvenile offenders. Exceptions: Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, and Turkey.
- Most prison administrations (39 out of 45) *exclude* persons placed in educational institutions/units for juvenile offenders. Exceptions: Bulgaria, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Switzerland, and Turkey.
- Most prison administrations (41 out of 44) *exclude* persons held in institutions for drug-addicted offenders outside penal institutions. Exceptions: Malta and Spain.
- Most prison administrations (38 out of 44) *exclude* persons with psychiatric disorders in psychiatric institutions or hospitals outside penal institutions. Exceptions: Austria, Belgium, Ireland, Italy, Malta, and Portugal.
- Most prison administrations (38 out of 45) *exclude* asylum seekers or illegal aliens held for administrative reasons. Exceptions: Belgium, Germany, Ireland, Switzerland, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland and UK: Scotland.
- Most prison administrations (42 out of 45) *exclude* persons held in private facilities. Exceptions: Finland, Germany, and UK: England & Wales.
- Most prison administrations (33 out of 45) prison administrations *exclude* persons under electronic surveillance/electronic monitoring. Exceptions: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Netherlands, Poland, and Spain.

- Most prison administrations (25 out of 30) *include* fine defaulters among sentenced prisoners in the prison population. Exceptions: Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, Romania, and Slovak Republic.
- Most prison administrations (17 out of 21) *include* persons detained because of the revocation, suspension or annulment of the conditional release or probation in the prison population. Exceptions: Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, and Romania.

The standard definition of **pre-trial detainees** used in SPACE refers to the total number of inmates who have not received a final sentence yet. These include untried detainees, detainees found guilty but who have not yet received a sentence yet (in the countries where such concept exists), sentenced prisoners who have appealed or who are within the statutory limit for doing so, and detainees who have not received a final sentence yet, but who started serving a prison sentence in advance (in the countries where such concept exists). Compliance with that definition was distributed as follows:

- All prison administrations (40 out of 40) *include* untried detainees in the total number of pre-trial detainees.
- The concept of detainees found guilty but who have not yet received a sentence yet in the prison population does not exist in 19 countries. The others include them in their total number of pre-trial detainees.
- Most prison administrations (24 out of 33) *include* sentenced prisoners who have appealed or who are within the statutory limit for doing so in the total number of pre-trial detainees. Exceptions: Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, and Spain.
- The concept of detainees who have not received a final sentence yet, but who started serving a prison sentence in advance does not exist in 22 countries. The others include them in the total number of pre-trial detainees.

4.3.2 Flow of entries

The standard definition of **entries** used in SPACE refers to all entries of inmates into penal institutions that are not related to an ongoing detention. The counting unit is the number of admissions.

It should include: (1) admissions of detainees not serving a final sentence (pre-trial detainees), (2) admissions of inmates who have been found guilty but who are not yet sentenced, and (3) admissions of inmates who have been sentenced, even if they have lodged an appeal or are within the statutory limit to do so.

It should exclude: (1) admissions following a transfer from one penal institution to another, (2) admissions of inmates following their removal from the institution in order to appear before a judicial authority (investigating judge, court, etc.), (3) admissions of inmates following their removal from the institution in order to be

treated in a hospital, (4) admissions of inmates following a prison leave or a period of absence by permission, and (5) admissions of inmates re-arrested after an escape/abscond.

Most prison administrations (28 out of 36) *comply* with the standard definition of entries. Exceptions: Hungary, Latvia, Netherlands, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, and UK: Scotland.

4.3.3 Flow of exists

The standard definition of **exits** used in SPACE refers to releases from penal institutions, inmates who died inside penal institutions and escapes from penal institutions.

It should include: (1) Exits of inmates who have been released from the penal institutions; (2) exits of inmates who died inside penal institutions, and (3) exits due to an escape/abscond from a penal institution.

It should exclude: (1) Transfer from one penal institution to another, (2) exits in order to appear before a judicial authority (investigative magistrate, court, etc.), (3) exits in order to be treated in a hospital, (4) placement in another penal institution that do not lead to the change of the status of the detainee/prisoner, and (5) exits corresponding to a prison leave or a period of absence with permission.

Most prison administrations (30 out of 39) *comply* with the standard definition of exits. Exceptions: Bulgaria, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Sweden, UK: England & Wales and UK: Scotland.

4.3.4 Staff

The standard definition of **staff** used in SPACE refers to the total number of full-time and part-time staff. Part-time staff should be counted on the basis of “full-time equivalents” (FTE).

4.4 Technical information

4.4.1 Notes

Reference date (different from 1 September)

- **Croatia:** The reference date is 31 December.
- **Czech Republic:** The reference date is 31 December.
- **Georgia:** The reference date is 31 August.
- **Germany:** The reference date is 31 March.
- **Ireland:** The reference date is 31 August.
- **Poland:** The reference date is 31 December.
- **Portugal:** The reference date is 31 December.
- **Sweden:** The reference date is 1 October.
- **Switzerland:** The reference date is 7 September.
- **UK: England & Wales:** The reference date is 30 June.

Standard definition of inmates

Inmates: persons effectively deprived of freedom in any kind of penal institution.

- **Netherlands:** Data *only include* adult inmates.
- **Russian Federation:** The total number of inmates *include* all inmates held in temporary detention centres of (1) the penitentiary system, (2) the internal affairs bodies of Russian Federation, (3) the border guards of the Federal Security Service of Russian Federation, and (4) guardhouses, as well as suspects and defendants, in respect of whom detention has been chosen as a preventive measure, and those who are placed in medical organizations for medical assistance.
- **Spain:** Juvenile offenders are *excluded* in the total prison population.

Standard definition of entries (Tables 4.2.3)

- **Cyprus:** Only entries in penal institutions are *included*. Entries in police stations are *excluded*.
- **Hungary:** Only the fact of entry is recorded. The circumstantial details are not stated, e.g.: where the inmate came from.
- **Latvia:** The counting unit is the *person*, not the event.
- **Netherlands:** Only entries in penal institutions are *included*. Entries in custodial clinics, institutions for juveniles and institutions for aliens are *excluded*. In the total number of entries are *included* entries from free society and those from police stations into penal institutions. Entries following an escape/abscond are *included*.

- **Russian Federation:** The total number of persons newly arrested who entered the pre-trial detention centres and facilities operating as pre-trial detention centres *includes*: (1) persons in respect of whom the court chose a preventive measure in the form of pre-trial detention, (2) defendants in respect of whom the court changed the preventive measure for taking into custody at the judicial stage of the examination of the - case on the merits prior to the decision of the sentence; (3) persons with respect to whom at the pretrial stage detention in custody was not used as a preventive measure, but the sentence determined the measure of punishment associated with the deprivation of liberty, and they were detained upon pronouncement of the sentence; (4) persons conditionally convicted or sentenced to punishments not related to deprivation of liberty, in respect of which the court has replaced the sentence with real deprivation of liberty; (5) wanted persons and detainees on the basis of a court decision on detention; (6) persons sentenced to imprisonment who were not arrested before the sentence entered into legal force; and (7) persons taken into custody pursuant according to the Article 466 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Russian Federation.
- **Slovenia:** In the total number of entries are *included* transfers from one penal institution to another.
- **Sweden:** Admissions of detainees not serving a final sentence (pre-trial detainees) are not available, and thus *excluded* in the total number of admissions. Admissions of persons who have been sentenced and have lodged an appeal or are within the statutory time limit to do so are *excluded* in the total number of entries because figures are not available.
- **Switzerland:** All admissions (entries) are *included*. No distinction can be made concerning the different type of entries. It is not possible to distinguish all type of entries from 1st time entries (incarcerations).
- **UK: England & Wales:** The total number of entries corresponds to the sum of first receptions and the number of offenders recalled and returned to custody.
- **UK: Scotland:** Prisoner origin is not available in the management information collected by SPS. Recording practise is somewhat inconsistent, therefore, the total number of admissions may therefore *include* situations that should be excluded according to the standard definition.

Standard definition of exits (Tables 4.2.4)

- **Bulgaria:** The total number of exits *excludes* data on exits of remand centres.
- **Cyprus:** The total number of exits *excludes* inmates who died inside penal institutions. Releases from police stations are *excluded*.
- **Iceland:** Exits *includes* the total number of releases from prisons, half-way houses, alcoholic treatment and from electronic monitoring.
- **Latvia:** The counting unit for exits is the person, not the event. Inmates who died also *includes* inmates who died or committed suicide in community hospitals and inmates who died during short prison leaves.
- **Lithuania:** Inmates who died *includes* persons who died in public hospitals.
- **Netherlands:** Releases *only include* releases from penal institutions. Releases from custodial clinics, institutions for juveniles and institutions for aliens are *excluded*.
- **Russian Federation:** The definition of total number of exits *does not exist* in the Russian legal system. The figure indicated corresponds, therefore, to the sum of the number of releases on sentenced prisoners and non-sentenced inmates, the number of inmates who died inside penal institutions and the number of inmates who escaped from penal institutions.
- **Slovenia:** Releases *includes* transfers from one penal institution to another one.
- **Sweden:** Exits following an escape/abscond are *excluded*; data concerning exits of inmates not serving a final sentence is not available; Exits *only include* releases.
- **UK: England & Wales:** Deaths in prison custody figures *include* all deaths of prisoners arising from incidents during prison custody. They *include* deaths of prisoners while released on temporary license (ROTL) for medical reasons but exclude other types of ROTL where the state has less direct responsibility. In recent years, approximately one half of natural cause deaths in prison custody actually occur in hospitals or hospices.
- **UK: Scotland:** The total number of exits *excludes* escapes/absconds.

Standard definition of staff (Tables 4.2.5)

- **Bulgaria:** The total staff include all the staff of the system, including administrative staff, staff working inside prison institutions, staff working inside remand centres and staff working on probation service.
- **Cyprus:** All figures concern only the Prison institution without police stations.
- **Czech Republic:** The total number of staff *includes* female uniformed staff on maternity leave and staff members on long-term sickness leave. Total number of staff *excludes* members of uniformed staff as reserve (not permanently at work), civilians on maternity/family leaves, and other staff members not permanently at work for other reasons.
- **Denmark:** Probation officials are *included* in the total number of staff. The staff that is provisionally not fulfilling their tasks foreseen for them (maternity, education, compulsory military service in the Defence Forces, temporary assignment to another service, etc.) is *excluded* in the total number of staff.
- **Lithuania:** No distinction is made between part-time and full-time staff.
- **Luxembourg:** Total number of staff *includes* persons hired under the status of “state employees”.
- **Portugal:** Total number of staff *includes* personnel assigned to the Prison Administration as well as those working in the Probation and Insertion Service.
- **Russian Federation:** The employees of the penal system of the Russian Federation (herein after referred to as the “UIS”) include persons with special ranks of the UIS (employees), the federal state civil servants who occupy the posts of the federal state civil service, the workers and employees of penal institutions, the federal state unitary enterprises, the federal body of the UIS and of its territorial bodies, as well as the pre-trial detention facilities, enterprises, research, design, medical, educational and other organizations of the UIS. The employees of penal correctional institutions, which are in the staff of penal institutions and pre-trial detention facilities that are part of penal correctional systems, are personnel of penal institutions.
- **Spain (Catalonia):** Part-time staff has been counted as one full-time staff.
- **Turkey:** Prison staff working in prisons in General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses are *included*. Within the framework of the provisions of the Protocol on the Regulation of Health Services in Penal Institutions between the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Health, the number of staff assigned by the Ministry of Health is *excluded*.
- **UK: England & Wales:** Data refers to public sector prisons in England and Wales only and *exclude* privately run prisons.

Minors

- **Albania:** Minors includes offenders between 14 years old to less than 18 years old.
- **Austria:** There is a single penal institution specialised in juvenile offenders, however it includes offenders over 18 years old up to 21 years old. Specialised departments have also been established for juvenile offenders in other Austrian penal institutions.
- **Cyprus:** Offenders are considered juvenile offenders until 21 years old.
- **Estonia:** Minors includes offenders between 14 and 20 years old (included). However, some inmates over the age of 21 may be found in juvenile units.
- **Hungary:** The age of criminal responsibility can be 12 years of age in special cases. For persons who are older than 12 years of age but have not reached 14 years of age, the most severe sanction can be 1-4 years in special educative institutions. As a basic rule, the age of criminal majority is 18, although in special cases it can be 21.
- **Netherlands:** Juvenile offenders (which may include offenders aged 18 years and older) held in specialised facilities are *excluded* in the total number of inmates. However, the data for Netherlands *only includes* adult inmates.
- **Norway:** There are no juvenile courts in Norway, nor is there special legislation for young offenders over the age of 15. The General Penal Code however prescribes some special provisions for persons between 15 and 18 years of age.
- **Portugal:** Persons aged from 16 to less than 21 years are young adults and are tried under a special law which is specific to them.
- **Serbia:** A person who, at the time of committing the offence, has reached the age of 14 and has not reached the age of 18, is considered a juvenile offender.
- **Spain:** The Prison Administration has no competence concerning juvenile offenders, this matter is managed by autonomous communities. Therefore, juvenile offenders are *excluded* in the total prison population.
- **UK: England & Wales:** Minors includes offenders between 15 and 17 years old.

Foreigners

- Foreigners *include* inmates with unknown nationality and other statuses in Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Moldova, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Serbia, Switzerland, and Turkey.
- Foreigners *exclude* stateless inmates and inmates with unknown nationality in Azerbaijan, Belgium, Czech Republic, and Poland.
- Foreigners *only include* inmates with a foreign *citizenship* (not nationality) in Estonia and Latvia.
- Foreigners *exclude* inmates with the specific status of “non-citizen of Latvia” in Latvia.
- Foreigners *include* inmates with dual citizenship in Armenia and Austria.
- National inmates *include* British and Irish citizens in UK: Northern Ireland

Offences

- The following countries *do not apply* the principal offence rule: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland (for fine defaulters), Georgia, Germany, Italy, Latvia, and Turkey.
- Rape and other types of sexual offences are *not counted separately* in the following countries: Finland, Germany, and Netherlands.

4.4.2 Tables

Table 4.4.1 Compliance with the standard definitions for inmates, entries, exits, and staff

	Compliance with the standard definition of <u>inmates</u> ?	Compliance with the standard definition of <u>entries</u> ?	Compliance with the standard definition of <u>exits</u> ?	Compliance with the standard definition of <u>staff</u> ?	Does the total number of staff include the staff <u>not employed</u> by the prison administration?
Albania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Armenia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
Azerbaijan	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Belgium					
Bosnia-Herzegovina					
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Croatia	Yes		Yes	Yes	No
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Czech Rep.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Estonia		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Finland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Georgia					
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Greece	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hungary	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Iceland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Latvia	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Malta					
Moldova	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Montenegro	Yes		Yes	Yes	No
Netherlands	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
North Macedonia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Poland	Yes		Yes	Yes	No
Portugal			Yes	Yes	No
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Russian Fed.	No	No	No	No	No
Serbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Slovak Rep.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Slovenia	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Spain	No	Yes	Yes	No (Catalonia) Yes (State Adm.)	Yes
Sweden	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Switzerland	Yes	No		Yes	No
Turkey				No	No
Ukraine					
UK: Engl. & Wales	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
UK: North. Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
UK: Scotland	Yes	No	No	Yes	No

Table 4.4.2 Categories of inmates included in the total prison population

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Included?							
Albania	NAP	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Armenia	No	Yes	NAP	NAP	No	NAP	No	NAP
Austria	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Azerbaijan	No	Yes	No	NAP	No	No	NAP	NAP
Belgium	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
BiH: Rep. Srpska	NAP	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	Yes
Croatia	No	Yes	No	No	No	NAP	NAP	NAP
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	Yes
Czech Rep.	NAP	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Denmark	No	No	NAP	NAP	No	No	NAP	No
Estonia	No	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	No	NAP	Yes
Finland	No	NAP	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
France	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Georgia	Yes	Yes	NAP	No	No	No	NAP	No
Germany	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Greece	No	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	No	No	No
Hungary	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Iceland	No	NAP	NAP	No	No	No	No	No
Ireland	NAP	Yes	NAP	NAP	Yes	Yes	NAP	Yes
Italy	No	No	NAP	NAP	Yes	NAP	NAP	No
Latvia	No	Yes	No	No	No	NAP	NAP	NAP
Lithuania	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	NAP	NAP
Luxembourg	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Malta	NAP	Yes	NAP	Yes	Yes	NAP	No	No
Moldova	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Montenegro	Yes	No						
Netherlands	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
North Macedonia	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	NAP	No
Norway	No	NAP	NAP	No	No	No	No	No
Poland	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	Yes
Portugal	NAP	Yes	NAP	NAP	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP
Romania	NAP	Yes	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Russian Fed.	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Serbia	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	NAP	No
Slovak Rep.	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Slovenia	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Spain	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	NAP	Yes
Sweden	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Turkey	Yes	NAP	Yes	No	No	NAP	NAP	No
Ukraine								
UK: Engl. & Wales	No	Yes	NAP	NAP	No	Yes	Yes	No
UK: North. Ireland	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
UK: Scotland	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No

(1) Persons held in police stations or other similar types of investigative institutions before trial

(2) Persons held in custodial institutions/units for juvenile offenders

(3) Persons placed in educational institutions/units for juvenile offenders

(4) Persons held in institutions for drug-addicted offenders outside penal institutions

(5) Persons with psychiatric disorders in psychiatric institutions or hospitals outside penal institutions (e.g., persons considered as non-criminally liable by the court, persons under security measures, etc.)

(6) Asylum seekers or illegal aliens held for administrative reasons

(7) Persons held in private facilities (e.g., private prisons, detention centres, centres for the application of certain penal measures [e.g., centres for the treatment of psychiatric disorders, centres for the treatment of addictions etc.]

(8) Persons under electronic surveillance/electronic monitoring

Table 4.4.3 Age and criminal responsibility

	Age of criminal responsibility	Minimal age for the application of custodial sanctions and measures	Age of criminal majority
Albania	14	14	18
Armenia	14	14	18
Austria	14	14	18
Azerbaijan	14	14	18
Belgium	NAP	14	18
Bosnia-Herzegovina	14	14	18
Bulgaria	14	14	18
Croatia	14	14	18/21
Cyprus	14	14	16
Czech Rep.	15	15	18
Denmark	15	15	18
Estonia	14	14	18
Finland	15	15	18/21
France	13	16	18
Georgia	14	14	18
Germany	14	14	21
Greece	15	15	18
Hungary	14	14	18/21
Iceland	15	15	18
Ireland	12	12	18
Italy	14	14	18
Latvia	14	14	18
Lithuania	14	14	18
Luxembourg	16	16	18
Malta	14	14	18
Moldova	14	14	18
Montenegro	14	16	18
Netherlands	12	12	18
North Macedonia	14	16	18
Norway	15	15	18
Poland	13	15	17
Portugal	16	NAP	21
Romania	16	14	18
Russian Fed.	14	14	18
Serbia	14	14	18
Slovak Rep.	14	14	18
Slovenia	14	16	18/21
Spain	14	14	18
Sweden	15	18	18
Switzerland	10	15	18
Turkey	12	12	18
Ukraine	14	16	18
UK: Engl. & Wales	10	15	18
UK: North. Ireland	10	10	18
UK: Scotland	8/12	16	18/21

Table 4.4.4 Legal status of prison population

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
					(5.1)	(5.2)
				Included?		
Albania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Armenia				NAP		
Austria	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP		
Azerbaijan	Yes	NAP		NAP		
Belgium	Yes	NAP	Yes	NAP	Yes	
BH: Rep. Srpska	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes				
Croatia		NAP	NAP			
Cyprus	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	Yes	Yes
Czech Rep.	Yes	Yes	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP
Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	NAP	Yes	Yes
Estonia	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP	NAP
Finland					Yes	
France	Yes		Yes			
Georgia	Yes	NAP		NAP		Yes
Germany	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	Yes	
Greece	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	Yes	
Hungary	Yes	NAP	Yes	NAP	Yes	Yes
Iceland	Yes	NAP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	Yes	
Italy	Yes	NAP	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP
Latvia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Luxembourg	Yes	NAP		NAP	Yes	Yes
Malta*						
Moldova	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Montenegro	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	NAP	Yes	
North Macedonia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Norway	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Poland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Portugal	Yes	NAP	Yes	NAP		
Romania	Yes	Yes	Yes		NAP	NAP
Russian Fed.	Yes	NAP		NAP		
Serbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Slovak Rep.	Yes			NAP	NAP	Yes
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Spain	Yes	NAP	NAP	NAP	Yes	NAP
Sweden	Yes					
Switzerland	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes
Turkey		NAP	Yes			
Ukraine						
UK: Engl. & Wales	Yes	Yes		NAP	Yes	Yes
UK: North. Ireland	Yes	NAP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UK: Scotland	Yes	Yes	Yes	NAP	Yes	

Pre-trial detainees: Categories included/excluded:

- (1) Untried detainees (no court decision has been reached yet);
- (2) Detainees found guilty but who have not yet received a sentence yet;
- (3) Sentenced prisoners who have appealed or who are within the statutory limit for doing so;
- (4) Detainees who have not received a final sentence yet, but who started serving a prison sentence in advance;
- (5) *Sentenced prisoners* (5): Categories included/excluded (apart from those with final sentence)

(5.1): Persons detained for fine conversion reasons (fine defaulters);

(5.2): Persons detained because of the revocation, suspension or annulment of the conditional release or probation.

4.5 Sources

Table 4.5 Sources (1/2)

Albania	The General Directory of Prisons, Ministry of Justice and SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Armenia	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Austria	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Azerbaijan	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Belgium	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Bosnia-Herzegovina	United Nations Surveys on Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (UNCTS) and SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Bulgaria	National Statistical Institute: Statistical Yearbook 2016, Chapter "Criminality and Justice", available at: http://www.nsi.bg/sites/default/files/files/publications/God2016.pdf
Croatia	Report from the Ministry of Justice- Prison department.
Cyprus	Ministry of Finance, Statistical Service, https://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/cystat/statistics.nsf/populationcondition_27main_en/populationcondition_27main_en?OpenForm&sub=7&sel=2 .
Czech Republic	Central Registry of Imprisoned Persons, Prison Service of the Czech Republic
Denmark	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Estonia	Ministry of Justice – Unpublished.
Finland	Tables 4.2.1., 4.2.3. and 4.2.4.: Criminal Sanctions Agency, personal communication August 2018.
France	Table 4.2.1. : Statistique mensuelle des personnes détenues et écrouées en France au 1er septembre 2015 (collecte auprès des établissements); Tables 4.2.3. and 4.2.3. : Infocentre pénitentiaire (données issues des logiciels de gestion).
Georgia	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Germany	Table 4.2.1: Statistisches Bundesamt (Ed.), Bestand der Gefangenen und Verwahrten in den deutschen Justizvollzugsanstalten nach ihrer Unterbringung auf Haftplätze des geschlossenen und offenen Vollzuges jeweils zu den Stichtagen 31. März, 31. August und 30. November eines Jahres, Wiesbaden 2012...017; Statistisches Bundesamt (Ed.), Strafvollzug – Demographische und kriminologische Merkmale der Gefangenen am 31.03.2011...016, Wiesbaden 2012...017. Table 4.2.3: No published data available. Table 4.2.4: Bundestags-Drucksache 19/2872, 15 June 2018.
Greece	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Hungary	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Iceland	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Ireland	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Italy	Italian Institute of statistics - http://www.wistatit - Ministry of Justice Department of Statistics
Latvia	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Lithuania	Prison Department under the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania – General Unit.
Luxembourg	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Malta	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Moldova	Data provided by the Ministry of Justice, National Penitentiary Institution.
Montenegro	ZIKS-unpublished statistical data.

Table 4.5 Sources (2/2)

Netherlands	Ministry of Justice / WODC and SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
North Macedonia	Table 4.2.1 – Foreigners total – from UNODC database and SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Norway	https://www.ssb.no/en/sosiale-forhold-og-kriminalitet/statistikker/fengsling and SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Poland	Central Prison Authority, Department of Statistics.
Portugal	Directorate-General for Probation and Prison Services, Ministry of Justice and SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Romania	Romanian National Administration of Penitentiaries (www.anp.gov.ro) – Social Reintegration Office
Russian Federation	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Serbia	Annual Reports of Administration for Enforcement of Penal Sanctions.
Slovakia	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Slovenia	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Spain	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
Sweden	Swedish prison and probation service - Statistical section: Prison and probation service register (KVR and KLAS), unpublished. Some of the statistics are available at http://statistik.kriminalvarden.se/SASPortal/main.do (the website is in Swedish).
Switzerland	Source: Federal Statistical Office – Detention Statistic 2018 https://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/en/home/statistics/crime-criminal-justice/execution-penal-sentences-justice/persones-placement-detainee.html
Turkey	Table 4.2.1 – Foreigners total – from UNODC database. The source for “stock of minors” row in Table 4.2.1 is Ministry of Justice General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses website. Link: http://www.cte.adalet.gov.tr . All other stock data provided in above tables is from is Ministry of Justice General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses website. Link: http://www.cte.adalet.gov.tr . All flow data is from Turkish Statistical Institute, Justice Statistics http://www.tuik.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?alt_id=1070
Ukraine	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
UK: England & Wales	Remand data on young offenders include everyone in prisons under the responsibility of NOMS and exclude those in secured training centres and children home run by Youth Justice Boards. Source: Based on data taken from ‘Offender Management Statistics quarterly’ Annual Tables http://www.justice.gov.uk/statistics/prisons-and-probation/oms-quarterly
UK: Northern Ireland	SPACE I, The Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space).
UK: Scotland	Scottish Government Justice Analytical Services prison statistics.

5 Probation Statistics

5.1 General comments

5.1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides information on the number and the characteristics of *probationers*, that is to say persons placed under the supervision of probation agencies, as well as on the staff and work of these agencies. The Council of Europe's Recommendation CM/Rec(2014)4 defines a **probation agency** as “a body responsible for the execution in the community of sanctions and measures defined by law and imposed on an offender. Its tasks include a range of activities and interventions, which involve supervision, guidance and assistance aiming at the social inclusion of offenders, as well as at contributing to community safety. It may also, depending on the national legal system, implement one or more of the following functions: providing information and advice to judicial and other deciding authorities to help them reach informed and just decisions; providing guidance and support to offenders while in custody in order to prepare their release and resettlement; monitoring and assistance to persons subject to early release; restorative justice interventions; and offering assistance to victims of crime. A probation agency may also be, depending on the national legal system, the ‘agency responsible for supervising persons under electronic monitoring’”. In that context, the Council of Europe's Recommendation CM/Rec(2017)3 states that “the expression ‘community sanctions

and measures' means sanctions and measures which maintain suspects or offenders in the community and involve some restrictions on their liberty through the imposition of conditions and/or obligations. The term designates any sanction imposed by a judicial or administrative authority, and any measure taken before or instead of a decision on a sanction, as well as ways of enforcing a sentence of imprisonment outside a prison establishment".

The definitions of the Council of Europe reflect the wide variety of the sanctions and measures placed under the generic term of *community* sanctions and measures in Europe, which in turn explains the broad range of functions fulfilled by the European probation agencies. In particular, *probation* is used as a generic term that includes both the cases in which a person found guilty by a court is released by that court without imprisonment, but subject to conditions that will be supervised by a probation agency (a procedure known as probation in its strict sense) as well as the cases in which an inmate is conditionally released from imprisonment (a procedure known in many countries as *parole*), as long as he or she is placed under supervision of a probation agency. The extent of that supervision, however, differs considerably from one country to another.

Some countries have a specific Probation Agency and others a Prison and Probation Administration. Independently of that within the same country there may be more than one agency or administration. The latter are the same that were listed in Chapter 4 of the European Sourcebook (Prison Statistics): Bosnia and Herzegovina, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

The indicators presented in this chapter include the annual number of entries on probation and the annual number of releases from it during the years 2011 to 2016 (known respectively as the *flow of entries* and the *flow of exits*), as well as the number of persons effectively placed under the supervision of probation agencies on 31st December of each of these years (*stock of probationers*), the staff working in these agencies on 31 December 2015 by type of staff, and the number of written reports produced by them during the year 2015. The stock on 31 December 2015 and the flow of entries during 2015 are also broken down by type of supervision, while the flow of exits during that same year is a breakdown by type of exits.

Probation is placed at the end of the criminal justice process and has only a remote and indirect relationship with crime rates; instead, it is dependent on the penal policy of each country, which may or may not promote the use of community sanctions and measures. Furthermore, the interpretation of probation rates is not straightforward. In fact, "there is no 'magic formula' to estimate a rate of probationers that would be appropriate for a country. The reason is that probationers are serving community sanctions and measures, which are frequently referred to as alternatives to imprisonment because they aim at the social inclusion of the offender by keeping him/her in the community. Consequently, the probation rate cannot be interpreted without comparing it to the prison population rate" (Aebi, Hashimoto

& Tiago, 2020: 15)³³. Research based on comparisons of trends in probation rates, prison population rates and crime rates suggest that, at least in some countries, community sanctions and measures are not really being used as alternatives to imprisonment, but rather as supplementary sanctions, hence ‘widening the net’ of European criminal justice systems³⁴.

Finally, and similarly to what happens with all the figures based on criminal justice statistics presented in the European Sourcebook, there are also differences across countries that do not reflect substantial dissimilarities but are merely due to the statistical counting rules applied to collect them (particularly relevant in that perspective is the counting unit used in probation statistics), or to other legal, statistical, or criminal policy factors. Basic information on such differences is presented under the heading *Technical information* (5.3), while further information on the use of probation can be found in the *Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics* (SPACE II) available online at www.unil.ch/space.

The ‘stock’ and ‘flow’ perspectives

As it was the case with prison statistics (see Chapter 4 of the European Sourcebook), data on probation populations can be described from two perspectives, which generate different but equally important results. The first perspective refers to ‘how many probationers are under the supervision of probation agencies on a given day’ (*stock*). The second perspective refers to ‘how many persons were placed under the supervision of probation agencies during the course of the year’ (*flow of entries*) and to ‘how many probation services ceased to be under the supervision of probation agencies during the course of the year’ (*flow of exits*). Both perspectives are also interrelated, in such a way that the stock of probationers on 31st December of a given year is influenced by the flows of entries and exits during that year, but also by the number of persons placed under the supervision of probation agencies during the previous years who are still under that supervision. The situation is hence identical to the one described when introducing prison statistics, which means that the stock data cannot easily be compared to the data presented in the first three chapters of the European Sourcebook, which usually uses a flow perspective (for example, the annual number of offences recorded by the police, of cases treated by the prosecution services, or of persons convicted).

Regarding probation populations, the following data were requested:

- Number of persons under the supervision of probation agencies on 31 December 2011 to 2016: stock of probationers (Table 5.2.1.1)
- Distribution of the probationers placed under the supervision of probation agencies on 31 December 2015 by

³³ Aebi, M. F., Hashimoto, Y. Z. & Tiago, M. M. (2020). Probation and Prisons in Europe 2019: Key Findings of the SPACE reports. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

³⁴ Aebi, M.F., Delgrande, N. & Marguet, Y. (2015). Have community sanctions and measures widened the net of the European criminal justice systems? *Punishment & Society*, 17(5): 575–597.

- sociodemographic characteristics: women, minors, and foreigners (Table 5.2.1.2);
 - type of supervision: Supervision before a final sentence, Fully suspended custodial sanctions with probation, Partially suspended custodial sentences with probation, Conditional pardon or conditional discharge (with probation), Community service, Electronic monitoring, Home arrest (curfew orders), Semi-liberty, Treatment, Mixed orders, Supervision after conditional release from prison, and the residual category “other” (Table 5.2.1.3).
- Annual number of entries on probation during the years 2011 to 2016: flow of entries. The counting unit is the person entering probation but, as the same person can be counted multiple times if she is placed under the supervision of a probation agency more than once during the same year, this indicator is referred to as the flow of entries, instead of the flow of persons entering probation (Table 5.2.2.1).
- Distribution of the persons who entered probation during the year 2015 by
 - sociodemographic characteristics: women, minors, and foreigners (Table 5.2.2.2);
 - type of supervision: Supervision before a final sentence, fully suspended custodial sanctions with probation, Partially suspended custodial sentences with probation, Conditional pardon or conditional discharge (with probation), Community service, Electronic monitoring, Home arrest (curfew orders), Semi-liberty, Treatment, Mixed orders, Supervision after conditional release from prison, and the residual category “other” (Table 5.2.2.3).
- Annual number of exits from probation during the year 2015 (flow of exits) and its distribution by type of exit: completion, revocation, imprisonment, absconders, death, and the residual category “other”. The counting unit is the person that ceases to be under the supervision of a probation agency but, as the same person can be counted multiple times if (s)he exits probation more than once during the same year, this indicator is referred to as the flow of exits, instead of the flow of persons that ceased to be on probation (Table 5.2.3).
- Probation staff: rate of staff per 100 probationers and distribution of the staff in the following categories: Top-level executives at the national probation administrations, Top-level executives at the regional probation administrations, Senior Probation officers (chiefs of units), Probation officers (qualified Probation staff), Probation agency officers (unqualified Probation staff), Paid external staff, Volunteers, and the residual category “other staff” (Table 5.2.4).
- Number of written reports produced per one staff member during 2015 and their distribution by the following types of report: Pre-sentence

reports, Advisory reports with respect to conditional release, and the residual category “other reports” (Table 5.2.5).

5.1.2 Quality of the data

Most of the probation data included in this edition of the *European Sourcebook* come from the *Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics* (SPACE. II)³⁵. The data validation procedure did not reveal major inconsistencies.

Up to 37 countries provided data on the stock of probationers for at least one year of the series, although a comparison between 2011 and 2016 is possible for only 29 of them

Twenty-nine countries provided data on the percentage of females among their probationers in 2015. Most of the countries (23) in which minors are included in the probation population provided data on them. However, only 18 countries provided data on the flow on the percentage of foreigners

Few countries provided data on the distribution of probationers by type of supervision on 31 December 2015.

Up to 37 countries provided data on the flow of probationers for at least one year of the series, although a comparison between 2011 and 2016 is possible for only 33 of them. The percentages of countries that provided data on the number of females, minors, and foreigners in the flow of entries during 2015 are similar to the ones observed for stock data. Likewise, only few countries provided data on the distribution of the flow of probationers during 2015 by type of supervision.

Thirty-three countries provided data on their probation staff, but only 14 were able to do so for the number of written reports produced by that staff.

5.1.3 Results

There were considerable differences between the countries as regards the total number of persons under the supervision of probation agencies in 2015. The rates per 100 000 population ranged from 3 (Serbia) to 866 (Georgia). Such differences reflect the recent development of supervision by probation agencies in many countries as well as —to a larger extent— the different definitions of the concept. In particular, the extent of what precisely means being under the supervision of an agency varies widely across countries. For example, when one compares the low number of probation staff to the high number of probationers observed in some countries, it seems clear that the level of the supervision cannot be the same as the one provided in countries where the ratio staff/probationers is lower. In particular, it would seem that, in some countries, inmates conditionally released are formally placed under the supervision of probation agencies, but that placement does not imply a personal follow up by probation staff. This corroborates that, as we mentioned in the

³⁵ See www.unil.ch/space.

introduction, cross-national comparisons of the rates of persons under the supervision of probation agencies are misleading.

The ratio of probation staff per 100 probationers varies from less than one member of staff per 100 probationers (in Greece) to 10 or 12 per 100 in some Nordic countries. The average number of reports produced by that staff during 2015 differs considerably from one country to the other, ranging from one to 86, which corroborates that figures are not comparable because the tasks of probation agencies are not equivalent as far as the production of reports is concerned.

The average percentage of women under the supervision of probation agencies is 10%. This is a low percentage, but it represents the double of the percentage observed in the prison population (see Chapter 4). In general, the percentage of women on probation corroborates the differential implication of men and women in delinquency. In particular, the difference between the percentage of women on probation and in prison corroborates that the difference comes mainly from the lesser involvement of women in violent offences, which are overrepresented among the prison population.

The average percentage of foreigners on probation is 11%, which corroborates that it is much more difficult for them than for nationals to be placed on probation. The main reason is that quite often foreigners do not have a stable residence in the country where they were sentenced. This interpretation is corroborated through a comparison with the higher percentage of foreigners among inmates (roughly 16% on average, according to the information provided in Chapter 4). It must be mentioned, however, that the majority of probation agencies (28 out of 46) were unable to provide information on the nationality of their probationers.

The percentage of minors on probation is slightly higher than that of minors in prison, but that can be explained by the fact that, in most countries, minors are not included in the prison population. At the level of probation, there are also several agencies that do not include minors and, among those that include them, the differences are sometimes striking.

From 2011 to 2016, the rate of probationers per 100,000 population increased in a majority of countries. As can be seen in Table 5.2.1.1, in 17 out of the 29 probation agencies that provided the necessary data, the 2016 probation population rate (stock) was more than 5% higher than in 2011; in 11 the 2016 rate was more than 5% higher than that of 2011; while in Austria both rates were comparable.

Similarly, in 19 out of the 33 probation agencies that provided the necessary data, the 2016 rate of entries (flow of entries) was more than 5% higher than in 2011. In three prison administrations, the rates were comparable (the 2016 flow of entries was up to 5% lower or higher than that of 2011), and in 11 prison administrations, the 2016 flow of entries was more than 5% higher than that of 2011.

Notes on Tables 5.2.4 and 5.2.5

Notes on Table 5.2.4	
Czech Republic	The counting rule of the FTE (full-time equivalent) is not respected. Every employee is counted as one employee independently of their percentage of working hours. However, there are only 2 or 3 employees working part time.
Lithuania	The counting rule of the FTE (full-time equivalent) is not respected.
UK: Northern Ireland	The information provided is based on actual numbers of people rather than 'Work time Equivalent'. For example, on 31 December 2010 PBNI staff totalled 441 people working the equivalent of 405.97 full-time members of staff. Administrative Staff includes all corporate staff, administrative support within field teams and also cleaning staff. Other Probation Workers include Probation Service Officers, Community Service and Psychology Staff.
Notes on Table 5.2.5	
Albania	No information available.
Hungary	There are two main categories of advisory reports in Hungary: probation advisory reports and social inquiry reports. Most of the probation advisory reports are pre-sentence reports made at the request of the prosecutor or the judge. Social inquiry reports are prepared in every juvenile case at the request of the police. Probation officers make social inquiry also reports during reprieve proceedings, and for the preparation of the decision about the cancellation of the payment of costs of the criminal procedure or court fine
Ireland	Other reports include generic reports and Revocation Report
Slovak Republic	Other reports correspond to the Report and review prepared by the centres of social work on the request of the courts.
Slovenia	Other reports include 83 reports on the help to the family during the process.
UK: England & Wales	Pre-Sentence- Reports include both Pre-Sentence Reports and Shortened Pre-Sentence Reports. Reports concerning supervision during the execution of community sanctions includes Breach Reports Reports after a conditional release include Recall Reports Other reports not detailed in the table but included in the total figures include Addendum Report, Home Circumstances Report, Report for The Life Sentence Commissioners Progress Report To The Life Sentence Unit, Parole Report, Probation Officers Report.

5.2 Tables

5.2.1 Probation population: Stock of probationers

Table 5.2.1.1 Probation population rate per 100 000 population (stock of probationers) on 31 December

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	161	250	323	462	669	865	439
Armenia	103	83	113	77	112	149	45
Austria	176	178	155	183	182	174	-1
Azerbaijan	90	104	62	90	109
Belgium	369	352	354	364	382	392	6
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	164	162	145	...	144	108	-34
Croatia	24	70	68	71	77	84	248
Cyprus	188	144	131	141	126	97	-48
Czech Republic	...	321	213	262	236	252	...
Denmark	172	173	176	176	168	151	-12
Estonia	544	529	485	431	369	321	-41
Finland	46	44	46	46	40	54	17
France	284	287	...	278	257	262	-8
Georgia	866	736	283	342	516	577	-33
Germany	195	195	194	194	193
Greece	65	...	107	105	188	183	183
Hungary	385	443	434	422	...
Iceland	60	63	58	57	55	74	22
Ireland	136	142	143	145	131	121	-11
Italy	72	49	56	72	87	98	35
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	859	303	5	316	...
Lithuania	234	266	279	269	272	271	16
Luxembourg	286	199	...	205	198	156	-45
Malta	212	205	229	233	251	248	17
Moldova	232	257	280	262	298	292	26
Montenegro	52
Netherlands	220	210	256	267	...	250	14
North Macedonia
Norway	38	36	38	37	36	42	9
Poland	641	531	547
Portugal	187	226	252	248	283	284	52
Romania	64	75	93	126	203	263	314
Russia	332	326	316	302	213	293	-12
Serbia	3	5	10	16	17	20	525
Slovak Republic	299	2090	113	148	247
Slovenia	2	2	3	...
Spain
Sweden	146	153	137	125	119	109	-25
Switzerland	101	95	87	93	51	48	-52
Turkey	371	...
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	290	275	264	258	287	326	13
UK: Northern Ireland	236	237	245	234	235
UK: Scotland	322	389	406	407	...
<i>Mean</i>	213	267	217	198	205	231	
<i>Median</i>	181	197	185	188	193	248	
<i>Minimum</i>	3	5	10	2	2	3	
<i>Maximum</i>	866	2090	859	462	669	865	

Table 5.2.1.2 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners in the probation population on 31 December 2015

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners
Albania	669	0.0
Armenia	112	10.6	2.1	0.7
Austria	182	15.4	20.0	25.7
Azerbaijan	109
Belgium	382	12.0	0.2	11.0
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	144	6.2	3.0	...
Croatia	77	8.6	...	1.0
Cyprus	126	1.8	32.8	6.0
Czech Republic	236	12.4	7.2	...
Denmark	168	13.3	0.6	8.3
Estonia	369	8.8	3.8	24.2
Finland	40	11.4	0.1	6.6
France	257	6.8	0.0	...
Georgia	516	5.6	1.2	0.4
Germany	193
Greece	188	3.0	0.2	5.2
Hungary	434	12.3
Iceland	55	8.3	5.0	3.3
Ireland	131	13.3	3.4	...
Italy	87	9.9	...	14.6
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	5
Lithuania	272	11.1	6.1	...
Luxembourg	198	13.5	...	39.7
Malta	251
Moldova	298	0.1	1.4	...
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway	36
Poland
Portugal	283	10.2	0.5	7.6
Romania	203	9.0	1.3	...
Russia	213	15.8	1.9	...
Serbia	17	7.9	...	0.2
Slovak Republic	247
Slovenia	2
Spain
Sweden	119	13.0	0.1	14.0
Switzerland	51	11.4	...	36.3
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	287	12.3
UK: Northern Ireland	235	9.4	0.9	...
UK: Scotland	406	14.2	1.8	...
<i>Mean</i>	205	9.9	4.3	11.4
<i>Median</i>	193	10.6	1.6	7.1
<i>Minimum</i>	2	0.1	0.0	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	669	15.8	32.8	39.7

Table 5.2.1.3 Distribution of the probationers under the supervision of probation agencies on 31st December 2015 by type of supervision (1/2)

of which %:

	Total per 100 000 pop.	Supervision before a final sentence	Fully suspended custodial sanction with probation	Partially suspended custodial sentence with probation	Conditional pardon or conditional discharge (with probation)	Community service	Electronic monitoring	Home arrest (curfew orders)	Semi-liberty	Treatment	Mixed orders	Supervision after conditional release from prison	Other (please specify in the comments)
Albania
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan	109	...	1.0	27.8	70.6
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	144	72.1	1.8	20.0	6.1	...
Croatia	77	0.5	8.4	0.4	0.0	70.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	3.0
Cyprus	126	18.0	81.3	0.7	...
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	40	47.0	2.3	4.4	46.2	...
France	258	3.2	72.3	0.0	...	22.4	5.5	3.7	...
Georgia	516	...	82.5	15.5	0.9	1.0	0.1	0.9	0.2
Germany
Greece
Hungary	455	12.0	13.7	...	2.9	64.4	0.3	6.7	...
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	87	30.2	11.6	11.2	...	17.9	1.3	5.8	7.3	4.8	9.9
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	5	100.0	3113.8	...	163.8	2870.2	28.7	460.6	124.5
Lithuania
Luxembourg	198	1.9	31.3	10.9	...	37.7	2.2	...	1.3	14.3	0.4
Malta	251	7.2	10.3	...	62.5	3.4	3.2	3.3	2.3	...
Moldova	295	0.6	38.4	...	49.1	9.1	0.0	14.1	3.0	39.3
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway	44	...	24.1	47.4	11.9	0.8	0.0	15.4	0.4
Poland	909	1.9	39.1	...	0.9	26.1	1.0	6.1	0.1	9.0	12.4
Portugal
Romania	203	...	75.9	4.7	0.2	19.3
Russia	187	3.7	...	1.4	...	0.0	94.8
Serbia	17	23.7	12.9	33.0	28.0	0.1	2.3
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	3	5.9	94.1

Table 5.2.1.3 Distribution of the probationers under the supervision of probation agencies on 31st December 2015 by type of supervision (2/2)

of which %:

	Total per 100 000 pop.	Supervision before a final sentence	Fully suspended custodial sanction with probation	Partially suspended custodial sentence with probation	Conditional pardon or conditional discharge (with probation)	Community service	Electronic monitoring	Home arrest (curfew orders)	Semi-liberty	Treatment	Mixed orders	Supervision after conditional release from prison	Other (please specify in the comments)
Spain
Sweden	119	0.0	18.5	2.2	8.0	...	30.7	40.8
Switzerland	45	...	19.4	7.3	...	26.1	2.4	...	8.0	5.6	0.0	27.5	36.8
Turkey	292	0.0	44.6
Ukraine
UK:	25.4	8.2	0.3	8.6	17.3	34.7	8.0
England & Wales	287
UK: Northern Ireland	235	17.6	0.0	39.9	13.6	32.4
UK:
Scotland	407	28.8	2.7	6.9	38.5	11.6	11.4
Mean	212	18	238	7	35	158	8	9	17	5	12	33	30
Median	187	7	25	7	2	24	2	4	1	6	5	10	12
Minimum	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maximum	909	100	3114	16	164	2870	45	28	94	9	40	461	125

5.2.2 Probation population: Flow of entries in probation

Table 5.2.2.1 Flow of entries on probation per 100 000 population

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	% change 2011-2016
Albania	73	90	72	138	206	194	166
Armenia	43	48	54	42	61	69	61
Austria	209	221	222	223	216	207	-1
Azerbaijan	161	190	183	145	173	198	23
Belgium	292	282	308	325	350	336	15
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	404	395	176	...	104	77	-81
Croatia	35	90	150	155	167	177	412
Cyprus	202	118	117	268	260	268	33
Czech Republic	203	145	173	203	199	191	-6
Denmark	208	210	210	222	223	201	-4
Estonia	468	435	389	355	309	318	-32
Finland	63	65	61	57	57	69	9
France	203	215	...	224	...	142	-30
Georgia	384	291	326	287	319	298	-22
Germany
Greece	78	...	109	139	165	149	91
Hungary	276	262	245	261	...
Iceland	89	94	103	98	97	123	39
Ireland	141	134	136	135	121	125	-11
Italy	108	79	89	107	133	144	33
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	912	920	...	877	514	529	-42
Lithuania	260	373	397	393	413	420	61
Luxembourg	106	126	...	78	86	87	-18
Malta	117	105	154	149	172	185	58
Moldova	204	207	224	219	257	231	13
Montenegro	38	...	34	...
Netherlands	270	260	307	311	...	292	8
North Macedonia
Norway	105	107	111	125	127	126	19
Poland	963	920	857
Portugal	235	293	335	304	351	352	50
Romania	28	14	35	55	104	111	292
Russia	699	668	660	645	592	604	-14
Serbia	6	19	24	48	42	45	659
Slovak Republic	189	168	174	151	150
Slovenia	29	31	116	23	102	119	306
Spain
Sweden	207	203	191	174	168	155	-25
Switzerland	91	79	80	83	65	65	-29
Turkey	120	196	311	375	398	456	281
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	334	314	302	293	...	319	-4
UK: Northern Ireland	200	198	196	159
UK: Scotland	419	425	420	436	435	442	5
<i>Mean</i>	233	236	224	219	217	219	
<i>Median</i>	201	196	179	166	172	191	
<i>Minimum</i>	6	14	24	23	42	34	
<i>Maximum</i>	963	920	857	877	592	604	

Table 5.2.2.2 Percentage of women, minors, and foreigners in the flow of entries in probation during 2015

	Total offenders per 100 000 pop.	of which % of women	of which % of minors	of which % of foreigners
Albania	206	...	7.0	0.0
Armenia	61	11.6	2.8	0.7
Austria	216	18.0	16.6	26.0
Azerbaijan	173
Belgium	350	10.6	0.7	12.6
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	104	6.9
Croatia	167	8.2	...	0.9
Cyprus	260	4.8	23.1	21.4
Czech Republic	199	13.5	9.5	...
Denmark	223	8.9	1.5	7.2
Estonia	309	9.9	6.4	23.9
Finland	57	10.2	0.3	4.7
France
Georgia	319	6.0	1.4	...
Germany
Greece	165	1.1	0.2	2.3
Hungary	245	16.4
Iceland	97
Ireland	121	14.1	5.8	...
Italy	133	10.3	...	15.5
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	514
Lithuania	413	10.4	10.3	...
Luxembourg	86	11.2	...	44.7
Malta	172	1.5	8.1	...
Moldova	257	0.2	2.6	...
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway	127	14.9	0.8	8.9
Poland
Portugal	351	11.4	2.2	7.8
Romania	104	8.0	0.5	...
Russia	592	12.8	2.3	0.4
Serbia	42	8.4	...	0.2
Slovak Republic	150	10.7	1.8	...
Slovenia	102
Spain
Sweden	168	11.8	0.2	14.7
Switzerland	65	17.8	...	39.0
Turkey	398	5.0	7.2	1.3
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	435	15.4	3.0	...
<i>Mean</i>	217	10.0	5.0	12.2
<i>Median</i>	172	10.4	2.6	7.8
<i>Minimum</i>	42	0.2	0.2	0.0
<i>Maximum</i>	592	18.0	23.1	44.7

Table 5.2.2.3 Distribution of the probationers placed under the supervision of probation agencies during 2015 (flow of entries) by type of supervision (2/2)

	<i>of which %:</i>												
	Total per 100 000 pop.	Supervision before a final sentence	Fully suspended custodial sanction with probation	Partially suspended custodial sentence with probation	Conditional pardon or conditional discharge (with probation)	Community service	Electronic monitoring	Home arrest (curfew orders)	Semi-liberty	Treatment	Mixed orders	Supervision after conditional release from prison	Other (please specify in the comments)
Romania	104	...	60.6	8.0	0.3	31.1
Russia	211	15.0	...	2.5	...	0.0	82.5
Serbia	43	18.1	16.6	42.2	22.1	0.1	0.8
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	102	77.9	8.6	4.1	...	1.1	3.4	1.5	3.4
Spain
Sweden	168	29.9	11.2	4.6	...	24.3	30.1
Switzerland	71	...	4.0	1.6	...	65.1	4.4	...	5.1	1.3	0.0	13.0	6.5
Turkey
Ukraine
UK:
England & Wales
UK: Northern Ireland
UK:	435	41.1	7.7	4.7	27.4	4.6	12.7
Scotland	...	1.7
<i>Mean</i>	181	20	19	6	14	33	11	7	2	3	11	10	18
<i>Median</i>	168	11	9	2	3	31	4	2	1	4	6	7	7
<i>Minimum</i>	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Maximum</i>	514	78	81	21	43	65	49	22	6	9	47	35	83

5.2.3 Probation population: Flow of exits from probation

Table 5.2.3 Number of persons that ceased to be under the supervision of probation agencies (flow of exits from probation) during the year 2015, by type of exit

	Total per 100 000 pop.	of which %					
		Comple- tion	Revoca- tion	Imprison- ment	Ab- sconder	Death	Other
Albania	62.4	99.3	1.8	1.3	...	0.7	4.5
Armenia	32.6	97.7	1.1	1.4	...	2.1	3.9
Austria	211.9	68.5	16.4	0.6	...	0.5	14.0
Azerbaijan	64.7	90.2	1.3	0.5	1.6	0.5	5.8
Belgium	337.0	65.2	18.8	0.5	15.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	169.9	96.0	1.6	1.9	0.5
Croatia	88.9	92.6	0.4	4.8	0.0	0.6	1.7
Cyprus	53.7	0.2	...
Czech Republic	150.0	31.6	17.4	0.7	62.3
Denmark
Estonia	342.8	79.8	10.5	8.3	...	1.3	0.0
Finland	54.7	90.8	7.2	0.7	0.0	1.4	0.0
France
Georgia	185.4	90.5	1.4	6.6	0.5	0.9	0.1
Germany	75.3	67.1	25.8	7.1
Greece	27.1	85.9	11.0	1.1	0.3	0.6	1.1
Hungary	249.8	70.2	13.3	0.2	0.1	1.1	...
Iceland	52.3	80.8	4.1	15.1	0.0	0.0	...
Ireland	97.6	87.7	7.1	4.5	2.7	1.0	0.4
Italy	88.5	82.7	5.8	...	0.8	0.6	10.1
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia
Lithuania	411.4	68.6	8.3	2.7	...	0.8	19.5
Luxembourg	112.8	85.4	10.6	3.6	...	0.5	0.0
Malta
Moldova	212.3	77.5	3.6	3.8	1.8	1.1	14.1
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway	128.2	91.9	9.2	0.4	...
Poland
Portugal	284.7	90.7	2.7	0.5	6.2
Romania	21.1	69.2	4.2	3.2	23.4
Russia	325.0	36.0	...	8.1	55.9
Serbia	27.2	93.1	0.5	1.7	4.0	0.3	0.4
Slovak Republic	50.6
Slovenia
Spain	241.8	96.8	1.3	0.1	...	0.3	...
Sweden	150.1
Switzerland
Turkey	419.0	56.2	27.6	1.0
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	288.0	68.7	7.0	10.0	1.2	0.6	12.5
UK: Northern Ireland
UK: Scotland	373.7	69.6	11.5	12.5	...	0.9	5.5
<i>Mean</i>	168.5	78.62	8.27	4.11	1.05	0.83	11.47
<i>Median</i>	139.1	82.67	7.05	2.27	0.54	0.83	11.78
<i>Minimum</i>	21.1	31.58	0.40	0.07	0.00	0.78	12.12
<i>Maximum</i>	419.0	99.28	27.60	15.12	4.03	0.79	12.04

5.2.4 Staff of probation agencies

Table 5.2.4 Staff of probation agencies on 31st December 2015, by type of staff

	<i>of which %</i>								
	Probation staff per 100 probationers	Top-level executives at the national probation administrations	Top-level executives at the regional probation administrations	Senior Probation officers (chiefs of units)	Probation officers (qualified probation staff)	Probation agencies of officers (unqualified probation staff)	Paid external staff	Volunteers	Other staff (specify)
Albania	1	0.9	19.0	14.7	75.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.4
Armenia	2	3.9	22.1	...	74.0
Austria	3	2.2	1.7	3.5	64.1	11.5	0.0	12.0	5.1
Azerbaijan
Belgium	1	0.8	0.3	7.1	150.3	43.2	0.0	0.0	11.2
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	4	0.5	7.7	...	79.2	12.6
Croatia	3	6.5	13.0	0.0	66.3	14.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cyprus	3	5.9	47.1	70.6	29.4	0.0	...
Czech Republic	2	0.4	1.8	16.3	69.7	...	0.0	0.0	12.1
Denmark	5	...	2.6	3.4	62.3	30.4	1.5
Estonia	4	1.0	6.2	...	76.0	11.6	...	0.5	4.6
Finland	12	2.3	1.2	5.8	83.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
France	3	0.5	0.6	9.1	67.5	1.6	25.1
Georgia	2	1.0	4.0	1.3	42.7	2.3	18.3	3.0	27.4
Germany	1
Greece	0.4	3.9	6.6	19.7	60.5	7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hungary	1	1.5	4.4	4.8	89.2
Iceland	4	12.5	50.0	...	12.5	...	37.5
Ireland	6	1.3	1.6	12.1	55.5	29.6
Italy	4	0.1	0.6	3.5	45.3	30.1	6.6	7.8	5.9
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	4	0.8	0.0	13.6	74.5	11.2
Lithuania	3	2.0	6.0	4.8	80.2	7.1	...	98.0	...
Luxembourg	1	...	0.0	6.9	69.0	...	0.0	...	24.1
Malta	3	2.9	0.0	11.8	58.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.5
Moldova	2	0.9	23.2	4.7	5.2	56.4	0.0	0.0	9.5
Montenegro	25.0	75.0
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway
Poland	9	0.3	...	1.6	15.6	81.0	1.4
Portugal
Romania	1	0.2	0.0	9.5	71.1	12.3	6.8
Russia	4	...	0.8	23.0	71.6	4.6
Serbia	6	1.4	...	2.8	84.5	11.3
Slovak Republic	1	11.1	88.9
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden	10	0.1	0.0	6.2	69.5	2.3	22.0
Switzerland
Turkey	2	0.1	2.1	1.4	26.3	63.1	7.0
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	5	0.4	5.5	5.6	36.3	51.3	0.9
UK: Northern Ireland	8	1.1	1.1	8.2	45.6	14.7	0.5	0.0	28.7
UK: Scotland
Mean	4	2	6	11	65	19	4	13	13
Median	3	1	2	7	69	12	0	0	10
Minimum	0.4	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Maximum	12	13	47	71	150	63	29	98	38

5.2.5 Reports produced by probation agencies

Table 5.2.5 Number of written reports produced probation agencies during 2015, by type of report

	Number of reports per 1 staff member	<i>of which %</i>		
		Number of pre-sen- tence reports	Number of advisory re- ports with respect to conditional release	Other reports (please specify)
Albania
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belgium
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	86.0	0.1	1.4	98.6
Croatia	12.6	1.0	99.0	100.0
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland	19.2	76.1	...	23.9
France
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary	26.7	16.7	0.3	83.0
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	6.8	88.9	...	11.1
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	3.4	31.9	68.1	...
Lithuania
Luxembourg	0.9	100.0
Malta	8.7	24.7	35.1	40.2
Moldova	5.1	79.4	20.6	0.0
Montenegro
Netherlands
North Macedonia
Norway	...	100.0
Poland	22.4	39.1	46.3	14.6
Portugal
Romania	15.1	78.8	13.5	7.7
Russia	100.0
Serbia	22.7	...	62.2	37.8
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	88.2	11.8
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Turkey
Ukraine
UK: England & Wales	17.9	100.0
UK: Northern Ireland	23.1	62.1	0.1	37.7
UK: Scotland	...	87.6	12.4	...
<i>Mean</i>	19	59	37	44
<i>Median</i>	16	76	28	38
<i>Minimum</i>	1	0	0	0
<i>Maximum</i>	86	100	99	100

Notes on Tables 5.2.4 and 5.2.5

Notes on Table 5.2.4	
Czech Republic	The counting rule of the FTE (full-time equivalent) is not respected. Every employee is counted as one employee independently of their percentage of working hours. However, there are only 2 or 3 employees working part time.
Lithuania	The counting rule of the FTE (full-time equivalent) is not respected.
UK: Northern Ireland	The Information provided is based on actual numbers of people rather than 'Work time Equivalent'. For example, on 31 December 2010 PBNi staff totalled 441 people working the equivalent of 405.97 full-time members of staff. Administrative Staff includes all corporate staff, administrative support within field teams and also cleaning staff. Other Probation Workers include Probation Service Officers, Community Service and Psychology Staff.
Notes on Table 5.2.5	
Albania	No information available.
Hungary	There are two main categories of advisory reports in Hungary: probation advisory reports and social inquiry reports. Most of the probation advisory reports are pre-sentence reports made at the request of the prosecutor or the judge. Social inquiry reports are prepared in every juvenile case at the request of the police. Probation officers make social inquiry also reports during reprieve proceedings, and for the preparation of the decision about the cancellation of the payment of costs of the criminal procedure or court fine
Ireland	Other reports include generic reports and Revocation Report
Slovak Republic	Other reports correspond to the Report and review prepared by the centres of social work on the request of the courts.
Slovenia	Other reports include 83 reports on the help to the family during the process.
UK: England & Wales	Pre-Sentence- Reports include both Pre-Sentence Reports and Shortened Pre-Sentence Reports. Reports concerning supervision during the execution of community sanctions includes Breach Reports Reports after a conditional release include Recall Reports Other reports not detailed in the table but included in the total figures include Addendum Report, Home Circumstances Report, Report For The Life Sentence Commissioners Progress Report To The Life Sentence Unit, Parole Report, Probation Officers Report.

5.3 Technical information

This section provides information on the organisation of probation agencies in each country. It is based on a section created in collaboration with the Confederation of European Probation (CEP) for the fifth edition of the European Sourcebook³⁶. The section has been updated with the information collected for this sixth edition of the Sourcebook and with data from the SPACE II Council of Europe Penal Statistics.

5.3.1 The structure and organisation of Probation Agencies

All countries have a probation agency or an institution that fulfils the typical tasks of a probation agency, but under a different name (see the comments to Table 5.3.1.1). In 25 countries, that agency is independent from the prison agency, in 14 countries there is only one prison and probation administration, and in Switzerland their status differs across cantons. The types and competencies of probation agencies are described in Table 5.3.1.1 and the notes to it.

³⁶ The following experts of the CEP contributed to Section 5.3.1 of the previous edition (2014) of the European Sourcebook: Bernd Glaeser (NEUSTART, Wien, Austria), Jana Spero (Ministry of Justice, Zagreb, Croatia), Michal Karban (Probation and Mediation Service, Prague, Czech Republic), Andri Ahven (Ministry of Justice, Tallinn, Estonia), Roberta Palmisano (Office for Studies Research Legislation and International Relations, Rome, Italy), Mariella Camilleri (Department of Probation and Parole, Valetta, Malta), Valeriu Melinte and Alisa Simicevscaia (Oficul Central de Probațiune, Chișinău, Moldova), Martine Wiekeraad, Reclustering Nederland, Utrecht, Netherlands), Evelina Obersterescu (Ministry of Justice, Bucharest, Romania), Ján Evin (Ministry of Justice, Bratislava, Slovak Republic), Mats Johansson (Swedish Prison and Probation Service, Norrköping (Sweden), and Francesca Emmett (National Offenders Management Service, Warrington, UK: England & Wales).

Table 5.3.1.1 Type and competency of the probation agencies (or equivalent bodies)

	Type			Competency			
	Public	Non-profit/ state subsidi- sided	Private en- terprise	Minors	Adults	Pre-sen- tence stage	Execution stage
Albania	X			X	X	X	X
Armenia	X			X	X	X	X
Austria		X		X	X	X	X
Belgium	X	X		X	X
Bulgaria	X			X	X	X	X
Croatia	X				X	X	X
Cyprus	X			X	X	X	X
Czech Republic	X			X	X	X	X
Denmark	X			X	X	X	X
Estonia	X			X	X	X	X
Finland	X	X		X	X	X	X
France	X				X	X	X
Georgia	X			X	X	X	
Germany	X	X		X	X	X	X
Hungary	X			X	X	X	X
Iceland	X			X	X	X	X
Italy	X			X	X		X
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99) (UNR)	X	X		X	X	X	X
Latvia	X			X	X	X	X
Lithuania	X			X	X		X
Malta	X			X	X	X	X
Moldova	X			X	X	X	X
Netherlands		X		X	X	X	X
North Macedonia							
Norway	X			X	X	X	X
Poland	X			X	X	X	X
Portugal	X			X	X	X	X
Romania	X			X	X	X	X
Russian Fed.	X			X	X	X	X
Serbia	X			X	X	X	X
Slovak Republic	X			X	X	X	X
Slovenia	X				X		X
Spain	X			X	X		X
Sweden	X	X		X	X	X	X
Switzerland	X				X		X
Turkey	X			X	X	X	X
UK: Eng. & Wales	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
UK: N. Ireland	X			X	X	X	X
UK: Scotland	X				X	X	X

Comments to Table 5.3.1.1 (1/3)

Albania	The Probation Service, created in 2008, is the institution which deals with offenders convicted with alternative sanctions in the criminal justice system in Albania. The Probation Service Institute prepares for the prosecutor an assessment report for the accused / person under investigation and implements the Execution Order issued by the Prosecution. It prepares an assessment report on the request of the Court for defendants sentenced to imprisonment.
Austria	The probation service in Austria is run by NEUSTART, a private non-profit organisation almost fully funded by the Ministry of Justice. Within the Ministry of Justice, the Prison administration is responsible for NEUSTART, which nevertheless is a separated independent body. NEUSTART offers various social work services to victims and offenders all over the country. The probation service in the narrow sense of a supervision order is carried out either by professional social workers or volunteers trained and guided by professionals. Besides probation, victim-offender mediation (VOM), unpaid work as a diversion measure, unpaid work as an alternative to custody for fine defaulters and electronic monitoring are the main activities.
Belgium	In the context of the 6th state reform, the probation services have been transferred from the Ministry of Justice to the following three federal entities: (a) the Flemish community, (b) the German-speaking community, (c) The French community.
Bulgaria	General Directorate "Execution of Sentences" (GDES) is a specialised administrative structure, legal entity under the Minister of Justice with headquarters in Sofia. The Directorate exercises direct supervision and control over the places of deprivation of liberty and probation, and the remand measure of detention in places of deprivation of liberty.
Croatia	Probation offices started opening in 2011 (12 local offices and a head office in the Ministry of Justice).
Cyprus	The Police and the "Conditional Release - Parole Board" (PB) are under the authority of the Ministry of Justice and Public Order. Probation officers are also employed by the Social Welfare Services (SWS) of the Ministry of Labour, Welfare and Social Insurance. The Police and the SWS are not considered probation agencies, however these two government agencies employ probation officers who handle probation cases (among other responsibilities that they have).
Czech Rep.	Probation and Mediation Service – Czech Republic (PMS) is an organisational unit of the Ministry of Justice of the Czech Republic. Supervision of the activities carried out by the Ministry of Justice. The legislation of PMS is contained in Act No. 257/2000 Coll. Probation and Mediation Service.
Estonia	There are probation supervision departments of prisons. There are no separate agencies.
Germany	There is no uniformed federal system for probation. The systems differ across states (Länder). As a consequence, there are no national statistics on probation and data are no longer available since 2016, as it can be seen in the SPACE II Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics (www.unil.ch/space)
Iceland	The Prison system in Iceland is run by the Prison and Probation Administration (PPA), a governmental institution controlled by the Ministry of Justice. According to the Execution of Sentences Act (ESA) no. 15/2016 the PPA's role is to supervise the execution of sentences and other functions in accordance with the provision of the Act and the regulations issued thereunder and to supervise the running of the prisons.
Italy	The Ministry of Justice, Department of Penitentiary Administration manages probation in Italy, through the Offices for the Execution of Sentences in the Community (UEPE) Those Offices are staffed mainly with social workers of justice (probation officers) At the central level, at the Department Headquarters there is the Directorate General for the Execution of Sentences in the Community (DGEPE), providing coordination, directions, and guidance to local Offices.
Lithuania	Until 2012 there were correction inspections with territorial subdivisions. After a change in legislation, these were renamed as probation agencies, which have further tasks.
Malta	The current probation agency was set up in 2012 as a department of the Ministry of Home Affairs and National Security. It replaced the former Probation Service (before 2012, the prisons and the Probation Service were part of the Department for Correctional Services).
Netherlands	In the Netherlands there are three probation agencies (independent private bodies). These agencies are almost fully financed by the Ministry of Justice.

Comments to Table 5.3.1.1 (2/3)

Norway	<p>The Correctional Service of Norway consists of the Directorate, five regional offices and prisons and probation offices. At the central and regional level, both prison and probation are managed while prisons and probation offices as local units are managed separately. A number of pilots are currently being carried out where prison and probation are under the same local management as well.</p> <p>The Directorate answers to the Ministry of Justice and Public Security, and receives its policy instructions and budget from the Ministry.</p>
Portugal	<p>The Probation Agency, in the Ministry of Justice, is called the Directorate-General for Reintegration and Prison Services (DGRSP)</p>
Romania	<p>There is a central department in the Ministry of Justice and 42 probation services (one in each county).</p>
Serbia	<p>The probation agency was created in 2011.</p>
Slovak Rep.	<p>According to national legislation, the Criminal Law Department of the Ministry of Justice governs and guides conceptually and methodically the administration of probation. However, such an activity should not be considered probation administration as such.</p> <p>Probation is performed by probation and mediation officers, who are public servants employed by the eight (8) regional courts, but physically based at the district courts. The president of each regional court is considered their chief of staff.</p>
Slovenia	<p>Probation tasks are performed by social work centres, which are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Labour, Family, and Social Affairs.</p>
Spain	<p>In the General state Administration, probation agencies are placed under the authority of the Ministry of Interior. In Catalonia, the only autonomous community with the prison competences transferred, probation agencies are placed under the authority of the Regional Justice Administration.</p>
Switzerland	<p>There is no uniformed federal system for probation. The systems differ across cantons.</p>
Ukraine	<p>In 2018 the Statutes of the Probation Service and Prison Service were changed. The Probation and Prison Departments in the structure of the Ministry of Justice were replaced by the following legal entities (without the independent body status): The Public Institution "Centre of Probation" and the Prison Administration. Their activities are directed and coordinated by the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine.</p>
UK: England & Wales	<p>The Probation Service for England and Wales is a statutory Criminal Justice Service for the supervision of offenders in the community and the provision of reports to the criminal courts to assist them in their sentencing duties. The Service works with the Police, Prison Service, and other organisations under the Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangement (MAPPA). The Service also fulfils a role in assisting victims of crime. The service is part of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) which itself is part of the Ministry of Justice. It comprises 42 probation areas which are coterminous with police force area boundaries and served by 35 probation trusts. Trusts are funded by NOMS and employ all staff except the Chief Probation Officer and are accountable to local boards and NOMS. The work of Trusts is scrutinised both by NOMS and Her Majesty's Inspector of Probation. Starting from 2014 the structure of the service was changed so that more serious offenders were dealt with by the National Probation Service and the less serious by around 20 Community Rehabilitation Companies whose legal status gradually moved from being owned by the government to private companies.</p> <p>The Probation Service have a statutory requirement to assist the criminal courts by the provision of reports and to supervise offenders in the community. They work with other agencies to provide a multi-agency approach to deal with offenders.</p>
UK: Northern Ireland	<p>The Northern Ireland Assembly is the devolved legislature for Northern Ireland. It is responsible for making laws on transferred matters in Northern Ireland and for scrutinising the work of Ministers and Government Departments. The Probation Board for Northern Ireland is a Non-Departmental Public Body, sponsored by the Department of Justice.</p>
UK: Scotland	<p>Probation services in Scotland are funded through the Scottish Government equivalent of the Ministry of Justice (Directorate General of Education, Communities and Justice). The funding is then distributed by geographically based local authorities who manage the operation of criminal justice social work through their social work departments. Some services are also provided by the voluntary sector.</p> <p>This means that here is no central Probation Agency in Scotland. Community orders involving supervision and/or unpaid work are imposed by courts. It is then the responsibility of Scottish local authority social work departments to arrange the appropriate supervision / work placements for offenders. There are 32 Scottish local authority social work departments.</p>

5.3.2 Description of data recording methods for Tables on probation

Stock data

The reference date for stock data is 31st December, but in Scotland is 31st March, in Sweden 1st October, while in France, Latvia, and the Russian Federation is the following day (1st January of the following year)

Minors

Minors are included in the figures provided by the majority of countries. The details are presented in the following Table.

Minors are included	Minors are NOT included	Minors are PARTIALLY included
<p><i>30 countries:</i> Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Kosovo (UN R/1244/99) (UNR), Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Moldova, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovak Rep., Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, UK: Northern Ireland.</p>	<p><i>10 countries:</i> Croatia, Czech Republic, Italy, Luxembourg, North Macedonia, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, UK: England & Wales.</p>	<p><i>3 countries:</i> France, Netherlands, UK: Scotland.</p>

Counting unit

In most countries, the counting unit used in probation statistics is the person. The details are presented in the following Table. The counting unit is:

	the person	partially the person*	other*
Stock indicators	<p>25 countries: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Switzerland, Turkey, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland.</p>	<p>9 countries: Czech Republic, France, Ireland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, UK: Scotland</p>	<p>7 countries: Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, Malta, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Ukraine</p>
Flow indicators	<p>21 countries: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Iceland, Lithuania, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Poland, Turkey, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland.</p>	<p>10 countries: Czech Republic, France, Ireland, Latvia, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK: Scotland</p>	<p>8 countries: Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Ukraine</p>

Notes on the counting unit

Belgium	The counting unit is the number of <i>files</i> and not the number of persons.
Czech Republic	The counting unit is the sanction or measure (i.e., both for stock and flow, one person can be registered with more than one sanction or measure).
Denmark	The counting unit is the number of <i>cases</i> .
France	Sometimes the counting unit is persons, sometimes it is measures. In fact, some persons may be concerned by several measures, so when details according to the type of monitoring are asked, it is about measures and no longer about persons.
Ireland	The counting unit are the <i>orders</i> rather than persons. A person can be subjected to more than one order at any given time for different offences.
Italy	Flow data refer to the number of <i>cases</i> taken in charge by the probation services.
Latvia	For the stock, the counting unit is the sanction or measure (i.e., one person can be registered with more than one sanction or measure); for the flow, if the person is sentenced twice within the year and thus serves two separate convictions then it is not possible to separate them, but if one person has several sanctions for one conviction then it is counted as one unit.
Malta	The counting unit is the number of cases, and cases are counted as per the number of community sanctions, and not by the person.
Norway	The counting unit is the number of <i>cases</i> started, ongoing or closed. For <i>stock</i> , this implies that the numbers for cases coincide with the numbers for <i>persons</i> .
Romania	The counting unit is the number of cases. Persons serving two or more community sanctions will be counted twice or more times.
Serbia	For the flow of entries, the counting unit is the <i>verdict</i> , and there can be several verdicts for the same persons. The moment the person starts to execute the sanction he/she becomes an <i>active case</i> . For the stock and flow of exits, the counting unit is thus the active case (i.e., the person).
Slovak Republic	The counting unit is the <i>court case</i> .
Slovenia	The counting unit is the case.
Spain	In the case of community service and sentence suspensions, the counting unit is the <i>record</i> ; for conditional release, the counting unit is the <i>person</i> , as well as for semi-liberty and electronic monitoring. In the Autonomous Community of Catalonia, the counting unit is always the person.
Sweden	In the total stock, the counting unit is the person. For the other indicators, the counting unit is the sanction or measure (i.e., the person will be counted as many times as sanctions or measures he/she is serving)
Switzerland	In the flow, the counting unit is the execution of a sanction. A person executing two or more sanctions will be counted two or more times.
Turkey	The SPACE statistics refer to the number of <i>cases</i> . However, in the Reports of the Probation services there is also data on the number of <i>persons</i> . For example, overall, there were 273,401 cases in stock in December 2015, compared to 226,970 persons in stock in December 2015. For flow statistics, the breakdown by categories is available for cases, but not for persons (only the total number of probationers and of minors are available).
Ukraine	The counting unit depends on the database to be used.
UK: England & Wales	Flow: Each person is counted once only for each type of supervision started within the reporting period. Stock: Each person is counted once only in each total or subtotal even if they started several types of supervision within the reporting period.
UK: Scotland	The counting unit is the <i>order</i> which is different from the person as some people may have been given more than one order.

5.3.3 Electronic monitoring

Implementation of electronic monitoring (EM) across Europe by technique and type of EM

Electronic tag	Technique		Type		
	Telephone calls	Other electronic system	Electronic curfew	Tracking of movement	Other
23 countries: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland.	9 countries: Albania, Finland, Hungary, Lithuania, Moldova, North Macedonia, Poland, Spain, UK: England & Wales.	7 countries: Bulgaria, France, Moldova, Netherlands, Russian Fed., Sweden, Turkey	19 countries: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Estonia, France, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland.	14 countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Russian Fed., Spain, Sweden, Turkey.	6 countries: Bulgaria, Finland, France, Moldova, Russian Fed., Turkey

Notes on electronic monitoring (EM)

Albania	Electronic tagging is implemented in Albania by placing a bracelet on the foot of the convicted person, which enables his/her localisation at all times, as well as tracks his/her movements. The convicted person is contacted through phone calls for possible violations or bracelet malfunction.
Armenia	No EM implemented in Armenia.
Bulgaria	As to "technique", radio-frequency monitoring may be applied. As to "type", voice identification may be applied (Article 262 of the Execution of Punishments and Detention Act).
Czech Republic	Electronic monitoring was integrated into the Czech law system in 2009, but bracelets or other type of technique of EM were not available in 2015. The EM system was started in September 2018.
Denmark	Electronic monitoring is in all cases an alternative way of serving a full (short) prison sentence. The decision is made by the Prison Service.
Estonia	The majority of persons are monitored by use of a base station at the offender's home. Tracking movement means use of GPS equipment.
Finland	The person is confined to their home outside of their daily schedule which may include going to work/school or running errands. They have an electrical ankle bracelet and in addition, they are visited by a team of probation officers at random times to make sure they are following the rules and remain sober. Source of data: http://www.rikosseuraamus.fi/material/attachments/rise/esitteet/697aJhOOE/VALRA_si-dosryhmille.pdf
Netherlands	Electronic monitoring in the Netherlands is not a sanction in its own right, but it is a condition attached to: pre-trial supervision by probation agencies, fully or partially suspended custodial sentence with probation, home arrest, or conditional release with probation. There are two types of EM executed: Radio Frequency-Identification (RFId) and Global Positioning System (GPS).
Norway	Since electronic monitoring is a way of executing unconditional imprisonment granted by the Correctional Services, breach of conditions results in transfer to prison, and this is done without further intervention by the judicial authorities. The curfew implies that the offender will have to be at home during certain hours and has to be out and active (work, school, program, other - decided by the Correctional Services) during the rest of the time. His or her presence during out-time is checked through contact persons and random visits.
Portugal	Tracking of movement is used only in domestic violence restraint orders.
Russian Federation	For electronic monitoring are used: Stationary control device is paired with an electronic bracelet on his ankle to control the mode of the presence on the premises or on the designated territory. The mobile control device is paired with an electronic ankle bracelet to track the location of a person controlled by the signals of global navigation satellite system GLONASS/GPS.
Slovenia	No EM implemented in Slovenia.
Spain	Electronic monitoring is not an autonomous alternative sanction. However, alternatives to imprisonment are only applied to prisoners during the execution of the imprisonment sanction. Data for adults are recorded as an input. Electronic monitoring is not provided by the juvenile criminal law.
Sweden	Some of the electronic tags are combined with GPS (global positioning system). This is to ensure that the person is in an approved place at every point in time. Besides electronic curfew at home as a way to carry out a prison sentence, electronic monitoring is also partly applied for granted prison leaves. It is also applied inside some of the prison institutions, namely the institutions with the lowest level of safety regulations, which is where the inmates with the lowest risk of breaching the conditions are serving their sentences.
Turkey	Other techniques include GPS tracking and Alcohol use monitoring.

5.4 Sources

The vast majority of data on stock and flow from 2011 to 2016 are taken from the SPACE II Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics³⁷, available at www.unil.ch/space. Additional sources include

Albania	Data drawn from analysing statistical reports gathered by the General Department of Probation from local Probation Offices.
Austria	NEUSTART - Bewährungshilfe, Konfliktregelung, Soziale Arbeit www.neustart.at .
Belgium	Database of the Houses of Justice.
Bulgaria	Ministry of Justice – General Directorate Execution of Penalties: Statistics on Execution of Penalties, not published.
Czech Republic	AIS PMS - administrative and statistical file system 2015.
Estonia	Ministry of Justice, unpublished.
France	Ministry of Justice. Penitentiary Administration. Stock data come from the informatics program SPIP: APPI.
Hungary	The Hungarian Prison Service Headquarters and the Hungarian Probation Service national registry system (unpublished)
Iceland	Prison and probation Administration.
Italy	Italian Institute of statistics - http://www.istat.it - Ministry of Justice, and Department of Statistics Directorate General for the Execution of Sentences in the Community (DGEPE) -Observatory on Community Sanctions and Measures. Published on the Internet website www.giustizia/statistiche .
Lithuania	Prison Department under the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania – Planning and Project Management Division, unpublished.
Malta	Department of Probation and Parole.
Moldova	Ministry of Justice – Central Probation Office.
North Macedonia	Annual reports of the Department for the treatment and enforcement of non-custodial sanctions and measures in the Administration for Enforcement of Penal Sanctions.
Norway	Registration system of the Correctional Services of Norway.
Poland	Ministry of Justice.
Portugal	Directorate-General for Reintegration and Prison Services (DGRSP).
Romania	Data are gathered by the Probation Department and they partially published on the Ministry of Justice website.
Serbia	Annual reports of the Department for the treatment and enforcement of non-custodial sanctions and measures in the Administration for Enforcement of Penal Sanctions. www.uiks.mpravde.gov.rs .
Slovak Republic	Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic, Department of Informatics and Project Management, Department of Sectoral Statistics and Reporting, unpublished.
Slovenia	Social data database and several additional sources.
Spain	National Statistics Institute of Spain (INE): http://www.ine.es .
Sweden	Swedish prison and probation service - Statistical section: Prison and probation service register (KVR), unpublished. Some of the statistics are available (in Swedish) at http://statistik.kriminalvarden.se/SASPortal/main.do .
Switzerland	Swiss Federal Office of Statistics
Turkey	Ministry of Justice, General Directorate for Probation website, Statistics http://www.cte-ds.adalet.gov.tr/menusayfalari/bilgibankasi/istatistik/%20istatistik/istatistik.htm
UK: England & Wales	Source: Ministry of Justice - Justice Statistics Analytical Services - Prison Probations and Reoffending Team, - Probation statistics not all published
UK: Northern Ireland	PBNI's Case Management System, Probation Information Management System (PIMS).
UK: Scotland	Criminal Justice Social Work Statistics bulletin published by the Scottish Government.

³⁷ See, e.g., *Aebi, M. F., & Chopin, J.* (2017). SPACE II – 2016 – Council of Europe Annual Penal Statistics: Persons under the supervision of probation agencies. Strasbourg: Council of Europe

6 National Victimisation Surveys

6.1 General comments

6.1.1 Introduction

Victimisation surveys started in the 1970s to give another estimate of crime experienced in a country to enhance the figures of crime recorded by the police. However, since then they have developed extensively to give estimates of many other aspects of how the population of a country interacts with social conditions and with the criminal justice system. Originally directed at households only, they have also developed to research prevalence of crime and use of crime prevention measures in business and government agencies. They have proved particularly useful in looking at the experience of new types of crime such as cybercrime and computer fraud. A discussion of the wide range of other issues covered by recent victimisation surveys in European countries can be found in section 6.4.

This chapter provides information on the national victimisation surveys carried out in countries participating in the European Sourcebook. To improve comparability with other types of crime data included in the different editions of the

European Sourcebook, data from national victimisation surveys were collected for six different years: 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, 2010 and 2015³⁸.

Readers should keep in mind that the results of national victimisation surveys conducted in different countries cannot be directly compared because of the differences in methodology. Indeed, even in the same country, methodologies and sample sizes do not remain the same since many countries are developing their victimisation surveys in an attempt to measure new types of crime, cover new types of victim and measure new aspects of their criminal justice systems. Such developments are often hampered by shortages in resources. To appreciate the extent to which comparisons are able to be made, the original documents for each country should be consulted. In this chapter web references are given throughout but especially in Tables 6.1.4 and 6.4.

This chapter has been expanded from previous editions which concentrated on households, to include some other types of surveys: e.g., section 6.1.6.1. mentions the national business surveys that are conducted and section 6.2.11 considers cybercrime against businesses. The police crime data in chapter 1 includes all crimes reported to the police, whether from individuals, businesses, or government organisations.

This chapter also does not include data from local or regional surveys in individual countries. Neither does it cover cross-national victimisation surveys that have been carried by groups of countries or international bodies from time to time: examples are:

The International Crime Victim Survey that was carried out from 1989 to 2005 in many European countries³⁹.

The EU-ICS (European Union Crime and Safety Survey) a one-time survey carried out in 2005.⁴⁰

In the past, some countries used the ICVS as an alternative to a national survey. Thus, we include Table 6.1.1. to show 23 European countries that participated in different sweeps of the ICVS. Others have used ICVS methodology or questions as a basis for their own surveys.

³⁸ For a review of the victimisation surveys carried out in the EU countries since their first developments in the 1960s until 2008 see *Aebi M.F. & Linde A. (2010). A review of victimisation surveys in Europe from 1970 to 2010 in Van Dijk, J., Mayhew, P., Van Kesteren, J., Aebi, M.F. & Linde, A. (Eds) Final Report on the study of crime victimisation (pp.D1-D76) Tilburg: Intervict/PrismaPrint Tilburg.* available online at <http://www3.unil.ch/wpmu/icvs/key-publications>.

³⁹ A full list of ICVS publications and all details of the survey can be found at <http://www.unil.ch/icvs>.

⁴⁰ For full details see <http://www.worldsocialscience.org/documents/european-crime-safety-survey-eu-ics.pdf>.

Table 6.1.1. European countries participating in the different sweeps of the ICVS with national samples

	1989	1992	1996	2000	2004/5
Austria			*		
Belgium	*	*		*	*
Bulgaria					*
Denmark				*	*
Estonia		*	*	*	*
Finland	*	*	*	*	*
France	*		*	*	*
Germany	*				*
Greece					*
Hungary					*
Iceland					*
Ireland					*
Italy		*	*		*
Luxembourg					*
Netherlands	*	*	*	*	*
Norway	*				*
Poland		*	*	*	*
Portugal				*	*
Spain	*				*
Switzerland	*		*	*	*
UK: England & Wales	*	*	*	*	*
UK: Northern Ireland	*		*	*	*
UK: Scotland	*		*	*	*

6.1.2 Data collected on Victimization Surveys for the European Sourcebook

The following data on national victimisation surveys was requested from all countries contributing to the Sourcebook:

- a) Availability and periodicity of national victimisation surveys. This data is summarised at Table 6.1.2.
- b) Wording of the questions for the following offences:
 - i. Bodily injury/assault
 - ii. Sexual assault
 - iii. Robbery
 - iv. Theft of personal property
 - v. Theft of a motor vehicle
 - vi. Theft by means of domestic burglary
 - vii. Corruption

A summary of definitions is at Table 6.1.5 and separate more detailed tables by offence can be found in Tables 6.2.1.3 to 6.2.9.2

- a) Wording on the questions on trust in the police and feelings of safety. These are summarised at Table 6.1.5, 6.2.8.2 and 6.2.9.2.
- b) Methodology of the national victimisation surveys: e.g.:

- i. Sample size (see Table 6.3.1)
 - ii. Sample design (see Table 6.3.2)
 - iii. Sample representativeness (see Table 6.3.3)
 - iv. Response rate Table 6.3.4)
 - v. Age range of those interviewed (see Table 6.3.5)
 - vi. Survey mode (see Table 6.3.6)
- c) Main results of national victimisation surveys for the following indicators:
- i. Prevalence and incidence of victimisation for the last 12 months and
 - ii. Percentages of victims reporting to the police
- For the following offences: (see Tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.7.1)
- i. Bodily injury/assault
 - ii. Sexual assault
 - iii. Robbery
 - iv. Theft of personal property
 - v. Theft of a motor vehicle
 - vi. Theft by means of domestic burglary
 - vii. Corruption
- d) Incidence is not included in this Chapter as the results are not at all comparable between countries.
- e) The data received from countries can be found in the raw data available on the web site (<http://www.unil.ch/europeansourcebook>)
- f) Any errors in this chapter or incompatibilities with the raw data should be reported to the ESB team at the University of Lausanne (marcelo.aebi@unil.ch)

Not all countries answered the questionnaire about national victimisation surveys and those that answered did not always reply for each sweep of the ESB. Of the 38 countries who replied five (Greece, Kosovo, Malta, Russian Federation and Slovak Republic) had never conducted a national victimisation survey. Fourteen others conduct a periodical national victimisation survey: see table 6.1.2.1 for a list of countries and survey frequency. Another 19 countries do not conduct a periodical survey but have conducted one or more national or regional victimisation surveys: see Table 6.1.2.2 for a list of countries. More details and comments are given in Table 6.1.2.3.

Table 6.1.2.1 Countries with periodical national victimisation surveys and frequency of such surveys

Belgium	Belgium has resumed conducting victimisation surveys on a regular basis, starting with 2018 data, although the gap between surveys has not yet been finalised. The previous survey was in 2008/9. Prior to that surveys were conducted normally every 2 years.
Denmark	Annual surveys have been carried out since 2005
Finland	Annual surveys have been conducted annually since 2012.
France	Annual since 2007
Germany	Surveys were conducted in 2012 and 2017. There are plans to conduct surveys every two years starting in 2020.
Iceland	Annually for the whole country since 2011
Italy	About every 5 years
Netherlands	Annual
Norway	Surveys were conducted in 2004, 2007, 2012, 2015 and 2018
Sweden	Annual
Turkey	Annual
UK: England & Wales	Continuous (with annual results)
UK: Northern Ireland	Continuous (with annual results)
UK: Scotland	Every two years

Table 6.1.2.2 Countries with occasional national victimisation surveys and characteristics of such surveys

Albania	Participated in 2010 International Crime Business Survey, the 2006 National Survey on Children Violence, and the 2008 National Survey on Domestic Violence
Armenia	2010
Austria	Austria conducted a 2016 nationwide survey on domestic violence (including attacks on sexual integrity)
Bulgaria	Annual surveys were carried up to 2010. None have been carried out since then or are planned for the future.
Croatia	1997, 2000, 2009
Cyprus	A Victimization Survey was conducted in 2009, by Ministry of Finance, Statistical Service
Czech Republic	2006, 2013 and 2017 Victimization surveys 2013 Domestic violence survey 2016-2019 Violence against elderly survey
Estonia	There have been annual small surveys since 2010 (similar to the ICVS, sample c.1000 respondents). The general victimisation level is not comparable to the earlier surveys due to much shorter questionnaire, but the wording of some questions was the same as was in the previous surveys
Finland	Before 2012 surveys were conducted in 1980,1988,1993,1997,2003,2006 and 2009.
Georgia	Surveys were carried out in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2013.
Ireland	Surveys were conducted in 1998, 2003, 2008 and 2010. From 2015 some questions on victims were included in the quarterly household survey
Lithuania	Surveys were conducted in 2003, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2011. There have also been surveys of victims such as young people or women
Poland	Surveys were conducted in 1991, 1995, 1999, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2014
Portugal	A partial survey was conducted in 1990 in and around Lisbon. Wider surveys were conducted in 1992 and 1994.
Serbia	Serbia was recently included in the survey on violence against women, which also used victimisation survey methodology (Research in the EU countries conducted by Fundamental Rights)
Slovenia	A survey on ICVS lines was conducted in 2001
Spain	Surveys were conducted in 1978,1980,1991,1995 by the Centre of Sociological Research but data are no longer available.
Switzerland	Surveys – on ICVS lines- were conducted in 1984/7, 1989, 1996, 2000 and 2005 by the University of Lausanne and in 2011 by Zurich University
Ukraine	Regional victimisation surveys have been carried by different institutions.

Table 6.1.2.3 National victimisation surveys: general comments and references

Albania	<p>Details of some past surveys can be found at: http://www.unicef.org/albania/violence_against_children_in_Albania.pdf http://www.undp.org/content/albania/en/home/library/poverty/domestic-violence-in-albania-national-survey/ Hysi, V. (2000) The ICVS in Albania, in UNICRI publication No 62, Rome Hysi, V. (2001) The ICVS Albania (National Report), Tirana.</p>
Armenia	The 2010 survey was conducted with the support of the OSCE office in Yerevan
Austria	Data from the 2016 survey on domestic violence can be found at https://rm.coe.int/16806ee8b2
Croatia	A 1997 Survey was conducted - for Zagreb only - by the Institute for Criminal law, criminology, and victimisation at the Zagreb Law School. A 2000 survey was conducted by Gallup and the 2009 survey by UNDP Croatia.
Czech Republic	The 2006 and 2013 victimisation surveys were based on the ICVS.
Finland	<p>Surveys conducted by the Institute of Criminology & Social Prevention Since 2012 the Finnish National Research Institute of Legal Policy (from 2015 onwards Institute of Criminology and Legal Policy, University of Helsinki) has conducted an annual victimisation survey. Data is collected by mail and online questionnaire. In 2015 the sample size was 14 000 and 15-74 years-old persons were picked by random sampling from the Finnish Population register. Response rate was 47.6 %. The results of this survey are comparable with those of 2012 to 2014 but not with the surveys conducted before 2012. In 2013, a survey on the experiences of violence and abuse by children and adolescents was conducted. A nationally representative sample (N=11,364) of Finnish 6th and 9th graders, 12 and 15 years old respectively, answered the questionnaire, which asked about the respondents' experiences of general criminal violence, sibling and peer victimisation, parental corporal punishment, sexual abuse, violence, and harassment connected to online activity and mobile phones, and witnessing domestic violence. In 2018, the University of Helsinki will perform the second national survey of crime against businesses. The national business crime survey analyses crime against companies and their employees, and the harm caused by such crime. The 2018 survey will focus on crime targeted at the retail and hotel and restaurant sectors. The survey will cover around 3,000 workplaces across the whole of Finland.</p>
France	In 1996 CESDIP-CRNS conducted the first national victimisation survey. INSEE included a victimisation section in its permanent survey on living standards in households (EPCVM) from 1996 to 2006. From 2007 INSEE replaced this by a reference section on living standards and security. All national surveys in France have a reference period of 24 months.
Georgia	Surveys were supported by the EU. Each wave contained 3,000 respondents.
Lithuania	Methodology depends on the institution conducting the survey. Three specific institutions were the Ministry of the Interior, the Police Department, and the Law Institute of Lithuania.
Norway	The Survey of Living Conditions EU-SILC is carried out annually. From 2011 onwards the survey consists of a set of core questions and a theme sections with rotating topics. The topics are repeated in a cycle of three years. In 2011 and 2014, the topics were outdoor activities, organizational activity, political participation, and social networks. In 2012, 2015 and 2018 the topics were housing conditions and offences and fear of crime.
Slovenia	Data for the 2001 survey are held in the Social Sciences Data Archive. See https://www.fdv.uni-lj.si/en/research/journals/social-science-data-archive
UK: England & Wales	The Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) is a continuous victimisation survey which asks respondents about their experiences of crime during the previous 12 months. Publications giving details of the methodology and the results can be accessed through: https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/crimeinenglandandwalesyearendinmarch2019
UK: Northern Ireland	The Northern Ireland Crime Survey (NICS) asks those over 16 their experiences of crime in the previous 12 months. Details of methodology and results can be found at https://www.justice-ni.gov.uk/articles/northern-ireland-crime-survey
UK: Scotland	The Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) asks people about experiences and perceptions of crime. It is completed face to face in the homes of respondents. The survey in its current format was carried out on an annual basis in the 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11 survey years. From 2011/12 to 2016/7 the survey interviewed 12,000 households every two years. From 2016/7 the survey interviews just under 6,000 households every year. More details of methodology and results are at https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-crime-justice-survey-2017-18-main-findings/

6.1.3 Standard wording of the questions included in national victimisation surveys

Table 6.1.3.1 shows the wording of the questions for the different offences included in the surveys, as well as for trust in the police and feelings of safety. The table provides the standard wording inspired by the ICVS questionnaire, specifying the countries that applied a similar wording, those that did not include the question in their survey, and those that used a different wording. For the latter, the tables included in section 6.2 provide the wording used in their questionnaire

Table 6.1.3.1 Wording of the questions included in national victimisation surveys (1/2)

Offence/ Topic	Standard wording	Similar wording	Different wording	Question not included
Bodily injury	<i>Have you been personally attacked (e.g. someone hit you with his/her fists, kicked you, or used force or violence in any way?)</i>	12 countries: Belgium, Croatia, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland	10 countries: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Lithuania, Norway, Turkey, UK: England & Wales.	1 country: Portugal
Sexual assault	<i>Has anyone grabbed you, touched you or assaulted you for sexual reasons in a really offensive way?</i>	6 countries: Belgium, Estonia, Georgia, Italy, Netherlands, Sweden	12 countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Lithuania, Portugal, Turkey, UK: England & Wales, UK: Scotland	5 countries: Germany, Ireland, Norway, Poland, UK: Northern Ireland
Robbery	<i>Has anyone stolen from you by using force or threatening you?</i>	11 countries: Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Sweden	10 countries: Czech Republic, Finland, France, Lithuania, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland	2 countries: Iceland, Norway
Theft of personal property	<i>Have you personally been the victim of a theft of personal property such as pickpocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, sports equipment, etc.?</i>	7 countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Italy, Poland	15 countries: Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland	0 countries
Theft of a motor vehicle	<i>Have you or other members of your household had any of their cars, vans or trucks, stolen?</i>	11 countries: Bulgaria, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, UK: Scotland, UK: Northern Ireland	8 countries: Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Poland, Turkey, UK: England & Wales,	4 countries: Denmark, Iceland, Lithuania, Norway

Table 6.1.3.1 Wording of the questions included in national victimisation surveys (2/2)

Offence/ Topic	Standard wording	Similar wording	Different wording	Question not included
Theft by means of domestic burglary	<i>Has anyone actually got into your house or flat without permission and stolen or tried to steal something?</i>	12 countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Sweden, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland	7 countries: Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Portugal, Turkey, UK: Scotland	3 countries: Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway
Corruption	<i>Has any government official, for example a customs officer, a police officer, or inspector in your country asked you or expected you to pay a bribe for his or her services?</i>	2 countries: Estonia, Georgia	3 countries: Lithuania, Portugal, Sweden	17 countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Turkey, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland
Trust in the police	<i>Taking everything into account how good a job do you think the police do in your area in controlling crime? Do you think they do a very good job, a fairly good job, a poor job or a very poor job?</i>	9 countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Poland	10 countries: Czech Republic, France, Lithuania, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, UK: England & Wales UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland	3 countries: Denmark, Finland, Norway
Feelings of safety	<i>How safe do you feel walking alone in your area after dark? Do you feel very safe, fairly safe, a bit unsafe or very unsafe?</i>	13 countries: Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Poland, Sweden. UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland.	8 countries: Belgium, Finland, France, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey	2 countries: Czech Republic, Denmark

Table 6.1.3.2 Comments on the wording of the questions included in national victimisation surveys

Bulgaria	No questions on corruption were included. However, a separate, much more elaborate, annual, national survey on corruption is conducted. Sometimes it coincides with the victimisation survey (the same sample, the questions are added to the victimisation questionnaire), but usually it does not.
Croatia	The wording of the questions asked in 2000 only differed from those in 2009 with regard to sexual assaults. The definition of sexual assault in the Croatian survey in 2009 was narrower in the sense that only rape and attempted rape were included, while other forms of sexual assaults were excluded. The 2000 survey included a broader question that in addition to rape and attempted rape also covered other offensive sexual behaviour. As far as robbery is concerned, the question is sufficiently similar to be considered as matching the one provided here. The question on theft of a motor vehicle in the Croatian 2009 survey was narrower than the one provided here since it referred only to personal automobiles and did not include other members of the same household.
Czech Republic	For the most recent survey, a new model was used with both core and specific variable modules. The core module is basic battery of questions that creates the space for long-term regularly repeated monitoring. The survey also focuses on previously neglected or new issues and phenomena such as psychological aspects of victimisation (e.g., victim's motivation for reporting the incident, impacts of victimisation). The survey explored a 3-year period. In most incidents victims were further questioned whether the incident had occurred in the last year, and how many times. The specific variable module is a changeable battery of questions that focus on specific topics (they might not be repeated in each round). Its content is flexible and partly dependent on available finance. One module focuses on mapping the effectiveness of legislation and the level of care for victims.
Denmark	The question of theft is followed by a question regarding the place and type of the theft. The safety question is: How often do you think of the risk of being a victim of crime, i.e., assault, theft, vandalism, etc.
Estonia	Bodily injury (assault): according to the given definition verbal assaults are excluded and therefore the reporting rate is not known (it is known for all assaults only).
France	For detailed information on the French victimisation survey see Ministère de l'Intérieur 'Rapport enquête - cadres de vie et sécurité 2016'
Germany	The following question was included about cybercrime from 2012: "Viktimsierung bei Internetnutzung: Bitte denken Sie an Ihre Nutzung des Internets zu privaten Zwecken, Waren Sie in der Zeit seit Anfang [2012] von den folgenden Sicherheitsproblemen selbst betroffen?":
Lithuania	Not all results of the 2011 survey have been published. The methodology of victimisation surveys was different: respondents were asked to list which offences they had been a victim of, or were asked whether they had become a victim of crime. See report at Justickis, Viktoras, Uscila, Rokas and Kiškis, Alfredas (2012) "Two-Rays Approach in the Integration of Victimological and Recorded Data on Criminality". Jurisprudence, 19 (12), p. 803-820 (http://www3.mruni.eu/~akiskis/Alfredo-str2012-2.pdf)
Netherlands	Not all questions are available for each of the required years
Norway	No specific questions on Robbery, Domestic Burglary or Theft of a motor vehicle but such offences are probably included in the question about theft. Threats are also collected.
Poland	There were no changes in methodology of survey between 2001-2016. There were changes in the way of calculating presented data – it was not directly calculated from the survey database but from the published report.
UK: England & Wales	Full details of the most recent surveys can be found using the ONS gateway: https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/crimeinenglandandwalesyearendingmarch2017
UK: Scotland	More detail can be found at https://www.gov.scot/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Crime-Justice/crime-and-justi2.ce-survey

6.1.4 Completeness and quality of the data

Up to 23 countries answered the questions on the wording of the different questions and the methodology of the surveys.

Regarding the completeness of the surveys:

- a) Bodily injury is the offence with the highest number of countries reporting data (23 on its prevalence, 10 on its incidence and 17 on its reporting to the police.)
- b) Theft by means of domestic burglary (22, 11 and 17 countries)
- c) Theft of a motor vehicle (18, 10 and 16 countries)
- d) Sexual assault (15, 9 and 10 countries)
- e) Corruption (4, 1 and 1 country)

The indicator most commonly used by countries was the prevalence of victimisation: e.g., the percentage of households/individuals victimised) followed by the percentage of victims that reported the offence to the police, while the incidence of victimisation was reported less frequently. Seventeen countries provided data on the answers to the questions on trust in the police and the quality of the job of the police and 21 provided data on feelings of safety.

No results from national victimisation surveys can be exact because of the sampling errors associated with carrying out surveys on a finite sample of the population. This contrasts with figures in other chapters of the sourcebook that are a complete record of events or persons recorded by the criminal justice system. Sample sizes are shown in Table 6.3.1. and many countries give ranges associated with their survey results. Such ranges should be taken into account when interpreting national results.

6.1.5 Main Results

Among the offences included in this section, theft of personal property showed the highest prevalence in Europe in 2015 and sexual assault the lowest one. The percentage of respondents feeling unsafe or very unsafe on the street after dark varies widely across countries; but, with only a couple of exceptions, it was lower than 50%. Also, with a couple of exceptions, the percentage of respondents thinking that the police were doing a good or very good job in controlling crime in the local area was higher than 50%. However, data showed no direct correlation between confidence in the police and unsafety in the streets after dark.

6.1.6. Other victimisation surveys carried out by European countries.

Data and metadata contained in Chapter 6 are those associated with national household victimisation surveys. However, crime data included in Chapter 1 is the total of crimes recorded by the police and this will include crimes other than against those

living in households. Readers may be interested in the following comments and sources:

Business and commercial surveys

Many crimes recorded by the police are committed against businesses and other commercial organisations. Measuring such crimes is problematic and a good discussion of difficulties and attempts to overcome them can be found in Killias et al. (2011)⁴¹. Business surveys have been carried out from time to time by only a small number of countries in Europe. Most other countries are content to join cross-national attempts to measure crime against business (see section 6.1.6.2). The first cross-national business crime survey - using a methodology similar to the ICVS - was conducted in 1994 in the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Netherlands, Switzerland, and the UK. National surveys have included:

- a) In 1989, a business crime survey was carried out among Dutch businesses⁴².
- b) UK: England and Wales has carried out commercial victimisation surveys since 1994. Years covered are 1994, 2002 and annually since 2012. More details are given at <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/crime-against-businesses-findings-from-the-2017-commercial-victimisation-survey>
- c) UK- Scotland. Results from the first Scottish Business Crime Survey were published in 2001: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.sj.8340089> Since then further commercial surveys have been carried out by the industry itself: e.g. the Scottish Grocers Federation carried a further survey in 2017 see: <https://www.scottishshop.org.uk/images/SGF-Crime-Report-Guidance-2017.pdf>
- d) The first Italian Business crime survey was carried out by Transcrime in 2008 and collected data from 11.500 companies about their experience of crime: see <http://www.transcrime.it/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Executive-summary-Report-16.pdf>. This was a pilot for the cross-national European business survey described in 6.1.5.2 (f).

Cross-national surveys of different types of victim

Another related group of surveys not covered by this chapter are those on specific types of victims, either on a national or cross-national basis: examples are:

⁴¹ Killias et al. (2011) A survey of Business crime in Switzerland: on the difficulties of field research, see: <https://www.zora.uzh.ch/id/eprint/58433/>.

⁴² *Directie Criminaliteitspreventie* (1990). Bedrijfsleven en Criminaliteit, Kerngetallen uit de eerste Nederlandse slachtofferenquet onder bedrijven, Ministerie van Justitie, Den Haag.

- a) The EU minorities and discrimination survey (EU-MIDIS) conducted in 2009⁴³.
- b) The Violence against women in the EU survey conducted in 2014⁴⁴.
- c) Surveys of victims of cybercrime⁴⁵
- d) The 4th biennial Global Economic Crime Survey is based on interviews with executives responsible for detecting economic fraud in 5428 companies in 40 countries.⁴⁶ It is conducted by PWC, a commercial accounting organisation. Results are also published for individual European countries: e.g., the Russian results for 2018 are published at <https://www.pwc.ru/en/publications/recs-2018.html>
- e) The Global White Collar crime survey: Anti-Bribery and Corruption was based upon 250 companies and carried out by the University of Manchester, UK in 2018.: see https://www.research.manchester.ac.uk/portal/files/78276482/Lord_et_al_2018_Global_White_Collar_Crime_Survey_spreads.pdf
- f) A pilot Study of a EU-wide survey of Business crime was carried out in 2012⁴⁷: see https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/e-library/docs/1eu_bcs_final_report_galluptranscrime_executive_summary_en.pdf

⁴³ See <http://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2011/eu-midis-european-union-minorities-and-discrimination-survey>.

⁴⁴ See <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2014/vaw-survey-main-results>.

⁴⁵ See *Can, M., Reep-van de Burg, M. & Junger, M.* (2018). Victims of Cybercrime in Europe. A review of victim surveys <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40163-018-0079-3>.

⁴⁶ The 4th biennial Global Economic Crime Survey is available for download at pwc.com/crimesurvey.

⁴⁷ For a brief description see *Del Frate, A.A.* (2012) The International Crime Business Survey: Findings from Nine Central-Eastern European Cities. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, September 2004, Volume 10, Issue 2–3, pp 137–161

6.2 Tables from household victimisation surveys

6.2.1 Bodily injury

Table 6.2.1.1 Prevalence of bodily injury (assault) victimisation during the last 12 months according to national victimisation surveys

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	..	1.2	2.3	2.1	2.8	..
Bulgaria	(1.1)	(0.3)	(0.5)	..
Croatia	0.9	..	7	..
Czech Republic	1.5
Denmark	..	1.7	3.2	1.8	1.4	1.3
Estonia	2.2	1.7	2.3	1.4	2.4	2.3
Finland	5.7	5.6	6.1	5.8	6.1	7.3
France	0.9	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.5
Georgia	0.4	..
Germany	2.8	3.0
Iceland	3.4	2.1
Ireland	..	1	1	1	1	..
Italy	..	(0.5)	(0.8)	..	(0.6)	1.2
Lithuania	8.2	11.5	4	..
Netherlands	..	1.8	1.3	1.5	1	0.7
Norway	5.1	5.5	4.3	3.5
Poland	1.1	0.8
Portugal	..	0.8
Sweden	2.7	2.4	2.0
Turkey	(1.1)	(2.4)	(1.6)
UK: England & Wales	2.2	3.2	2.2	2	1.6	0.9
UK: Northern Ireland	(2.1)	(2.1)	(1.6)	(0.7)
UK: Scotland	2.8	2.8
Mean	3	2	3	3	2.4	2.1
Median	2	2	2	2	2.0	2.0
Minimum	1	1	1	0	0.4	0.7
Maximum	6	6	8	12	7.0	7.3

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.1.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.1.2 Bodily injury (assault) victimisation: Percentage of victims reporting to the police

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	..	39	29.6	33.9	32.7	..
Croatia	26.6	..	39	..
Denmark	..	35	39	43	47	38
Finland	8.2	17.4	14.9	22.6	15	..
France	54.4	38.2	45.6	36.6	30.6	42.0
Georgia	42	..
Germany	31.6	36.6
Iceland	45.8	38.7
Ireland	..	62	51	53	55	..
Italy	21.8	..	19	20
Lithuania	53.8	(42.6)
Netherlands	..	48.2	40.5	52.8	41.3	34.9
Poland	52.8	..
Sweden	32	37	27
UK: England & Wales	(47.7)	(39.7)	(55.9)	(58.2)	(64.9)	..
UK: Northern Ireland	54	30	36	48
UK: Scotland	52	43
Mean	37	40	34.9	40	40.1	36.6
Median	48	39	41	40	41	39
Minimum	8	17	15	23	15	20
Maximum	54	62	56	58	(64.9)	48

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.1.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.1.3 Bodily injury (assault) victimisation: Deviations from the ICVS standard wording of the question

ESB standard wording	...have you been personally attacked (e.g. did someone hit you with his /her fists, kicked you, or used force or violence on you in any way)?
Bulgaria	Has someone attacked you or threatened you so that you experienced intense fear, indoors or outside – in a bar, on the street, at school, on public transport, at the beach or at your workplace? Other questions in the survey ask if it was just a threat or an actual attack and whether the respondent was injured or not
Czech Republic	a) In the last 3 years has someone personally (who is not a member of your household) physically attacked you, and not because of trying to steal from you? b) Has this happened during the last 12 months?
Denmark	Have you been a victim of violence during the last 12 months?
Finland	During the last 12 months, has any known or unknown person behaved in any of the following ways toward you: (1) slapped you; (2) pulled your hair; (3) hit you with a fist; (4) hit you with a hard object; (5) kicked or strangled you; (6) used a weapon?
France	(In year n-1 or n-2), have you personally been a victim of physical violence from a person not currently living in the same dwelling as you (including from a former spouse or a spouse who currently does not live with you)?
Iceland	Were you a victim of a violent crime in 2015? Violent crimes include assault, for example being beaten with a fist or a weapon.
Lithuania	Have you been beaten or has physical pain or health impairment been caused to you by the use of other types of violence during 2015?
Norway	We ask the respondents whether during the last 12 months they have been exposed to violence with or without visible marks or injury.
Turkey	Have you personally been a victim of one of the events below in (year): ...other (injury, sexual harassment, robbery)?
UK: England & Wales	And again, since ... has anyone, including people you know well, deliberately hit you with their fists or with a weapon of any sort or kicked you or used force or violence in any other way?

Similar definition: Belgium, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland.

6.2.2 Sexual assault

Table 6.2.2.1 Prevalence of sexual assault victimisation during the last 12 months according to national victimisation surveys

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	1.2	0.9	1.2	..
Bulgaria	(0.2)	(0.1)	(0.3)	..
Croatia	2.7	..	0.3	..
Czech Republic	2	..	0.5
Denmark	0.1	0.4
Estonia	(2.5)	(1.3)	(3.6)	(1.4)	(2)	..
Finland	1.1
France	1.0
Georgia	0.1	..
Iceland	0.5	2.0
Lithuania	0	0.7	0.3	..
Netherlands	..	1.1	1	0.9	0.7	0.1
Sweden	0.9	0.7	1.7
Turkey	(0.5)
UK: England & Wales	1.5
Mean	3	1	1	1	0.6	1.1
Median	3	1	1	1	0.7	1.0
Minimum	3	0	0	0	0.1	0.1
Maximum	3	1	4	2	(2)	2.0

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.2.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.2.2. Sexual assault: Percentage of victims reporting to the police

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	3.8	4.8	7.2	..
Croatia	15.5	..	16	..
Denmark	24	39
Estonia	..	8	10	25
France	8
Georgia	(100)	..
Iceland	18.2	10.3
Lithuania	0	(40)
Netherlands	..	15	6.8	11.3	7.3	12.4
Sweden	11	23	9
Mean	..	12	7	18	17	16
Median	..	12	7	11	18	10
Minimum	0	8	0	5	7	8
Maximum	0	15	16	40	(100)	39

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.2.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.2.3 Sexual assault: Deviations from the ICVS standard wording of the question

ESB Standard wording	... has anyone grabbed you, touched you or assaulted you for sexual reasons in a really offensive way?
Bulgaria	Let me ask you a very personal question. Sometimes a person can be touched or attacked in a very offensive way, for sexual reasons. This can happen indoors or outside, for example in a bar, on the street, at school, on public transport, at the cinema, on the beach or at the workplace. Has someone touched you or attacked you for sexual reasons and against your will?
Croatia	Has someone raped you or tried to rape you?
Czech Republic	has anyone grabbed you, touched you or assaulted you for sexual reasons in a really offensive way? It can happen at home or elsewhere, such as on the street, in a restaurant
Denmark	Has a man during the last 5 years by use of force or threats tried to force you or actually forced you to have intercourse with him? This also includes boy-friends, a husband and other sexual partner. There is also a question of prevalence during the last 12 months. Only women are asked. The question was not included until 2008. The same goes for the question on robbery.
Finland	During the last 12 months, has any known or unknown person behaved in any of the following ways toward you: (1) forced you into sexual intercourse or other sexual interaction against your will; (2) tried to force you into sexual intercourse or other sexual interaction against your will?
France	There are three questions in the CVS: (in year n-1 or n-2 year), (apart from the people who are currently living with you) Did someone engage in a sexual exhibition, for example a man that stripped in front of you against your will? (In year n-1 or n-2 year), (apart from the people who are currently living with you). Did someone try to kiss you against your will, to fondle or do other inappropriate gestures? (In year n-1 or n-2 year), (apart from the people who are currently living with you) Did someone require you to undergo sexual touching or to have sex against your will, or try to do it? Sexual assault was not included in the surveys from 1996 to 2006. It was in the investigation of 1986, but in a different form. The figure for 2015 is an average for 2011-2015
Iceland	Were you a victim of a sexual crime in 2015, including rape or an individual showing their genitals to others (flashing), incest and abuse? The questions on sexual assault have changed from time to time and data are not comparable.
Lithuania	Did anyone satisfy their sexual passion by physical contact with you against your will by using physical violence or threatening to use it immediately, or otherwise denying the possibility of resistance as well as taking advantage of your helpless condition, dependence, or made you do that during 2015?
Portugal	During the last year, were you victim of a sexual crime in which you were attacked, grabbed or groped? (If yes, how many times?)
Turkey	Have you personally been a victim of one of the events below in (year): ...other (injury, sexual harassment, robbery)
UK: England & Wales	During the last 12 months, have you been sexually interfered with, assaulted or attacked, either by someone you knew or by a stranger?
UK: Scotland	Separate response categories for: Sexually threatened you and touched you sexually when you did not want it (groping, touching of breasts, bottom or genitals, unwanted kissing).

Similar definition: Belgium, Estonia, Georgia, Italy, Netherlands, Sweden. Question not included: Germany, Ireland, Poland, UK: Northern Ireland.

6.2.3 Robbery

Table 6.2.3.1 Prevalence of robbery victimisation during the last 12 months according to national victimisation surveys

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	..	0.7	1	0.7	0.4	..
Bulgaria	(0.7)	(0.6)	(0.3)	..
Croatia	0.7	..	3	..
Czech Republic	1.4	..	1.1
Denmark	1.1	..
Estonia	2.9	3.4	2.9	1.8	2.1	1.4
France	0.4	0.5	0.5
Georgia	0.6	..
Germany	0.7	1.0
Ireland	..	1	1	1	1	..
Italy	..	0.3	0.4	..	0.3	0.5
Lithuania	5.7	8.5	2.2	..
Netherlands	0.3	0.1	0.1
Poland	1.9	1.5
Portugal	..	0.5
Sweden	1	1	0.9
Turkey	(2)	1.1	..
UK: England & Wales	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.3
UK: Northern Ireland	(0.3)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)
UK: Scotland	(0.2)	(0.2)
Mean	2	1	1	2	1.0	0.7
Median	2	1	1	1	1.0	0.5
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.1
Maximum	3	3	6	9	3.0	1.5

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.3.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.3.2 Robbery: Percentage of victims reporting to the police

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	..	43.9	50.2	50	59.4	..
Bulgaria	(36)	(30)	(76)	..
Croatia	55	..	62	..
Denmark	77	..
Estonia	..	35	39	38
France	57.4	40	43
Georgia	44.5	..
Germany	30	32
Italy	49.6	..	75.6	87.9
Lithuania	77.8	(45.7)
Netherlands	92.1
Poland	56.6	..
Sweden	33	57	44
UK: England & Wales	47.2	55.1	44.5	47.4	55.3	..
UK: Northern Ireland	62	58	73	..
UK: Scotland	31	..
Mean	47	45	52	50	57	52
Median	47	44	50	47	58	43.5
Minimum	47	35	36	30	30	32
Maximum	47	55	79	92	77	88

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.3.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.3.3 Robbery: Deviations from the standard ICVS wording of the question

ESB Standard wording	Has anyone stolen something from you by using force or threatening you?
Czech Republic	a) In the last 3 years have anyone stolen something from you personally by using violence or threatening of violence or has anyone tried it? b) Has this happened during the last 12 months?
Finland	Has any of the following happened to you during the last 12 months: (1) theft of personal property, such as wallet, purse, credit card or mobile phone, taking place outside your home?
France	Have you personally been a victim of theft/attempted theft with physical violence or threat (theft with grievous bodily harm, hand-held or mobile phone bag snatching, theft with verbal threats or using a weapon, racketeering/ extortion)?
Iceland	No specific question regarding robbery but it is probably included by most in the question of theft and burglary.
Lithuania	Was your property robbed by using physical violence (threatening to use it immediately), or was there an attempt to do so during 2011?
Portugal	There were 2 questions: - Did someone take or try to take from you any values or objects using force or threats? (If yes, how many times) - During the year 1994, did someone take or try to take your purse or any other object used or carried with you through the process of snatching? (If yes, how many times?)
Turkey	Have you personally been a victim of one of the events below in (year): ...purse snatching, pickpocketing, theft ... other (injury, sexual harassment, robbery?
UK: England & Wales	Apart from anything you have already mentioned], during that time has anyone tried to steal something you were carrying out of your hands or from your pockets or from a bag or case?
UK: Northern Ireland	A combination of questions asked which equate to mugging which includes robbery and snatch theft
UK: Scotland	Separate questions on using force and theft are asked in the incident form.

Similar definition: Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden Question not included: Finland

6.2.4 Theft of personal property

Table 6.2.4.1 Prevalence of theft of personal property victimisation during the last 12 months according to national victimisation surveys

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Bulgaria	(5.8)	(2.8)	(3)	..
Croatia	(1.3)	..	(4)	..
Czech Republic	17.5	..	6.7
Denmark	..	16	17	13	12	10
Estonia	8	5.5	5.5	6.3	3.6	3.8
Finland	..	2.8	2.6	2.3	2.3	2.7
France	2.7	3.5	(2.4)	2	1.8	1.5
Georgia	8.5	..
Germany	3.1	3.1
Iceland	(9.9)	(8.5)
Italy	..	2.1	2.1	..	2.2	1.5
Lithuania	6.7	(5.8)	(16)	..
Poland	2.3	1.7
Portugal	..	1.2
Turkey	(7.1)	(4.2)	(2.7)
UK: England & Wales	(3.3)	(4.1)	(2.8)	(2.2)	(2.1)	(2.5)
UK: Northern Ireland	(1.5)
UK: Scotland	2.5	2.2
<i>Mean</i>	5	5	5	7	5.2	3.7
<i>Median</i>	3	4	3	6	3	1.7

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.1.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.4.2. Theft of personal property: Percentage of victims reporting to the police

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Bulgaria	(17)	(35)	(48)	..
Croatia	50.1	..	51	..
Denmark	67	67	65	60
Estonia	..	28	29	29	26	..
Finland	..	34	38	35
France	67.6	54.6	(53.1)	41.8	33.2	42
Georgia	40	..
Germany	37.6	42.3
Iceland	59.5	33.0
Ireland
Italy	26.8	..	29.3	35.1
Lithuania	74.5	(46.9)
Netherlands
Poland	43.6	..
UK: England & Wales	38	28.8	32	33.4	34.6	..
UK: Scotland	30	27
<i>Mean</i>	53	36	43	41	39	40
<i>Median</i>	53	31	38	35	35	38
<i>Minimum</i>	38	28	17	29	26	27
<i>Maximum</i>	68	55	75	67	65	60

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.4.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.4.3 Theft of personal property: Deviations from the standard ICVS wording of the question (1/2)

ESB Standard wording	... have you personally been the victim of a theft of personal property, such as pick-pocketing or theft of a purse, wallet, clothing, jewellery, sports equipment?
Belgium	In the last 12 months have you been the victim of a theft out of your home? (1) when you were not there (2) when you were there, but without violence or threat.
Czech Republic	a) Has anyone stolen from you personally without using the violence or threats in the past 3 years - e.g. pocket theft or theft of some of your things - e.g. at work, school, transport, street, etc.? (Do not include any thefts of things in your car and theft of personal belongings when breaking into dwellings or cottages / chalets) b) Has this happened during the last 12 months?
Denmark	Has anyone stolen or tried to steal money or things belonging to you during the last 12 months?
Finland	Has any of the following happened to you during the last 12 months: theft of personal property, such as wallet, purse, credit card or mobile phone, taking place outside your home?
France	(In year n-1 or n-2 year), have you personally been a victim of theft or attempted theft without physical violence or threats (pickpocket theft, theft of a portfolio, a bag, a coat, a mobile phone or any other property in a public place - restaurant, dressing room or at your place of work or study?) This victimisation has been featured in all surveys, although the wording of the question may vary.
Iceland	Were you a victim of a burglary or theft in 2011? Burglary includes someone entering your home, vehicle, summer cottage or other dwellings with the purpose of stealing, and theft includes stealing a wallet, bicycle or other valuables.
Ireland	3 distinct questions as follows: Theft of mobile phone, Theft with violence, Theft without violence.
Lithuania	Was your property of a value over 130 LTL stolen or was there an attempt to steal it from you personally during 2011?
Netherlands	It is specified in more categories: a. bicycle theft; b. car theft; c. theft out of car; d. pickpocketing; e. other theft. Data for prevalence could not be provided.
Norway	We ask the respondents whether during the last 12 months they have been exposed to theft or criminal damage.
Portugal	There were 2 questions: - During the year was your wallet, purse or other valuables you carried taken from you by pickpocketing? (If yes, how many times) - Not counting the three situations that we have just spoken of (theft by pickpocketing and other thefts), during the year did someone take personal items from you in other circumstances? I shall ask you to disregard the theft of personal objects from your house or car. I am referring to clothes, wallet, purse, camera or any other personal items that you may have left anywhere – for instance, at the place you work or study, at a restaurant, coffee shop or cinema, at a transportation station or at the beach.
Sweden	Different wording not provided.
Turkey	Have you personally been a victim of one of the events below in (year): ...purse snatching, pickpocketing, theft?

Table 6.2.4.3 Theft of personal property: Deviations from the standard ICVS wording of the question (1/2)

UK: England & Wales	Since the first of [^DATE^], [apart from anything you may have already mentioned], was anything you were carrying stolen out of your hands or from your pockets or from a bag or case? AND Apart from anything you have already mentioned], in that time has anyone TRIED to STEAL something you were carrying out of your hands or from your pockets or from a bag or case?
UK: Northern Ireland	Several questions are asked in relation to personal theft including; ...was anything you were carrying stolen - out of your hands or from your pockets or from a bag or case? ...And (apart from anything you have already mentioned), in that time has anything (else) of yours been stolen, from a cloak-room, an office, a car or anywhere else you left it? and ...Can I just check, were you/was he/she holding, carrying or wearing (any of) what was stolen, including items in pockets of clothes being worn at the time?
UK: Scotland	Victim form asks what was taken? from either the respondent or members of their household and includes a variety of response categories detailing what was stolen, these include: "purse/wallet" and "briefcase/handbag/shopping bag", "jewellery" etc.

Similar definition: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Italy, Poland.

6.2.5 Theft of a motor vehicle

Table 6.2.5.1 Prevalence of theft of a motor vehicle victimisation during the last 12 months according to national victimisation surveys

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	..	1.1	1.2	0.6	0.4	..
Bulgaria	(0.9)	(0.5)	(0.3)	..
Croatia	0.8	..	1	..
Czech Republic	2.8	..	0.52
Estonia	0.7	1.6	0.9	0.7	0.4	..
Finland	..	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.4	1.1
France	2.6	1.2	0.8
Georgia	5.5	..
Germany	0.1	0.1
Ireland	..	1	1	1	1	..
Italy	..	8	6.3	..	6.3	3
Netherlands	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2
Poland	0.3	0.3
Sweden	0.9	0.6	0.5
Turkey	(0.1)	(0.3)
UK: England & Wales	2.4	2.1	1.3	0.7	0.4	0.3
UK: Northern Ireland	1.8	0.5	0.4	0.1
UK: Scotland	0.2	0.1
Mean	1	2	2	1	1.1	0.6
Median	1	1	1	1	0.3	0.4
Minimum	1	0	0	0	0.1	0.1
Maximum	2	8	6	3	6.3	3

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.5.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.5.2 Theft of a motor vehicle: Percentage of victims reporting to the police

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	..	84.8	87.8	84.1	79.4	..
Bulgaria	(100)	(100)	(100)	..
Croatia	92.8	..	88	..
Estonia	..	86	86	(58)	88	..
France	44.6	46.3	51
Georgia	47.2	..
Germany	99.1	100
Ireland	..	95
Italy	93.4	..	88.6	96
Lithuania
Netherlands	..	93.2	94.6	92.7	..	55
Poland	90.2	..
Sweden	94
UK: England & Wales	98.6	97.7	93.5	93.4	93.6	..
UK: Northern Ireland	63	52	35	44
UK: Scotland	92	..
<i>Mean</i>	99	91	89	77	79	69
<i>Median</i>	99	93	93	86	88	55
<i>Minimum</i>	99	85	63	45	35	44
<i>Maximum</i>	99	98	100	100	100	100

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.5.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.5.3 Theft of a motor vehicle: Deviations from the standard ICVS wording of the question

ESB Standard wording	... have you or other members of your household had any of their cars, vans or trucks stolen?
Belgium	Different wording not provided
Croatia	Did the following happen to you in the past twelve months? ...stolen personal automobile
Czech Republic	a) have you or other members of your household had any of their cars stolen in last 3 years? b) Has this happened during the last 12 months?
Finland	During the last 12 months, have you, or a member of your household, experienced any of the following acts: (1) a car was stolen?
France	Has your household experienced a theft or attempted theft of your car? In surveys from 1996 to 2004, there was no distinction between car theft and theft in or from the car. Percentages are based on households not populations.
Iceland	No such question but many might include such an experience in their answer to the question regarding burglary and theft.
Poland	...has someone broken into your car and stolen it?
Turkey	Has your household been a victim of one the events below in (year): ...theft of a car, motorcycle or similar.
UK: England & Wales	During the last 12 months, that is [since ^DATE^,] have [you/ you or anyone else now in your household] had [your/their] car, van, motorcycle or other motor vehicle stolen or driven away without permission?

Similar wording: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland. Question not included: Denmark, Lithuania.

6.2.6 Theft by means of domestic burglary

Table 6.2.6.1 Prevalence of theft by means of domestic burglary victimisation during the last 12 months according to national victimisation surveys

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	..	5.1	9.0	6.9	6.1	..
Bulgaria	(3.1)	(2.3)	(2,1)	..
Croatia	2.0	..	5.0	..
Czech Republic	3.9	..	2.2
Denmark	3
Estonia	5.7	4.2	3.7	3.1	3.0	2.7
Finland	..	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.7
France	2.3	1.8	1.3	1.1	1.5	0.8
Georgia	2.7	..
Germany	0.4	0.5
Iceland	7.2
Ireland	..	3	3	3	3	..
Italy	..	2.8	1.8	..	1.4	1.8
Lithuania	2	1.7
Netherlands	2.5	2.8	1.8	3	2.7	2.7
Poland	3	2.5
Portugal	..	2.4
Sweden	1	1	1.0
Turkey	2	2.5
UK: England & Wales	5.3	6.4	3.4	2.5	2.4	2.3
UK: Northern Ireland	2	1.8	2.2	1.4
UK: Scotland	1.1	0.9
<i>Mean</i>	4	3	3	3	2.4	2.2
<i>Median</i>	4	3	2	2	2.0	2.1
<i>Minimum</i>	2	0	1	1	0.4	0.5
<i>Maximum</i>	6	6	9	7	6.1	7.2

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.6.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.6.2 Theft by means of domestic burglary: Percentage of victims reporting to the police

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Bulgaria	(54)	(70)	(66)	..
Croatia	(64.4)	..	73	..
Denmark	81
Estonia	..	55	62	51	38	..
France	75.2	81.9	79.8	67.1	54.9	59
Georgia	47.5	..
Germany	87.5	72.5
Iceland	39.1
Ireland	..	77	69	70	75	..
Italy	66.6	..	74.2	80.9
Lithuania	81.8	(62.2)
Netherlands	..	89	90.7	71.7	86.9	49
Poland	49.9	..
Sweden	74	86	74
UK: England & Wales	73	65.7	61.3	65.9	66.8	..
UK: Northern Ireland	65	57	67	67
UK: Scotland	62	50
<i>Mean</i>	74	74	69	65	67	56
<i>Median</i>	74	77	66	67	67	67
<i>Minimum</i>	73	55	54	51	38	39
<i>Maximum</i>	75	89	91	72	88	81

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.6.3. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.6.3 Theft by means of domestic burglary: Deviations from the standard ICVS wording of the question

ESB Standard wording	... has anyone actually got into your house or flat without permission and stolen or tried to steal something?
Czech Republic	a) Has someone broke into your dwelling during the last 3 years? Take into account burglaries in the basement and other buildings you have at your dwelling (e.g. garage, shed). Do not include burglaries in the chat / cottage and the objects belonging to them. b) Has this happened during the last 12 months?
Denmark	Has anyone – to your knowledge – broken into or tried to break into your home within the past 12 months? Home includes the rooms you live in, but not shed, garage, attic and basement.
Finland	During the last 12 months, have you, or a member of your household, experienced any of the following acts: (1) burglary, theft or attempted theft?
France	Have you experienced a burglary or attempted burglary in your home? (Burglary exists where people break and enter a house, cellar or attic, even when there is no theft: includes entry by climbing or using false keys). This victimisation has been featured in all surveys, although the wording of the question may vary. Results shown as a part of household.
Iceland	In 2015 did anyone enter your home, residence, motor vehicle, or any other enclosed space without your consent and stole or tried to steal something?
Portugal	Was your house burgled or suffered any clear attempt? (If yes, how often?)
Turkey	Has your household been a victim of one of the events below : ...theft at home.
UK: Scotland	In Scotland the term burglary is not used. Instead we refer to house-breaking. The definition of housebreaking differs from burglary in that entry needs to be forced or through a non-standard entrance (e.g., a window). Where there is a theft/attempted theft from a dwelling and entry is not forced (e.g., the offender had legitimate access to the dwelling or entered under false pretences or through an unlocked door) the term used is theft in a dwelling.

Similar wording: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland.

Question not included: Denmark, Lithuania.

6.2.7 Corruption

Table 6.2.7.1 Prevalence of corruption victimisation during the last 12 months according to national victimisation surveys

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Czech Republic	9.6
Estonia	4.5	3.6	5.2	3.3	0.5	..
Georgia	0.5	..
Lithuania	7.1	..

Table 6.2.7.2 Corruption: Percentage of victims reporting to the police

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Czech Republic	5
Georgia	(100)	..

Table 6.2.7.3 Corruption: Deviations from the standard wording of the question

ESB Standard wording	... has any government official, for instance a customs officer, a police officer or inspector in your country asked you, or expected you to pay a bribe for his or her services?
Lithuania	Did any public officer or an equivalent person demand a bribe from you, or provoke you to give a bribe for performance or non-performance of their obligations during 2011?

Similar wording: Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia.

Question not included: Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Turkey, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland.

6.2.8 Trust in the police

Table 6.2.8.1 Trust in the police: Percentage of the public who believe the police are doing a good job or a very good job in controlling crime in the local area.

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	77.8	86.4	69.2	..
Bulgaria	(43)	(46)
Croatia	48	..	61	..
Czech Republic	54.5
Estonia	47	63	..
Georgia	53	..
Germany	87	83.3
Iceland	87
Ireland	..	63	56	51	67	75
Italy	..	57.8	63.8	..	61.6	..
Netherlands	55.8	42.9	41.5	41.7
Poland	71.7	78.1
Sweden	55	65	61
Turkey	69.3	78	75.1
UK: England & Wales	81	81	75	51	62	62
UK: Northern Ireland	43	51
UK: Scotland	56
<i>Mean</i>	81	64	60	56	63	67
<i>Median</i>	81	60	56	51	65	62
<i>Minimum</i>	81	56	43	43	42	42
<i>Maximum</i>	81	81	78	86	87	87

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.8.2 and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.8.2 Trust in the police: Deviations from standard ICVS wording of the question

ESB Standard wording	Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police do in your area in controlling crime? Do you think they do a very good job, a fairly good job, a poor job or a very poor job?
Czech Republic	Were you satisfied with the police work during the investigation? Do the following statements about police work apply?
Finland	This kind of question is asked in later national surveys but it is not reported.
France	Regarding the action of the police or the gendarmerie in the fight against crime in your neighbourhood (or your village), would you say that it is very effective, effective, ineffective, not effective at all, don't know? This question is from the 2007 survey.
Lithuania	How would you evaluate the work of the following institutions?: (police).
Portugal	What does the person who reported the crime think of the way he/she was treated by the authorities? very satisfied; satisfied; not very satisfied; not satisfied at all?
Sweden	How much confidence do you have in the way the police conduct their work? A great deal, Quite a lot, Neither a lot nor little, Not very much, Very little, No opinion/ Don't know?
Turkey	How satisfied are you with public security services? (Not satisfied at all, not satisfied, Medium, Satisfied, Very satisfied).
UK: Northern Ireland	Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing? Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor and Very poor.
UK: Scotland	There is no single question looking at confidence in the police. Instead, a battery of questions is used to look at different aspects of police performance: Investigating incidents after they occur, dealing with incidents as they occur, solving crimes, responding quickly to appropriate calls and information from the public, Catching criminals, and Preventing crime.

Similar wording: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland. Question not included: Denmark

6.2.9 Feelings of safety

Table 6.2.9.1 Feelings of safety: Percentage of the respondents feeling unsafe or very unsafe on the street after dark

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	..	20	20	18	16	..
Bulgaria	(55)	(48)	(45)	..
Croatia	27.6	..	10	..
Czech Republic	48.7
Estonia	49	43	41	32	28	16.9
Finland	19	23	27	33	22	38.2
France	11	11
Georgia	5	..
Germany	17.1	21.5
Iceland	9.5	9.2
Ireland	..	26	25	26	25	..
Italy	27.6	..	28.9	..
Lithuania	42.5	72	52.9	..
Netherlands	4.4	3.5
Norway	7.9	6.7	7.5	5.6
Poland	20.4	20.3
Sweden	21	16	19
Turkey	39.4	25.8	25
UK: England & Wales	(24)	..
UK: Northern Ireland	32	33	28	..
UK: Scotland	31	23
<i>Mean</i>	34	27	33	36	22	17.5
<i>Median</i>	34	25	28	33	22	18.0
<i>Minimum</i>	19	20	20	18	4.4	3.5
<i>Maximum</i>	49	43	55	72	52.9	38.2

Figures in brackets see table 6.2.9.2. and notes on tables 6.2.1.1. to 6.2.9.2.

Table 6.2.9.2 Feelings of security: Deviations from the ICVS standard wording of the question

ESB Standard wording	How safe do you feel walking alone in your area after dark? Do you feel very safe, fairly safe, a bit unsafe, or very unsafe?
Belgium	Do you ever avoid leaving your home when it is dark?
Finland	During the last 12 months, have you been afraid of becoming a victim of violence when going out in the evening?
France	The question does not specifically target the night situation: Do you ever personally feel insecure in your neighbourhood or in your village? Often, occasionally, rarely, never, do not know? From the 2007 survey, there is also a question: in everyday life, do you ever refrain from going out for safety reasons? yes often, yes sometimes, yes but very rarely, never, never goes out? If affirmative: in the vicinity of your home, are there in particular groups of people that you are concerned about to the point of refraining from going out? often, yes sometimes, yes but very rarely, no. Percentage includes the population 14 years old or more
Lithuania	Do you feel safe from different offences in Lithuania? (survey conducted by Centre for Crime Prevention). Do you feel safe in your local area? (survey conducted by the Police Department under the Ministry of the Interior) Do you feel safe in Lithuania? / In your local area (city/district)? / In your inner environment (street/ village) (survey conducted by the Ministry of the Interior)
Norway	The respondents are asked whether they recently have feared exposure to violence or threats of violence when walking alone in their neighbourhood.
Portugal	When you have to walk on foot, alone, at night in your neighbourhood, how do you feel? Very safe, Reasonably safe, Somewhat unsafe, Very unsafe, You don't go out at night, Doesn't know / Doesn't answer.
Sweden	If you go out alone late in the evening in the area where you live, do you feel very safe, quite safe, quite unsafe, very unsafe or do you never go out alone late in the evening?
Turkey	How safe do you feel walking around your neighbourhood at night? Not safe at all, Not safe, Medium, Safe, Very safe.

Similar wording: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland. Question not included: Denmark.

Notes on Tables 6.2.1.1 to 6.2.9.2

Armenia	The questions in the 2010 survey refer to victimisation in the previous 3 years.
Bulgaria	Data include the answers "don't know" or "refused to answer".
Croatia	In 2009 the percentage of victims of theft of a motor vehicle was 1%. Note that this % was calculated in relation to the number of all the persons interviewed (although 15 % did not own a motor vehicle). In 2000 the % of victims of theft of a motor vehicle was calculated taking into account only car owners. In 2000, the % of victims reporting the crime of burglary to the police refers only to completed burglaries. Attempted burglary was much less frequently reported to the police – only in 30.5 % of the cases.
Czech Republic	Bodily injury: Data are available only for the five-year period (2002-2006), and not for any particular year. Percentage of victims reporting to police: with the exception of corruption, data are available only for the five-year period 2002-2006. Incidence has not been studied.
Estonia	Sexual assault: From 1992 to 2003 this includes both verbal and physical harassment; in 2008 it includes physical harassment only (the question was not comparable to the previous surveys, conclusions on trends cannot be made).
France	Data on sexual assault in 2010 is calculated only for persons aged 18-75 years.
Finland	Wording of the Trust in police question differs: How much do you trust in police? Responses: very much 42.4% quite much 49.2% = 92%
Iceland	Number for theft of a personal property might include robbery, and theft of a motor vehicle.
Italy	Bodily injury (assault) includes sexual assault.
Norway	Bodily injury is likely to include sexual assault
Turkey	Bodily injury: In 2005 this included being beaten or injured. In 2010 it included threats, injuries, & sexual harassment. Sexual assault is defined as sexual harassment. Theft includes purse snatching and pickpocketing. Motor vehicle includes theft of motorcycle.
UK: England & Wales	Reporting rates for bodily injury refer to the offence of more serious assaults with injury. Sexual assault questions are based on an additional CASI module on interpersonal violence asked of people aged 16-59. Theft of personal property data are from 'Other theft of personal property' and exclude pickpocketing and theft of items on the victim's person. Trust in police: breaks in the series in 2001 and 2010.
UK: Northern Ireland	1) No data available for 1990 or 1995. 2) The NICS common assault definition includes minor injuries. 3) Trust in the police – this question was only included in the NICS from 2007/08 onwards, and therefore no data are available for 1995, 2001, 2005. 4) In all NICS publications victimisation rates for robbery are not published separately. However, they are categorised with snatch theft as mugging.
UK: Scotland	Since 2011/12, the SCJS has been delivered on a biennial basis with no data collection in that financial year. The SCJS in its current form started in 2008/09, and therefore comparable data does not exist for years 2005 and before. Please note that the survey fieldwork is based on financial years (April-March)

Table 6.9.2.3 Years of reference

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	..	1998	2000	2004	2010	..
Bulgaria	2001	2006	2010	2015
Croatia	2000	..	2009	..
Czech Republic	2008	..	2017
Estonia	1992	1994	1999	2003	2008	2015
Finland	1988	1997	2003	2006	2009	2015
France	1985	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Georgia	2010	..
Germany	2012	2017
Iceland	2010	2015
Ireland	..	1996	2003	2006	2010	2015
Italy	..	1997	2002	..	2008	2015
Lithuania	2004	2005	2007	2015
Netherlands	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Norway	2004	2007	2012	2015
Poland	2008	2014
Portugal	..	1994	2015
Sweden	2005	2010	2015
Turkey	2010	2014
UK: England & Wales	1991	1995	2000	2005	2010	Apr 15 - Mar 16
UK: Northern Ireland	2001	2005	2010	2015
UK: Scotland						2016

6.2.10 Computer/cybercrime against individuals

This section includes information on estimates of computer or cybercrime against victims, as measured by household surveys. Many commentators believe that computer crime in various forms, measured as reported in household surveys, is of the same order of magnitude as ‘traditional’ crime discussed throughout the Sourcebook. Some surveys confirm this.

This section is not comprehensive as collection of this data was not an integral part of the Sourcebook process. Only a few countries supplied details. Neither were standards or definitions set by Sourcebook editors for the collection of cybercrime numbers. Details vary considerably from one country to another, as can be seen from Table 6.2.10.1. A selection of cybercrime data available is given Table 6.2.10.2, for the most recent year. Differences are likely to be accounted for by differences in definitions and scope of the questions, although there is good comparability between the British and the Dutch sources for different types of cybercrime.

Table 6.2.10.1 Cybercrime against households as measured by surveys

Country	Cybercrime types and definitions used	Sources/dates
		2020 onwards
Belgium		
	Has any of the following happened to you: Given personal information to others (phishing) Debit/credit card misused on the internet (fraud) Identity been stolen and misused (Identity Theft) Your device has been infected by Malware (Malware) Your e-mail/social media account hacked (Hacking) Received sexually harassing messages (Sexual Harassment) Received other harassing messages (General Harassment) Sensitive information been circulated about you. False information circulated about you (Defamation) You have been threatened with violence on the internet	2018 Finnish National Crime survey. Ages 15-74. Survey of households
Finland		
	<u>ID fraud</u> : skimming; phishing and pharming <u>Buying and selling fraud</u> : buying; selling. <u>Hacking</u> : computer; email account; website; other <u>Cyberbullying</u> : Slander; Blackmail; stalking; Threat; Other	Dutch Safety Monitor conducted by Statistics Netherlands: annual cross-sectional household survey using representative sampling methods Data available for 2012-17, and 2019. (https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb).
Netherlands		(Household) Crime Survey of England and Wales (CSEW) Financial years from April 2016-March 2017 onwards. https://www.ons.gov.uk/people-populationandcommunity/crime-andjustice/datasets/crimeinenglandandwalesexperimentaltables
UK: England & Wales	<u>Fraud</u> : Bank and credit acct fraud; consumer/retail fraud; advance fee fraud; other <u>Computer misuse</u> : computer virus; unauthorised access to personal information, including hacking	(Household) Scottish Crime and Justice Survey 2018-2019: supplementary tables on cybercrime: https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-crime-justice-survey-2018-19-datasets/
UK: Scotland	Personal details were stolen online Device infected by malicious software Someone accessed social media, email or other online account without your consent for fraudulent purposes Locked out of device and asked to make a payment to have it unlocked Card or bank account details were stolen online Received a scam email and provided bank details or made a payment Received a phone call from someone claiming there was a problem with your device: you let them access your device and/or paid them a fee, but it was a scam Victim of online dating fraud	

Table 6.2.10.2 Cybercrime against households: types of crime and prevalence

Country	Year	Type of Cybercrime	Prevalence of cyber victimisation (%)	
			Ever	Last 12 months
Finland	2018	Malware	42.4	12.5
		General Harassment	16.3	9.1
		Sexual Harassment	14.2	8.4
		Hacking	8.8	3.1
		Fraud	6.2	2.2
		Defamation	4.3	1.2
		Threat of violence	3.5	1.2
		Phishing	2.2	0.7
		Violation of personal privacy	1.7	0.6
		Identity theft	1.4	0.5
The Netherlands	2019	<u>ID fraud:</u>	..	0.5
		skimming;	..	0.4
		phishing and pharming	..	0.1
		<u>Buying and selling fraud:</u>	..	5.7
		buying;	..	5.2
		selling;	..	0.4
		<u>Hacking:</u>	..	8.2
		computer;	..	0.8
		email account;	..	2.6
		website;	..	3.2
		other	..	2.2
		<u>Cyberbullying:</u>	..	7.9
		Slander;	..	2.0
		Blackmail;	..	1.7
		stalking;	..	1.7
		Threat;	..	1.1
		Other	..	2.5
UK (England & Wales)	April 19 -	Fraud	..	7.0
	March 20	Computer misuse (including hacking)	..	3.0
UK (Scotland)	April 18-	Personal details were stolen online	..	0.7
	March 19	Device infected by malicious software	..	8.0
		Someone accessed social media, email or other online account without your consent for fraudulent purposes	..	4.8
		Locked out of device and asked to make a payment to have it unlocked	..	0.8
		Card or bank account details stolen online	..	4.5
		Received a scam email and provided bank details or made a payment	..	4.5
		Received a phone call from someone claiming there was a problem with your device: you let them access your device and/or paid them a fee, but it was a scam	..	4.1
		Victim of online dating fraud	..	0.2

6.2.11 Computer/cybercrime against companies and charities

A separate issue is the incidence of computer/cybercrime against companies, charities, and other organisations, which is acknowledged by law enforcement authorities and governments as a growing problem. Some countries have set up cyber security breach surveys. The purpose of such surveys is not only to gain an understanding of the amount of such cybercrime against companies, charities, NGOs, etc. but to discover the crime prevention methods, training of staff and investment that companies have found necessary to cope with this new phenomenon, as well as the success of such measures. They tend to be both qualitative and quantitative, based on a large questionnaire and interviews. Up to 5,000 companies, charities, and NGOs, etc. can take part and often the surveys are carried out annually.

It is not within the remit of this chapter to collect such information, which would be a considerable task, but it is mentioned here for completeness. Table 6.2.11.1 gives an indication of the extent of such surveys for Germany and for the UK. Overall results are similar and show significant differences by size of company and by type of organisation.

Table 6.2.11 Cybercrime against companies, charities, and other organisations

Country	Year	Content of survey	Title and source of survey data
Germany	2019	A nationwide survey of 5,000 companies with 10+ employees on the subject of cyber-attacks was conducted between August 2018 and January 2019. This focused on the prevalence of different types of cyber-attacks, consequences for the companies affected and factors that could increase or reduce the risk of being affected by such cyber-attacks.	Cyber-attacks against companies in Germany: results of a representative company survey 2018-19 KFN Research Report 158. 41% of the companies surveyed have experienced at least one cyber-attack in the previous twelve months that required a response, attacks that were thwarted automatically are not included. With an annual prevalence rate of 58%, large companies (500+ employees) are significantly more frequently affected than medium-sized (46-47 %) or small companies (10-49 employees: 39%). https://en.kfn.de/blog/2020/03/new-research-report-cyber-attacks-against-companies-in-germany/
	2020 (annual)	The UK conducts an annual survey of cyber breaches directed at commercial companies. Results are mostly about policies and companies' reactions to cybercrime more than the crimes themselves. Published chapters include awareness and attitudes: approaches to cyber security incidents and impact of breaches: dealing with breaches:	Cyber Breaches Survey, UK 2020 Almost half of businesses (46%) and a quarter of charities (26%) report having cyber security breaches or attacks in the last 12 months. Like previous years, this is higher among medium businesses (68%), large businesses (75%) and high-income charities (57%). https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cyber-security-breaches-survey-2020/cyber-security-breaches-survey-2020
UK (Total)			

6.3 Technical information on household surveys

The following tables include information on the methodology applied in the different countries for their victimisation surveys.

Table 6.3.1 shows the size of the samples used in each survey. It can be seen that they have been gradually increasing during the 20 years under observation. By 2010, 10 countries out of 20 used samples of more than 10,000 households.

Table 6.3.2 specifies the kind of sample design used in the national surveys. In general, the most common design is multistage probability sample.

Table 6.3.3 shows the level of representativeness of the national samples used in the surveys.

Table 6.3.4 shows the response rate of the surveys. It can be seen that such rate has been generally decreasing since 2000. The reliability of response rates reported reaching 100% seems doubtful.

Table 6.3.5 shows the age range of people interviewed. The minimum age is usually 15-16 years old. Most countries do not fix a maximum age.

Table 6.3.6 shows the survey modes that have been used for each year of reference. CATI and CAPI are the most frequent modes of survey.

Table 6.3.1 Sample size of the national victimisation surveys

Year	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Albania	..	1200	1500	1500	2590	..
Armenia	5337	..
Belgium	..	(6000)	(6000)	(12000)	(12000)	..
Bulgaria	1615	2500	2557	..
Croatia	1532	..	4500	..
Czech Republic	3082	..	3328
Denmark	..	12000	(1000)	11668	11585	11492
Estonia	1000	1173	1700	1687	4181	1000
Finland	9598	13762	8163	7715	7193	14000
France	11156	5786	5594	13263	16958	22,800
						units
Georgia	3000	3000	3000	..
Germany	35503	31192
Iceland	4000	4000
Ireland	..	2690	2994	3243	11391	..
Italy	..	50001	60001	..	60001	50350
Lithuania	1003	1001	1001	..
Netherlands	4513	5936	8756	5242	39220	111252
Norway	3340	3212	6186	6393
Poland	17000	17000
Sweden	10000	20000	20000
Turkey	2880	3440	3904
UK: England & Wales	10059	16348	32824	47023	46031	35000
UK: Northern Ireland	3010	3692	4081	c.3000
UK: Scotland	10010	5570

Figures in brackets see notes on tables 6.3.1. to 6.3.6

Table 6.3.2 Sample design of national victimisation surveys

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Simple random sampling	2 countries: Finland, France	3 countries Denmark, Finland, France	3 countries Finland, France, Norway	4 countries Denmark, Finland, France, Norway	4 countries Denmark, Finland, France, Norway	4 countries Denmark, Finland, France, Norway, UK: Northern Ireland
Stratified random sampling		1 country Italy	1 country Italy	1 country Italy	2 countries, Iceland, Italy	4 countries Iceland, Italy, Sweden. UK: Scotland
Stratified two stage cluster sampling			1 country Bulgaria	2 countries Bulgaria, Turkey	2 countries Bulgaria, Turkey	1 country Turkey
Multistage probability sampling	2 countries: Estonia, UK: England & Wales	3 countries Estonia, Ireland, UK: England & Wales	5 countries Estonia, Ireland, Lithuania, UK: England & Wales, UK: Scotland	5 countries Estonia, Ireland, Lithuania, UK: England & Wales, UK: Scotland	7 countries Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Lithuania, UK: England & Wales, UK: Scotland	6 countries Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, UK: England & Wales,
Other quota sampling				1 country Czech Republic		1 country Czech Republic
Random Route sampling						1 country Poland

Table 6.3.3. Sample representativeness of national victimisation surveys

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
National level	2 countries Estonia France	3 countries Estonia, France, UK: England & Wales	5 countries Croatia, Estonia, France, Lithuania, UK: England & Wales	4 countries Croatia, France, Lithuania, UK: England & Wales	4 countries Croatia, France, Lithuania, UK: England & Wales	7 countries Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Turkey, UK: Northern Ireland, UK: Scotland
National level and first regional level	1 country Finland	3 countries Denmark, Finland, Italy	4 countries Bulgaria, Finland, Italy, Norway	5 countries Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Norway	9 countries Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Finland, Iceland, Italy, Norway	8 countries Denmark, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Sweden, UK: England & Wales
National level, first regional level and second regional level		1 country Belgium	1 country Belgium	1 country Belgium	1 country Belgium,	
National level and urban-rural breakdown				1 country Turkey	1 country Turkey	
Blocks then household		1 country Ireland	1 country Ireland	1 country Ireland	1 country Ireland	1 country Ireland

Table 6.3.4 Response rate of national victimisation surveys

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Belgium	..	72	59	66	63	..
Denmark	..	64		64	63	61
Estonia	58	..
Finland	87	82	81	76	75	48
France						68.8
Georgia	40	..
Germany	21	15
Iceland	55.3	63.6
Italy	..	(100)	(100)	..	(100)	(100)
Ireland	62
Netherlands	..	55	59	70	70	(37)
Poland	65	..
Sweden	70	70	60
Turkey	86
UK: England & Wales	77	83	73	75	(67/75)	(67/75)
UK: Northern Ireland	70	64	68	67
UK: Scotland	62	63

Note: The methodology applied for computing the response rate varies from country to country. Rates reaching 100% must be interpreted cautiously and are therefore presented in brackets

Table 6.3.5 Age range of respondents in national victimisation surveys

Age range	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
Countries setting a minimum age for the persons interviewed	3 countries Estonia (18), Finland (15), France (14)	8 Countries Belgium (15), Estonia (16), Finland (15), France (14), Ireland (18), Italy (14), Netherlands (15), Portu- gal (16)	12 countries Belgium (15), Bul- garia (16), Croatia (16), Estonia (16), Finland (15), France (14), Georgia (16), Ireland (18), Italy (14), Netherlands (15) Norway (16), Portugal (16)	12 countries Belgium (15), Bul- garia (16), Czech Re- public (15), Denmark (16), Estonia (16), Finland (15), France (14), Georgia (16), Ireland (18), Lithua- nia (15), Netherlands (15), Norway (16)	16 countries Belgium (15), Bul- garia (16), Croatia (18), Denmark (16), Estonia (16), Finland (15), France (14), Georgia (16), Germany (16), Iceland (18), Ireland (18), Italy (14), Netherlands (16), Iceland (18), Ireland (18), Italy (14), Lithuania (15), Nether- lands (15), Norway (16), Portugal (16)	17 countries Czech Re- public (15), Denmark (16), Estonia (15) Finland (15), France (14), Germany (16), Iceland (18), Ireland (18), Italy (14), Netherlands (15), Norway (16), Poland (15), Sweden (16), Turkey (18), UK: England & Wales (16), UK: Northern Ire- land (16), UK: Scot- land (16)
Countries setting a maximum age for persons interviewed	2 countries Estonia (74), France (74)	2 countries Estonia (74), France (74)	3 countries Estonia (74), Finland (74), France (74)	5 countries Czech Re- public (79), Denmark (74), Estonia (74), Finland (74), France (74)	6 countries Denmark (74), Estonia (74), Georgia (65), Iceland (75), Lithua- nia (74), France (74)	5 countries Denmark (74), Finland (74), France (74), Sweden (79), Turkey (99)
Countries having a separate survey for children						1 Country UK: England & Wales (10- 15)

Table 6.3.6 Survey mode of national victimisation surveys

Survey Mode	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015
CATI		2 countries Denmark, Italy	4 countries Belgium, Croatia, Finland, Italy	3 countries Belgium, Denmark, Finland	5 countries Belgium, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Italy	2 countries Germany, Sweden
CATI + PAPI		1 country Belgium		1 country Czech Republic	1 country Croatia	2 countries Czech Re- public, Italy
CATI/CASI +CAWI					1 country Denmark	2 countries Denmark, Finland
CATI + Face to face	1 country Finland	1 country Finland				
CAPI		1 country Ireland	2 countries Estonia, Ireland	6 coun- tries Es- tonia, France, Ireland, Norway, Turkey, UK: Scot- land	7 countries Estonia, France, Georgia, Ireland, Norway, Turkey, UK: Scot- land	7 countries Estonia, France, Ireland, Norway, Poland, Turkey, UK: Scot- land
CAWI						1 country Iceland
CAPI + CASI		1 country UK: Eng- land & Wales	1 country UK: Eng- land & Wales	1 country UK: Eng- land & Wales	2 countries France, UK: England & Wales	1 country UK: Eng- land & Wales
PAPI	3 coun- tries Es- tonia, France, UK: Eng- land & Wales	2 countries Estonia, France	4 countries Bulgaria, France, Lithuania, UK: Scot- land	2 coun- tries Bul- garia, Lithuania	2 countries Bulgaria, Lithuania	
CAWI, PAPI, CATI, CAPI OTHER – One person inter- viewed at ran- dom from each household sampled						1 country Netherlands 1 country UK: North- ern Ireland

Notes on Tables 6.3.1-6.3.6

Belgium	The figures for the sample size are weighted. In 2010 the non-weighted sample was 37,000.
Croatia	The counting unit in the 2000 and the 2009 surveys was the person.
Czech Republic	2006 means data collected November 2005-November 2006. In 2015 the sample design was quota sampling based on age, sex, education, size of place of residence and region. Main differences from previous research can be caused by asking first on 3 years period and then last 12 months.
Denmark	Data corresponds to the year in which surveys were carried out. There are no exact data for the sample size in 2000, but it was much smaller than the others.
Estonia	The most recent survey was carried out from November 2008 to May 2009. The period of reference was 12 months prior to the interview. Accordingly, for most of the respondents the major reference period was 2008, but it could include also victimisations suffered from November 2007 to May 2009.
Finland	Since 2012, the Finnish National Research Institute of Legal Policy has started an annual victimisation survey. The counting unit is an individual not a household.
France	In 2016 the sample consisted of 22,800 units (approximately 15,500 respondent households) as well as an extension for priority areas.
Georgia	The respondents represented the whole country, with the exception of the breakaway territories (South Ossetia and Abkhazia).
Germany	In 2012 and 2017 the sampling was at the National level and first regional level (but the latter only for five Federal States, for which the sample size was increased)
Iceland	Data from the ICVS for 2005 is available but it is not comparable to the data from 2010.
Lithuania	The methodology and results presented here correspond to the surveys conducted by the Centre for Crime Prevention in 2005, 2006 and 2008. For the rest of the surveys mentioned in Table 6.1.3 there were no such detailed analyses of offences or the surveys covered a five-year period of reference.
Netherlands	The sample size and response rate are given for persons, not households
Netherlands	The SLC on victimisation is based on the general surveys of living conditions, which had questions regarding victimisation for the first time in 1983. The SLC in 1983, 1987, 1991, 1995, 1997, 2001, 2004, 2007 and 2012 included, in various degrees, questions regarding victimisation and fear of crime. The content of the surveys has been nearly identical from 1997.
Turkey	Although detailed information is not available, it appears that more than one person was surveyed in each household, as the total number of interviews was 6983 for 2005, and 7027 for 2010. The survey was conducted for the first time in 2003, hence there are no data before that. From 2015 onwards data are not generally available but can be purchased from the statistical office. As a result, 2014 data have been used.
UK: England & Wales	The response rates given are 67% for those aged 10-15 and 75% for those aged 16+ For 2015 data for injury, sexual assault (harassment) and robbery are aggregated.
UK: Northern Ireland	A good deal of the variation between years in the results is due to the fact that the amount of crime in many offences, particularly the serious ones, is quite low in Northern Ireland, because of the small size of the population. For indications of the sampling errors associated with the estimates the reader should refer to the NI statistical bulletins.

6.4 Sources of national metadata and results

Belgium	Belgian Federal Police - Direction of the operational police information - service of policy support Enquête bisannuelle.
Bulgaria	Center for the Study of Democracy / Vitosha Research – National Crime Survey 2002-2012, published in Crime Trends in Bulgaria 2000-2010, Center for the Study of Democracy, Sofia, 2011, available at: http://www.csd.bg/artShow.php?id=15693
Croatia	Ministry of Interior and United Nations Development Program, National Public Opinion Survey on Citizen Perception of Safety and Security in the Republic of Croatia, http://www.undp.hr/upload/file/230/115095/FILENAME/Survey_on_safety_and_security_E.pdf (for 2009 survey) For 2000 survey, the source is the unpublished report received from the survey coordinator, prof. dr. Turkovi.
Czech Republic	Martinkova Milada: Experiences of Czech Republic citizens with some delicts - victimological survey results, ICSP, published 2007 http://www.ok.cz/iksp/publikace.html#s2007 English summary Roubalova Michaela, Holas Jakub, Kostelníková Zuzana, Pešková Martina: „Victimisation survey focused on the experience of the Czech population with selected types of offenses within the set reference period, ICSP, In print
Denmark	Ministry of Justice: https://www.justitsministeriet.dk/forskning/offerrapporter/
Estonia	Kuriteoohvite uuring 2009. Justiitsministeerium. Tallinn, 2010. (English summary) http://www.just.ee/victim
Finland	The National Research Institute of Legal Policy in Finland is responsible for the data analysis. Rikollisuustilanne 2011, Omaisuusrikosten kohteeksi joutuminen 2006: yleisyys, piirteet ja muutokset, 2008 OPTL. Suomalaiset väkivallan ja omaisuusrikosten kohteena 2015 – kansallisen rikosuhritutkimuksen tuloksia. Katsauksia 13/2016. Kriminologian ja oikeuspolitiikan instituutti. Helsingin yliopisto, valtiotieteellinen tiedekunta. http://hdl.handle.net/10138/161960
France	For 1985, 1995, 2000 and 2005, see Robert Ph., Zauberman R., Nevanen S., Didier E., the development of delinquency based on surveys of victimisation, France, 1984-2005. <i>Déviance & Société</i> , 2008, 32, 4, 435-471. Miceli L., Nevanen S., Robert Ph., Zauberman R., the survey living standards and security in the set of data on victimisation, <i>Economie & statistiques</i> , 2009, 426, 3- 28. For 2016 see: https://www.interieur.gouv.fr/Interstats/Actualites/Rapport-d-enquete-cadre-de-vie-et-securite-2017 https://www.interieur.gouv.fr/Interstats/L-enquete-Cadre-de-vie-et-securite-CVS/Rapport-d-enquete-cadre-de-vie-et-securite-2018 https://inhesj.fr/sites/default/files/ondrp_files/publications/pdf/2017_RA_victimisation_0.pdf
Georgia	Georgia Crime and Victimization Survey 2011
Germany	Please see the web site of the BundesKriminalamt https://www.bka.de/DE/AktuelleInformationen/StatistikenLagebilder/ViktimsierungssurveyDunkelfeldforschung/viktimsierungssurveyDunkelfeldforschung_node.html
Iceland	The report on the victimisation survey issued by the national commissioner can be found at: https://www.logreglan.is/utgafa/tolfraedi/fraedilegar-rannsknir/reynsla-almenningis-af-afbrotum-og-vidhorf-til-logreglu/
Ireland	Module included in Quarterly National Household Survey (QNHS), CSO
Italy	Italian Institute of Statistics – www.istat.it
Lithuania	The survey results are presented at the website of the Centre for Crime Prevention (http://www.nplc.lt/lit/tyr/_tyrimai.aspx).

Netherlands	Incidence of victimisation over the last 12 months are provisional figures. Theft of personal property is split up according to categories provided in Table on availability of questions in the survey.
Norway	The report on the survey for 2015 can be found at: https://www.ssb.no/sosiale-forhold-og-kriminalitet/artikler-og-publikasjoner/levekarundersokelsen-eu-silc-2015-tema-boforhold-utsatthet-og-uro-for-lovbrudd .
Poland	An analytical tool is available online to allow the reader to access more detailed data.
Portugal	Data base of the Polish Crime Survey.
	Based on data from Inquérito de vitimação 1992, ISBN 972-8030-02-9; and Inquérito de Vitimação 1994, ISBN 972-8030-05-3.
Slovenia	Pečar (1982) – first victimisation study in Ljubljana; Pavlovič (1992) – ICVS in Ljubljana; Pavlovič (1997) – ICVS in Slovenia; Pavlovič (2001) – ICVS in Slovenia; Dekleva (1995) – bullying in primary and secondary schools; Cvek & Pšunder (2013) – peer violence and victimisation in primary schools; Dolinar, Jere, Meško, Podbregar in Eman (2010) – mobbing; Selič & Jakopin (2010) – mobbing among trainee doctors; Mičović (2011) – exposure of preschool children to food additives; Eman (2011) – environmental crime; Pavšič Mrevlje (2014) – victimisation of elderly in Ljubljana; Meško & Bernik (2011) – cybercrime and victimisation; Dimc & Dobovšek (2013) – cybercrime; Završnik (2015) – cybercrime; Umek & Meško (1999) – effects of crime on victims; Gorenak (2003) – satisfaction of victims of property crime with the police proceedings; Dvoršek, Maver & Meško (2006) - satisfaction of victims of property crime with the police proceedings; Meško & Pavlovič (1998) – fear of crime; Meško & Umek (1999) – fear of crime; Meško, Šifrer & Vošnjak (2012) – comparison of fear of crime in urban and rural environments; Vošnjak (2011) – correlations between victimisation and the fear of crime; Hacin & Eman (2014) – fear of crime in the municipality of Trbovlje using crime mapping tools. Project Feelings of Safety and the Role of Police in Ensuring Safety in Local Communities (2010...012) – local safety and security (feelings of safety) Project Legitimacy and Legality of Policing, Criminal Justice and Execution of Penal Sanctions (2013...016) – victims of crime Programme Safety and Security in Local Communities (2015...018) – local safety and security (feelings of safety).
Sweden	Sweden National Council for Crime Prevention, Sweden, www.bra.se .
Turkey	Turkish Statistical Institute, Life Satisfaction Survey online statistical tables: http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTabloArama.do Turkish Statistical Institute, Life Satisfaction Survey 2014, https://bi-runi.tuik.gov.tr/yayin/views/visitorPages/index.zul
UK: England & Wales	The User Guide to Crime Statistics in England and Wales http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/method-quality/specific/crime-statisticsmethodology/index.html and BCS 2010/11 User Guide http://www.esds.ac.uk/findingData/snDescription.asp?sn=6937
UK: Northern Ireland	The Northern Ireland crime survey is closely based on the Crime Survey for England and Wales. More details can be found in the web site below https://www.justice-ni.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/justice/experience-of-crime-findings...015-16-ni-crime-survey-feb-17.pdf
UK: Scotland	http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2011/10/28142346/19 2010/11 Scottish Crime and Justice Survey: Main Findings.

6.5 Other topics covered by national victimisation surveys in Europe

Chapter 6 has concentrated on prevalence and incidence of crime and respondents' views about the work of the police and safety issues. However, as countries have become more experienced with their use of victimisation surveys, they have realised that many other topics can be covered successfully. This section considers the most recent questionnaires used in Denmark, Germany, Sweden, and UK: England & Wales as examples of how wide the possibilities have become.

Denmark

As well as the questions already covered in this chapter, Table 6.5.1 presents additional topics covered in the Danish victimisation surveys over time.

Table 6.5.1 Additional topics covered in the Danish Victimization Survey

Number	Topic
1	Vandalism (since 2005)
2	Hate crimes (since 2008)
3	Concerns about crime in society in general (since 2015)
4	Different types of cybercrime (since 2018)
5	Other sexual crimes than rape (since 2018)
6	Hateful speech online (since 2020)
7	Sextortion (since 2020)"

Germany

As well as the questions already covered in this chapter, the 2017 German Victimization Survey questionnaire covers the topics in Table 6.5.2. The questionnaire is available in three languages, German, Turkish and Russian to cope with the minority populations living in Germany. More detail can be found in the publication *Victimization Surveys in Germany – English Summaries* by Leitgöb-Guzy, Birkel and Mischkowitz (Eds.)⁴⁸.

Table 6.5.2 Additional topics covered in the German Victimization Survey

Number	Topic
1	Sexual violence and domestic violence
2	Sexual and physical abuse of children (including in the domestic environment)
3	Hate crime
4	Cybercrime
5	Violence against the elderly

Sweden

As well as the questions already covered in this chapter, the 2017 German Victimization Survey questionnaire covers the topics in Table 6.5.3. More details are available at: <https://www.bra.se/bra-in-english/home/crime-and-statistics/swedish-crime-survey.html>

Table 6.5.3 Additional topics covered in the Swedish Victimization Survey

Number	Topic
1	Experiences of the police
2	Harassment (including online)
3	Credit card fraud
4	Sales fraud
5	Pickpocketing
6	Threats

⁴⁸ See the publication by the Bundeskriminalamt at: https://www.bka.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Publikationen/Publikationsreihen/PolizeiUndForschung/1_47_3_VictimisationSurveysInGermany_Volume3.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=3.

UK: England and Wales

As well as the questions already covered in this chapter, the 2017 CSEW questionnaire covers the topics in Table 6.5.4. More detail can be found at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/file?uri=/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crime-andjustice/methodologies/crimeandjusticemethodology/201718csewquestionnaire.pdf>

Moreover, the demographic information collected on the respondents has also increased so that victims can be identified by characteristics such as their age, education, employment, and health.

Table 6.5.4 Additional topics covered in the 2017 Crime Survey of England and Wales

Number	Topic covered
1	Performance of the criminal justice system
2	Experience of the criminal justice system
3	Mobile phone crime
4	Experiences of the police
5	Attitudes to the criminal justice system
6	Crime prevention and security
7	Financial loss and fraud
8	Anti-social behaviour
9	Drug use and drinking
10	Gangs and personal security
11	Domestic abuse, sexual victimisation and stalking
12	Online fraud

Appendix I: Definitions

1 Offences

The offence definitions given hereafter are operational, not legal definitions (“standard” definitions). They were devised 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. Standard definitions were chosen in a way to maximize the number of countries that could meet them without reservation. Standard definitions are listed for police-recorded offences *and* for convictions, with the possibility to state for *both* levels, using an *include / exclude* checklist, whether national definitions deviate from the standard definition.

The following Tables 1 and 2 show which countries were able to meet the standard definitions in *all* respects (marked “*YES*”), which countries provided data, but did not fully meet the standard definition (marked “*NO*”) and which countries did not provide any figures in chapters 1 and / or 3 for certain offences (marked “...”). In a small number of cases, country responses were ambiguous or incomplete, thus making it unclear whether a certain definition had been fully met or not; the respective definitions are marked “*Y/N*” for these countries in the tables.

Table 1 refers to the police level, Table 2 to convictions. At the bottom of each table is indicated how many countries were able to meet the standard definitions. A high rate of deviation from the standard definition stands for substantial variation

in definitions across Europe, while a low rate of deviation suggests rather uniform offence definitions across the continent.⁴⁹ Consistency in definitions is rather high with respect to, for example, the definitions of robbery, domestic burglary, and sexual assault.

For those countries that were unable to meet the standard definition, the following text (after Table 2) shows the way in which their offence definitions deviated from the standard. If a deviation refers to only one level (police or convictions), this level is indicated in brackets.⁵⁰ Otherwise, deviations refer to both levels.

Deviations are relatively frequent with respect to offences that are rather vague and hard to distinguish from related offences, such as bodily injury. As the detailed indications in the following sections will illustrate, the deviations are often related to problems in statistical recording of cases on the fringes to other offences, like assault leading to death. Such problems increase for offence groups between mere administrative and truly criminal offences, like major road traffic offences: Offences that are not defined as criminal in one country can and should typically not be *included*, while it is also difficult to *exclude* from a given offence group in another country offences that are considered criminal.

In order to ensure that the data correspond to changing legal and statistical situations and in general to improve comparability, some definitions have been changed in this edition. For three offences, the change was so significant that figures can only be compared very cautiously with earlier editions. This applies for major road traffic offences, which no longer require the committing of a severe road crime but instead it is sufficient if the offence is prosecuted in criminal proceedings (i.e.: not merely administrative ones). In addition, the definitions for the sexual offences of rape and sexual abuse of minors have been substantially modified. The definition of rape has been extended and, in line with legal developments, the focus on consent and the ability to validly give it was strengthened. This, accordingly, leads to a corresponding restriction of the offence definition of sexual abuse of minors. The offences of aggravated theft, cyber fraud and forgery of documents have been introduced to the Sourcebook for the first time in this edition.

How important are deviations in quantitative respect, and how much do they affect comparability? As a general rule, one may say that the inclusion or exclusion of “minor” offences (e.g., minor theft) has a greater impact on overall rates than deviations on serious but relatively rare offences, such as “assault leading to death”.

⁴⁹ Compliance with standard definitions was analysed in more detail for the 5th edition of the Sourcebook in Harrendorf, S. (2018): Prospects, Problems, and Pitfalls in Comparative Analyses of Criminal Justice Data, *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research* 47, 159-207, and for the 4th edition in Harrendorf, S. (2012): Offence Definitions in the European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics and Their Influence on Data Quality and Comparability, *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 18(1), 23-53.

⁵⁰ This does not necessarily mean that the rule was followed on the other level: It is also possible that data were not available, or the reply of the country was rather ambiguous or incomplete (also cf. Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1. Standard definitions followed in all respects on police level (part 1)

	Total criminal offences	Major road traffic offences	Intentional homicide	Bodily Injury	Aggrav. bodily injury	Sexual assault	Rape	Sexual abuse of a child
Albania	Y/N	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Armenia	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	...
Austria	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Azerbaijan	NO	NO	NO	...	NO	...	YES	...
Belgium	YES	YES	NO	NO	...	YES	NO	NO
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	...
Bulgaria	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Croatia	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Cyprus	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	Y/N
Czech Republic	YES	NO	NO	NO	...	YES	YES	NO
Denmark	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Estonia	NO	Y/N	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Finland	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
France	NO	...	NO	NO	...	NO	YES	NO
Georgia	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	...
Germany	NO	...	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO
Greece	NO	YES	Y/N	NO	...	YES	YES	...
Hungary	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Iceland	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	Y/N	YES	NO
Ireland	...	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Italy	NO	NO	Y/N	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	...
Latvia	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	...
Lithuania	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
Luxembourg	Y/N	...	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	...
Malta	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Moldova	YES	NO	NO	NO	Y/N	NO	NO	NO
Montenegro	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Netherlands	Y/N	YES	NO	NO	...	NO	NO	...
North Macedonia	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Norway	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	NO	NO	Y/N	Y/N	NO
Poland	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
Portugal	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	...
Romania	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Russian Federation	Y/N	Y/N
Serbia	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
Slovak Republic	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	...
Slovenia	NO	...	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
Spain	NO	NO	NO	NO	...	NO	NO	NO
Sweden	NO	YES	YES	NO	Y/N	NO	YES	NO
Switzerland	NO	...	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Turkey	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N	...	Y/N	...	Y/N
Ukraine	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
UK: England & Wales	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	Y/N
UK: Northern Ireland	Y/N	NO	Y/N	YES	...	YES	YES	Y/N
UK: Scotland	Y/N	...	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	...
Total "YES"	9	8	11	12	11	24	18	10
Total "NO"	24	23	23	25	18	11	19	17
Total "Y/N"	11	4	11	6	4	6	7	6
Total "..."	2	11	1	3	13	5	2	13
% "YES"	20%	17%	24%	26%	24%	52%	39%	22%
% "NO"	52%	50%	50%	54%	39%	24%	41%	37%
% "Y/N"	24%	9%	24%	13%	9%	13%	15%	13%
% "..."	4%	24%	2%	7%	28%	11%	4%	28%

Table 1. Standard definitions followed in all respects on police level (part 2)

	Robbery	Theft	Aggra- vated theft	Theft of a motor vehicle	Theft by means of burglary	Theft bmo domestic burglary	Fraud	Cyber fraud
Albania	NO	Y/N	NO	NO	NO	Y/N	NO	NO
Armenia	YES	NO	NO	Y/N	NO	YES	NO	...
Austria	YES	Y/N	Y/N	NO	NO	YES	NO	...
Azerbaijan	NO	NO	NO	...
Belgium	NO	Y/N	...	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Y/N	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Bulgaria	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
Croatia	YES	YES	YES	...	NO	...	YES	...
Cyprus	NO	NO	...	YES	YES	YES	NO	...
Czech Republic	NO	NO	...	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Denmark	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Estonia	YES	NO	...	NO	...	YES	YES	...
Finland	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	...
France	YES	YES	...	NO	NO	NO	NO	...
Georgia	YES	YES	...	YES	NO	NO	NO	...
Germany	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
Greece	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	...	NO	...
Hungary	YES	YES	...	YES	NO	NO
Iceland	YES	YES	...	Y/N	NO	...	NO	...
Ireland	Y/N	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N	...
Italy	YES	NO	...	Y/N	...	YES	YES	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	Y/N	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Latvia	YES	YES	YES
Lithuania	NO	YES	...	YES	NO	YES	YES	...
Luxembourg	Y/N	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N
Malta	Y/N	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	...
Moldova	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	Y/N	NO	Y/N
Montenegro	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Netherlands	YES	YES	...	NO	YES	YES	YES	...
North Macedonia	YES	YES	YES	YES	...	NO	YES	YES
Norway	Y/N	NO	NO	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	...
Poland	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	...
Portugal	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	Y/N	NO
Romania	YES	NO	...	NO	...	YES	NO	NO
Russian Federation	Y/N	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N
Serbia	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES
Slovak Republic	Y/N	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Slovenia	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO
Spain	YES	NO	...	NO	NO	NO	NO	Y/N
Sweden	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Switzerland	YES	NO	...	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Turkey	Y/N	Y/N	...	NO	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Ukraine	NO	NO	...	NO	...	YES	NO	...
UK: England & Wales	Y/N	NO	...	Y/N	Y/N	YES	NO	...
UK: Northern Ireland	Y/N	NO	...	NO	Y/N	YES	NO	...
UK: Scotland	NO	NO	...	NO	NO	YES	NO	...
Total "YES"	22	16	6	10	7	21	13	6
Total "NO"	13	19	11	21	19	8	22	9
Total "Y/N"	11	11	1	12	10	8	5	3
Total "..."	0	0	28	3	10	9	6	28
% "YES"	48%	35%	13%	22%	15%	46%	28%	13%
% "NO"	28%	41%	24%	46%	41%	17%	48%	20%
% "Y/N"	24%	24%	2%	26%	22%	17%	11%	7%
% "..."	0%	0%	61%	7%	22%	20%	13%	61%

Table 1. Standard definitions followed in all respects on police level (part 3)

	Forgery of documents	Money laundering	Corruption in the public sector	Drug offences total	Drug trafficking	Firearm
Albania	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Armenia	YES	NO	NO	NO
Austria	NO	YES	YES	NO	...	NO
Azerbaijan	NO	NO
Belgium	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Y/N	Y/N
Bulgaria	...	YES	NO	NO	...	NO
Croatia	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	...
Cyprus	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
Czech Republic	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	...
Denmark	YES	...	NO	NO	YES	...
Estonia	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	Y/N
Finland	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	...
France	YES	NO	NO
Georgia	YES	...	NO	NO	YES	YES
Germany	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
Greece	NO	...	NO	NO
Hungary	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Iceland	YES	NO	NO	Y/N
Ireland	Y/N	Y/N	...
Italy	...	YES	...	NO
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	Y/N	...
Latvia	NO	YES	...
Lithuania	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO
Luxembourg	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Malta	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Moldova	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	Y/N
Montenegro	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Netherlands	YES	YES	...	NO
North Macedonia	YES	YES	...	YES	YES	YES
Norway	Y/N	Y/N	NO	Y/N	...	Y/N
Poland	YES	Y/N	YES	NO	NO	NO
Portugal	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	Y/N
Romania	Y/N	YES	YES	NO	...	Y/N
Russian Federation
Serbia	YES	YES	YES	YES	Y/N	NO
Slovak Republic	Y/N	Y/N
Slovenia	YES	YES	Y/N	NO	NO	NO
Spain	NO	YES	NO	YES	...	NO
Sweden	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Switzerland	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Turkey	NO	Y/N
Ukraine	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	Y/N
UK: England & Wales	Y/N	NO	Y/N
UK: Northern Ireland	YES	YES	NO
UK: Scotland	NO
Total "YES"	13	18	11	8	10	4
Total "NO"	15	8	17	28	17	16
Total "Y/N"	3	2	2	5	7	13
Total "..."	15	18	16	5	12	13
% "YES"	28%	39%	24%	17%	22%	9%
% "NO"	33%	17%	37%	61%	37%	35%
% "Y/N"	7%	4%	4%	11%	15%	28%
% "..."	33%	39%	35%	11%	26%	28%

Table 2. Standard definitions followed in all respects on convictions level (part 1)

	Total criminal offences	Major road traffic offences	Intentional homicide	Bodily Injury	Aggrav. bodily injury	Sexual assault	Rape	Sexual abuse of a child
Albania	Y/N	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Armenia	Y/N	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	...
Austria	YES	...	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Azerbaijan	NO	NO	NO	...	NO	...	YES	...
Belgium	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Y/N
Bulgaria	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Croatia	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Cyprus	NO	NO
Czech Republic	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO
Denmark	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Estonia	NO	Y/N	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Finland	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
France	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
Georgia	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	...
Germany	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Greece
Hungary	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	NO	YES	Y/N	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)	Y/N
Latvia	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	...	NO	...
Lithuania	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
Luxembourg	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N	...
Malta
Moldova	...	NO	NO	NO	...	NO	NO	...
Montenegro	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N
Netherlands	Y/N	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
North Macedonia	NO	...	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	...
Norway	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Poland	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO
Portugal	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Romania	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Russian Federation	Y/N
Serbia	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Slovak Republic	Y/N
Slovenia	NO	NO	NO	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	NO	Y/N
Spain	Y/N
Sweden	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Switzerland	Y/N	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Turkey	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Ukraine	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
UK: England & Wales	NO	NO	NO	NO	Y/N	NO	YES	NO
UK: Northern Ireland	NO	YES	...	YES
UK: Scotland	Y/N	NO	NO	YES	YES	...
Total "YES"	9	10	10	10	11	18	14	8
Total "NO"	19	19	20	21	18	12	16	14
Total "Y/N"	12	2	2	2	3	3	2	2
Total "..."	6	15	14	13	14	13	14	22
% "YES"	20%	22%	22%	22%	24%	39%	30%	17%
% "NO"	41%	41%	43%	46%	39%	26%	35%	30%
% "Y/N"	26%	4%	4%	4%	7%	7%	4%	4%
% "..."	13%	33%	30%	28%	30%	28%	30%	48%

Table 2. Standard definitions followed in all respects on convictions level (part 2)

	Robbery	Theft	Aggra- vated theft	Theft of a motor vehicle	Theft by means of burglary	Theft bmo domestic burglary	Fraud	Cyber fraud
Albania	NO	Y/N	NO	NO	...
Armenia	YES	NO	...	Y/N	NO	...
Austria	YES	Y/N	Y/N	...	NO	...	NO	...
Azerbaijan	NO	NO	NO	...
Belgium	YES	YES	NO	YES	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	...
Croatia	YES	YES	YES	...	NO	...	YES	...
Cyprus
Czech Republic	NO	NO	NO	...
Denmark	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Estonia	YES	NO	YES	...
Finland	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	...
France	YES	NO	YES	...
Georgia	YES	NO	NO	...
Germany	YES	YES	YES	...	NO	NO	NO	...
Greece
Hungary	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	YES	NO	YES	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	YES	YES
Lithuania	NO	YES	YES	...
Luxembourg	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Malta
Moldova	NO	NO	NO	NO	...
Montenegro	Y/N	Y/N
Netherlands	YES	YES	NO	YES	...
North Macedonia	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Norway	...	Y/N
Poland	NO	NO	NO	...	NO	...	NO	...
Portugal	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO
Romania	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
Russian Federation
Serbia	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	NO	NO	Y/N	...	NO	...
Spain
Sweden	NO	YES	...	NO	NO	...
Switzerland	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Turkey	YES	YES	NO	...
Ukraine	NO	NO	...	NO	NO	...	NO	...
UK: England & Wales	NO	NO	...	Y/N	Y/N	YES	NO	...
UK: Northern Ireland	Y/N	NO	Y/N	...	NO	...
UK: Scotland	Y/N	NO	...	NO	NO	...	NO	...
Total "YES"	21	14	6	5	2	3	13	4
Total "NO"	10	17	10	5	7	2	19	3
Total "Y/N"	3	4	2	2	3	0	1	2
Total "..."	12	11	28	34	34	41	13	37
% "YES"	46%	30%	13%	11%	4%	7%	28%	9%
% "NO"	22%	37%	22%	11%	15%	4%	41%	7%
% "Y/N"	7%	9%	4%	4%	7%	0%	2%	4%
% "..."	26%	24%	61%	74%	74%	89%	28%	80%

Table 2. Standard definitions followed in all respects on convictions level (part 3)

	Forgery of documents	Money laundering	Corruption in the public sector	Drug offences total	Drug trafficking
Albania	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Armenia	...	YES	YES	NO	NO
Austria	NO	YES	YES	NO	Y/N
Azerbaijan	NO	NO	...
Belgium	YES	YES	YES	NO	...
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Bulgaria	...	YES	NO	NO	...
Croatia	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Cyprus
Czech Republic	NO	YES	...	NO	NO
Denmark	YES	...	NO	NO	YES
Estonia	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES
Finland	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
France	NO	...	YES	YES	NO
Georgia	YES	...	NO	NO	YES
Germany	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Greece
Hungary	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Iceland
Ireland
Italy	Y/N	YES	...	NO	...
Kosovo (UN R/1244/99)
Latvia	NO	...
Lithuania	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES
Luxembourg	Y/N	Y/N
Malta
Moldova	...	NO	NO	NO	...
Montenegro	Y/N	Y/N
Netherlands	YES	YES	YES	NO	...
North Macedonia	YES	YES
Norway	Y/N	...
Poland	YES	Y/N	YES	NO	NO
Portugal	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
Romania	Y/N	YES	YES	YES	NO
Russian Federation
Serbia	YES	YES	YES	YES	Y/N
Slovak Republic
Slovenia	...	NO	NO	NO	Y/N
Spain
Sweden	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
Switzerland	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
Turkey	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Ukraine	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
UK: England & Wales	Y/N	Y/N	...	Y/N	Y/N
UK: Northern Ireland	YES	...
UK: Scotland	...	NO	YES	NO	...
Total "YES"	11	19	13	7	8
Total "NO"	11	7	15	24	11
Total "Y/N"	4	3	0	3	5
Total "..."	20	17	18	12	22
% "YES"	24%	41%	28%	15%	17%
% "NO"	24%	15%	33%	52%	24%
% "Y/N"	9%	7%	0%	7%	11%
% "..."	43%	37%	39%	26%	48%

1.1 Total criminal offences

In principle, all offences subject to criminal proceedings should be *included*. This rule is, however, not trivial: There are some countries which follow a minor offence concept either excluding such offences from the criminal code (for example the ‘wykroczenia’ in Poland in cases of minor thefts etc.) or making them subject to special proceedings (for example most ‘contraventions’ in France which are handled by the police only) outside the criminal justice system. Sometimes they are recorded in police statistics, sometimes not.

Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Minor theft and other minor property offences
- Minor assault and other minor violent offences
- Criminal offences committed by minors
- Crimes according to a military penal code
- Major road traffic offences
- All other criminal offences subject to criminal proceedings

They *exclude*:

- All traffic offences subject to proceedings outside the criminal justice system
- All traffic offences sanctioned by fines issued automatically by a technical system
- Administrative offences subject to proceedings outside the criminal justice system
- Minor offences subject to proceedings outside the criminal justice system

This means that the providers of the data (= national correspondents) were requested to ensure that “their” figures *included*, where available from their national statistics, “minor theft”, “minor assault”, etc.

1.1.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

The following countries *exclude minor theft and other minor property offences* from their data:

- Azerbaijan
- Cyprus (police level)
- Czech Republic (police level)
- Estonia
- Lithuania
- Poland
- Ukraine

Regarding *minor assault and other minor violent offences*, the following countries *exclude* this offence category from the total:

- Azerbaijan
- Cyprus (police level)
- Czech Republic (conviction level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Poland
- Spain (police level)
- Ukraine

Criminal offences committed by minors are excluded in:

- Belgium (conviction level)
- Lithuania
- Poland (conviction level, except for most serious offences)

Crimes according to a military penal code are excluded in:

- Bulgaria
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic (conviction level)
- Estonia
- Greece (police level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Italy
- Lithuania
- Montenegro (police level)
- North Macedonia
- Poland
- Serbia
- Slovenia (conviction level)
- Spain (police level)
- Sweden
- Switzerland (police level)
- Ukraine

Major road traffic offences are only *excluded* in:

- Denmark (police level)
- France (police level)
- Germany (police level)
- Slovenia (police level)
- Switzerland (police level)

Regarding *all other criminal offences subject to criminal proceedings*, these are – in general (except for Germany and Slovenia on police level) – *included* in the police and conviction statistics of all countries. There are – however – some specific offence categories which are *excluded* sometimes.

For example, in Bulgaria police statistics *exclude* all crimes against the Republic of Bulgaria (treason, espionage, etc.), crimes against the country's defence capacity, military crimes, crimes against peace and humanity, and crimes committed abroad. In Germany, tax, and customs offences as well as offences against the security of the state (like treason, terrorism, etc.) and international crimes are *excluded*. Such exceptions will exist in many countries.

1.1.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

All traffic offences subject to proceedings outside the criminal justice system are included in:

- Spain (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)
- UK: England & Wales (conviction level)
- UK: Northern Ireland (conviction level)

In the following countries, *traffic offences sanctioned by fines issued automatically by a technical system* are *included*:

- Iceland (police level)
- Latvia
- Spain (police level)
- UK: England & Wales
- UK: Northern Ireland (conviction level)

Administrative offences subject to proceedings outside the criminal justice system are included in:

- Finland
- Latvia
- Spain (police level)

Other minor offences subject to proceedings outside the criminal justice system are included in:

- Armenia (police level)
- Finland
- Latvia

1.2 Major road traffic offences

The definition of major road traffic offences has been revised for the 6th edition. Whereas previously only severe road traffic offences were *included*, it is now sufficient that the respective offences are prosecuted as *criminal* offences. The data for major road traffic offences in the 6th edition *will therefore not* be comparable with data provided in the 5th edition.

According to the standard definition, major road traffic offences mean road traffic offences subject to criminal proceedings. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Negligent homicide and negligent injury in road traffic
- Dangerous / reckless driving
- (i.e.: driving in a way that falls far below what would be expected of a competent and careful driver and is obviously endangering life or health of another person or leads to the danger of serious damage to property)
- Seriously endangering road traffic in other ways
- (e.g., removing traffic signs, building obstacles, throwing objects onto the motorway)
- Driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol
- All other traffic offences subject to criminal proceedings

They *exclude*:

- Offences committed outside road traffic (e.g., involving trains, airplanes, ships, or boats)
- All traffic offences subject to proceedings outside the criminal justice system

1.2.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

The following countries *exclude negligent homicide and negligent injury in road traffic*:

- Cyprus
- France (conviction level)
- Romania
- Spain (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)
- UK: England & Wales (conviction level)

Dangerous or reckless driving is excluded in:

- Albania (police level)
- Armenia
- Austria (police level)
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Georgia
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Italy (police level)
- Lithuania
- Ukraine

In these countries *seriously endangering road traffic in other ways is excluded*:

- Armenia
- Austria (police level)
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Italy (police level)
- Moldova
- Poland
- Portugal (police level)
- Slovenia (conviction level)
- UK: England & Wales (conviction level)
- UK: Northern Ireland (police level)

Driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol is excluded in:

- Armenia
- Austria (police level)
- Denmark (police level)
- Italy (police level)
- Slovenia (conviction level)
- Ukraine
- UK: England & Wales
- UK: Northern Ireland (police level)

The following countries *exclude all other traffic offences subject to criminal proceedings:*

- Denmark (police level)
- France (conviction level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Italy (police level)
- Portugal (police level)

1.2.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Offences committed outside road traffic are included in:

- Azerbaijan
- Bulgaria
- Germany (conviction level)
- Hungary (police level)
- Moldova (conviction level)
- North Macedonia (police level)
- Serbia (police level)
- Switzerland (conviction level)
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine

The following countries *include all traffic offences subject to proceedings outside the criminal justice system* in their data:

- Germany (conviction level)
- UK: England & Wales (conviction level)

1.3 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
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Assistance with suicide
- Abortion
- Negligent killing
- War crimes, genocide, crimes against humanity

1.3.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

The following countries *exclude assault leading to death*:⁵¹

- Armenia
- Azerbaijan
- Belgium (police level)
- Bulgaria
- Czech Republic
- France (conviction level)
- Hungary
- Latvia
- Netherlands
- Portugal (conviction level)
- Romania
- Slovenia
- Spain (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine

⁵¹ As could be expected, many of these countries on the other hand *include* assault leading to death in bodily injury data.

These countries *exclude* cases of *enthanasia*:

- Azerbaijan
- Belgium
- Moldova (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- North Macedonia (police level)
- Romania
- Serbia (police level)
- Switzerland
- UK: England & Wales

Infanticide is *excluded* in:

- Azerbaijan
- Moldova
- Romania
- Slovenia

Finally, *attempts* are *excluded* in:

- Estonia
- Georgia
- Moldova
- Portugal (police level)
- Slovenia (conviction level)
- UK: England & Wales (police level)

1.3.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Assistance with suicide is *included* only in:

- Estonia
- Hungary
- Montenegro (police level)
- Switzerland (police level)
- UK: England & Wales (police level)
- UK: Scotland (police level)

Only four countries *include abortion*:

- Estonia
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Netherlands

Some countries even *include negligent killings*:

- Estonia
- Montenegro (police level)
- UK: England & Wales
- UK: Scotland (police level)

A number of countries *include war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity*:

- Albania
- Estonia (police level)
- France
- Slovenia (conviction level)
- UK: England & Wales (police level)
- UK: Scotland (police level)

1.4 Bodily injury

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

- Minor bodily injury
- Aggravated bodily injury
- Bodily injury of a public servant/official
- Bodily injury in a domestic dispute
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Assault leading to death
- Threats
- Assault only causing pain (e.g., slapping)
- Sexual assault
- Negligent bodily injury

1.4.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

The following countries *exclude minor bodily injury*:

- Czech Republic
- France (police level)
- Moldova
- Poland
- Switzerland (conviction level)
- Turkey (conviction level)

- Ukraine

Only Turkey on conviction level could not *include aggravated bodily injury*.

Bodily injury of a public servant is excluded in:

- Albania
- Armenia
- Hungary (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Portugal
- Romania
- Serbia (police level)
- Spain (police level)
- Sweden (conviction level)
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine

Bodily injury in a domestic dispute is excluded in:

- Moldova (conviction level)
- Romania
- Serbia
- Turkey (conviction level)

Attempts are excluded in:

- Moldova
- Montenegro (police level)
- Norway (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)

1.4.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

*Assault leading to death is included in the following countries:*⁵²

- Armenia
- Belgium
- Czech Republic
- France (conviction level)
- Greece (police level)

⁵² As could be expected, many of these countries on the other hand *exclude* assault leading to death from homicide data.

- Hungary
- Iceland (police level)
- Latvia
- Netherlands
- Portugal (conviction level)
- Slovenia (police level)
- Switzerland
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine

Threats are only *included* in:

- Georgia (police level)
- Norway (police level)
- UK: England & Wales (conviction level)

Assault only causing pain is *included* in these countries:

- Albania
- Belgium
- Denmark
- Finland
- Greece (police level)
- Netherlands
- Portugal
- Romania
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Turkey (conviction level)
- UK: Scotland

Sexual assault is only *included* in Greece and Norway (both on police level).

The following countries even *include negligent bodily injury*:

- Hungary (conviction level)
- UK: Scotland

1.5 Aggravated bodily injury

According to the standard definition, *aggravated bodily injury* means *inflicting serious (e.g., life-threatening or disabling) bodily injury to another person with intent, or under aggravated circumstances (use of weapons, or on a vulnerable victim)*. Cases of aggravated bodily are counted under the total of bodily injury as well. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Serious and lasting (i.e., disabling) bodily injury
- Life-threatening bodily injury
- Use of weapons (dangerous objects)
- Particularly vulnerable victims
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Assault leading to death
- Mere threats
- Sexual assault
- Negligent bodily injury

1.5.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

All countries are able to *include serious and lasting bodily injury and life-threatening bodily injury*.

Use of weapons (dangerous objects) is *excluded* only in:

- Albania
- Lithuania
- Switzerland
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine
- UK: England & Wales (police level)

Particularly vulnerable victims are *excluded* in the statistics of:

- Finland
- Germany
- Lithuania
- Switzerland
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine
- UK: England & Wales (police level)

Attempts are only *excluded* in:

- Montenegro (police level)
- Norway (police level)
- Portugal (police level)
- UK: England & Wales (police level)
- UK: Scotland

1.5.2 *Countries deviating from exclude rules:*

Assault leading to death is *included* in the data for the following countries:

- Albania
- Armenia
- Czech Republic (conviction level)
- France (conviction level)
- Hungary
- Iceland (police level)
- Latvia
- Netherlands (conviction level)
- Norway (police level)
- Portugal (conviction level)
- Slovenia (police level)
- Switzerland
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine

All countries are able to *exclude mere threats and sexual assault* except from Norway on police level.

The following countries even *include negligent bodily injury*:

- Bulgaria
- Norway (police level)
- Portugal (police level)

1.6 Sexual assault

The new standard definition for *sexual assault* is *physical sexual contact with a person against her/ his will or with a person who cannot validly consent to sexual acts*. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Any sexual acts committed with violence or threat of violence
- Any sexual acts committed with abuse of authority or undue pressure
- Any sexual acts committed against a helpless person

- Any sexual acts committed against a marital partner against her/his will
- Acts considered as rape
- Acts considered as physical sexual abuse of a child
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Any verbal or any other form of non-physical molestation
- Pornography
- Pimping
- Buying / offering paid sex
- Exhibitionism

1.6.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

Acts considered as rape are excluded in UK: England & Wales on conviction level.

Acts considered as physical sexual abuse of a child are excluded in Moldova on police level.

Moldova also *excludes attempts*.

Otherwise, all reporting countries could fully meet the *include* rules.

1.6.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Some countries actually report data based on a wider concept and thus *include verbal or any other form of non-physical molestation*:

- Albania (police level)
- France (police level)
- Netherlands
- Portugal
- Sweden
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine

Pornography is only *included* in:

- Albania
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Spain (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)

The following countries *include pimping*:

- Bulgaria
- Finland
- France (conviction level)
- Hungary
- Spain (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)

The list of countries which *include buying / offering paid sex* is shorter, but somewhat identical:

- Finland
- Spain (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)

Exhibitionism is also only *included* in countries which seem to follow a very wide concept of sexual assault:

- France (conviction level)
- Hungary
- Portugal
- Turkey (conviction level)

1.7 Rape

The definition of rape has been significantly extended compared to the 5th edition, in line with ongoing trends towards a legal model of rape centring around consent and the ability to give it. From this edition on, seemingly ‘consensual’ sexual acts are considered as rape if they are committed on/with persons unable to give their consent (like minors, severely intoxicated persons, etc.). Only for sexual acts *between minors*, some exceptions have been made from this general rule. Hence, rape data in the 6th edition *will not be comparable* to the data of the 5th edition.

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*:

- Penetration other than vaginal (e.g., buggery)
- Violent intra-marital sexual intercourse
- Sexual intercourse without force with a helpless person
- Sexual intercourse of an adult with a child or any other person who cannot validly consent
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Sexual intercourse between children, if factually consented by both partners
- Sexual intercourse between a child and a juvenile, if factually consented by both partners and the age difference is not larger than three years

1.7.1 *Countries deviating from include rules:*

Penetration other than vaginal is *excluded* from statistics on rape in:

- Moldova
- Switzerland
- Ukraine

Violent intra-marital intercourse is *included* by all countries.

Sexual intercourse without force with a helpless person is *excluded* in the following countries:

- Netherlands
- Serbia (police level)
- Slovenia (conviction level)
- Spain (police level)
- Switzerland

Sexual intercourse of an adult with a child or any other person who cannot validly consent is *excluded* in:

- Austria
- Estonia
- Germany (conviction level)
- Netherlands
- Portugal
- Serbia (police level)

Just two countries *exclude* attempts:

- Moldova
- Portugal (police level)
- Serbia (police level)

1.7.2 *Countries deviating from exclude rules:*

Sexual intercourse between children, if factually consented by both partners is *included* in:

- Albania (police level)
- Armenia

- Denmark
- Latvia
- Montenegro (police level)
- Spain (police level)
- UK: England & Wales (police level)

Sexual intercourse between a child and a juvenile (age difference max. 3 years) is included in the rape statistics of:

- Albania (police level)
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Denmark
- Georgia
- Hungary
- Latvia
- Montenegro (police level)
- Spain (police level)

1.8 Sexual abuse of a child

As a consequence of the extension of the definition of rape, sexual intercourse with a child is now always considered rape (see above) and was accordingly *excluded* here. The exceptions for certain sexual activities *between minors* are similar to the ones for rape. The data will not be comparable with the previous editions.

According to the standard definition, *any form of physical sexual contact of a person above the age of sexual consent with a person below the age of sexual consent, except of sexual intercourse* (because the latter falls under the category of rape). Where possible, the figures *include:*

- Any form of physical sexual contact not amounting to (statutory) rape
- Attempts

They *exclude:*

- Verbal or any other form of non-physical molestation
- Child pornography
- Acts considered as rape
- Sexual intercourse between children, if factually consented by both partners
- Sexual intercourse between a child and a juvenile, if factually consented by both partners and the age difference is not larger than three years

1.8.1 Age of consent

Table 3. Age of consent for sexual abuse of a child by country⁵³.

14	15	16	17	18
Albania ⁵⁴	Czech Republic	Armenia	Cyprus	France
Austria	Denmark	Belgium	Ireland	Turkey
Croatia ⁵⁵	Greece	Finland		
Estonia	Iceland	Lithuania		
Germany	Poland	Netherlands		
Hungary	Slovak Republic	North Macedonia		
Italy ⁵⁶	Slovenia	Norway		
Portugal	Sweden	Switzerland		
Serbia		UK: England & Wales		
Slovenia		UK: Northern Ireland		
Ukraine		UK: Scotland		

Table 3 above shows the age of consent, i.e., the age under which a minor cannot validly consent to have sexual contacts, for the responding countries.

Romania reported a differentiated approach, in which for some offences the age of consent is 13, but for other 15 or even 18 years.

1.8.2 Countries deviating from include rules:

All countries are able to *include any form of sexual contact not amounting to (statutory) rape* in their data.

Attempts are only *excluded* in Montenegro, Moldova, and Norway (police level).

1.8.3 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Verbal or any other form of non-physical molestation of persons under the age of consent is *included* in the following countries:

- Albania (police level)
- Moldova (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Poland
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Ukraine

⁵³ Ireland, Poland, Russian Federation, Slovak Republic, and Sweden didn't update the age of consent. Age is taken from the previous edition.

⁵⁴ For women minors the age of consent varies depending on when they reach sexual maturity.

⁵⁵ The age of consent is 14 if the partner is not more than three years older.

⁵⁶ The age of consent in Italy is 13 if the partner is not more than three years older.

Child pornography is included only in:

- Albania (police level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Switzerland

Acts considered as rape are included in:

- Bulgaria
- France
- Germany (conviction level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Moldova (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Portugal (conviction level)
- Spain (police level)
- Switzerland
- UK: England & Wales (conviction level)

Sexual intercourse between children, if factually consented by both partners is included in:

- Czech Republic (police level)
- Denmark
- France (police level)
- Germany (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Netherlands (conviction level)

Sexual intercourse between a child and a juvenile (age difference max. 3 years) is included in the rape statistics of:

- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Germany
- Hungary
- Montenegro (police level)
- Netherlands (conviction level)
- Portugal (conviction level)
- Ukraine

1.9 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-snatchings)
- Theft immediately followed by force or threat of force used to keep hold of the stolen goods
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Pick-pocketing
- Extortion
- Blackmailing
- Theft with force against property only

1.9.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

Countries *excluding muggings* are:

- Lithuania
- Poland
- Slovenia
- Sweden

Only two countries *exclude theft immediately followed by force or threat of force used to keep hold of the stolen goods*:

- Czech Republic
- UK: Scotland (police level)

Attempts are only *excluded* in Moldova and Montenegro (police level).

1.9.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Pickpocketing is only *included* in:

- Albania (police level)
- Cyprus (conviction level)
- UK: England & Wales (conviction level)

Extortion is only *included* in:

- Belgium (police level)
- Cyprus (police level)
- UK: England & Wales (conviction level)

Blackmailing is included in:

- Albania (conviction statistics)
- Cyprus (police statistics)
- UK: England & Montenegro (conviction statistics)

Theft with force against property only is included in:

- Albania
- Azerbaijan
- Cyprus (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Ukraine

1.10 Theft

According to the standard definition, *theft* means *depriving a person or organization of property with the intent to keep it*. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Minor (e.g., small value) theft
- Theft committed by means of burglary (i.e., by breaking and entering)
- Theft of motor vehicles
- Theft by employees
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Robbery
- Fraud
- Receiving/handling stolen goods

1.10.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

Minor (e.g., small value) theft is excluded in:

- Azerbaijan
- Cyprus (police level; threshold value: 1000 €)
- Estonia (only *excluded* for the first and second offence of an offender; threshold value: 64 € before 2014)
- Georgia (conviction level; threshold value: 20 €)
- Montenegro (police level; threshold value: 150 €)
- Poland (threshold value: 100 €)
- Serbia (no threshold provided)
- Switzerland (conviction level; no threshold provided)
- Ukraine (threshold value: 6 €)

Only Armenia, Montenegro, and Norway (each on police level) *exclude theft committed by means of burglary*.

Theft of motor vehicles is *excluded* in:

- Moldova (conviction level)
- Slovenia (conviction level)
- Ukraine

Apart from that, Estonia *excludes joyriding* with respect to the total of *theft*, while it is *included* in the subcategory *theft of a motor vehicle*.

Theft by employees is *excluded* in:

- Montenegro (police level)
- Norway (police level)
- Romania
- Slovenia (conviction level)
- Switzerland

Attempts are *excluded* in:

- Armenia
- Estonia
- Greece (police level)
- Italy
- Moldova
- Montenegro (police level)
- Norway (police level)
- Slovenia (conviction level)
- Spain (police level)
- UK: Northern Ireland
- UK: Scotland

1.10.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Robbery is *excluded* in every country.

Fraud is *included* in UK: Northern Ireland (conviction level) and UK: Scotland.

Only France (conviction level) and UK: England & Wales *includes receiving/handling stolen goods*.

1.11 Aggravated theft

According to the standard definition, *aggravated theft* means *theft under aggravating circumstances concerning the modus operandi or the kind of victim/ property stolen*. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- theft committed by means of burglary (i.e., by breaking and entering)
- all other cases of theft with force against property (e.g., breaking of a safe)
- theft using false or skeleton keys
- theft of motor vehicles
- theft against vulnerable persons
- theft of weapons
- theft of items of increased cultural or religious value
- attempts

They *exclude*:

- Robbery
- Fraud
- Receiving/handling stolen goods

1.11.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

The following countries *exclude theft committed by means of burglary*:

- Albania
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Norway (police level)

All other cases of theft with force against property is *excluded* in:

- Albania
- Denmark
- Hungary (conviction level)

Theft using false or skeleton keys is *excluded* in:

- Albania
- Armenia (police level)
- Denmark
- Hungary (conviction level)

Theft of motor vehicles is *excluded* in the statistics of:

- Albania
- Armenia (police level)
- Greece (police level)

- Hungary (conviction level)
- Moldova
- Netherlands (conviction level)
- Romania (conviction level)
- Spain (police level)

The following countries *exclude theft against vulnerable persons*:

- Albania
- Armenia (police level)
- Bulgaria
- Denmark
- Greece (police level)
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Moldova
- Montenegro (police level)
- Netherlands (conviction level)
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania (conviction level)

Theft of weapons is excluded in:

- Albania
- Armenia (police level)
- Greece (police level)
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Moldova
- Netherlands (conviction level)
- Poland
- Portugal (police level)
- Romania (conviction level)

Theft of items of increased cultural or religious value is excluded in:

- Albania
- Bulgaria
- Denmark
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Netherlands (conviction level)
- Poland

Attempts are only *excluded* in:

- Albania
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Moldova
- Montenegro (police level)

1.11.2 *Countries deviating from exclude rules:*

Robbery, fraud, and receiving/ handling stolen goods are only *included* in:

- Belgium (conviction level)
- Slovenia (police level)

1.12 Theft of a motor vehicle

According to the standard definition, *theft of a motor vehicle* means *depriving a person or organization of a motor vehicle with the intent to keep it or to use it*. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Joyriding
- Theft of trucks / lorries
- Theft of motorcycles
- Theft of motorboats
- Theft of a motor vehicle using force against the vehicle or other property
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Theft of motor vehicle parts
- Robbery of a motor vehicle
- Receiving/handling a stolen vehicle

1.12.1 *Countries deviating from include rules:*

The following countries *exclude joyriding*:

- Albania (police level)
- Czech Republic (police level)
- Greece (police level)
- Moldova (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Netherlands (police level)
- Romania (police level)
- Serbia (conviction level)
- Slovenia (police level)

- Spain (police level)
- Turkey (police level)
- Ukraine

Theft of trucks / lorries is only *excluded* in Poland on police level and in Serbia on conviction level and *theft of motorcycles* additionally in Moldova (police level).

Theft of motorboats is *excluded* in these countries:

- Austria (police level)
- Belgium (police level)
- Bulgaria
- Estonia (police level)
- Netherlands (police level)
- Poland (police level)
- Portugal (police level)
- Serbia (conviction level)
- UK: Northern Ireland (police level)
- UK: Scotland

Only two countries *exclude theft of a motor vehicle using force against the vehicle or other property*:

- Montenegro (police level)
- Serbia (conviction level)

Attempts are *excluded* in:

- Montenegro (police level)
- Portugal (police level)
- Serbia (conviction level)
- UK: Northern Ireland (police level)

1.12.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Theft of motor vehicle parts is *included* in:

- France (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Spain (police level)
- Sweden

Robbery is only *included* in the following countries:

- Belgium (police level)
- Bulgaria
- France (police level)

Receiving and handling a stolen vehicle is included in France (police level).

1.13 Theft by means of burglary

According to the standard definition, *burglary* means *theft from a closed part of a building or other premises after gaining access to it against the owners' will (e.g., by use of force against an object)*. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Domestic burglary
- Theft from a factory, shop, office, etc.
- Theft from a military establishment
- Theft by using false keys
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Theft from a motor vehicle
- Theft from a container
- Theft from a vending machine
- Theft from a parking meter
- Theft from a fenced meadow/compound

1.13.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

Theft by means of domestic burglary was only excluded in Serbia (police level).

All countries are able to *include theft from a factory, shop, office, etc.*

Only three countries *exclude theft from a military establishment*:

- Albania (police level)
- Armenia (police level)
- Belgium (police level)
- Georgia (police level)

Theft by using false keys is excluded in:

- Armenia (police level)
- Bulgaria (police level)
- France (police level)
- UK: Scotland

Attempts are excluded in Armenia and Moldova on police level.

1.13.2 *Countries deviating from exclude rules:*

Theft from a motor vehicle is included in:

- Austria
- Croatia
- Czech Republic (police level)
- Germany (conviction level)
- Greece (police level)
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Poland
- Slovenia (police level)

The following countries *include theft from a container:*

- Austria
- Croatia
- Czech Republic (police level)
- Greece (police level)
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Poland
- Slovenia (police level)
- Spain (police level)
- Sweden (police level)
- Ukraine (conviction level)

The group of countries including *theft from a vending machine* is almost identical:

- Austria
- Croatia
- Czech Republic (police level)
- Greece (police level)
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Poland
- Slovenia (police level)
- Sweden (police level)

Again, almost the same group of countries includes *theft from a parking meter*:

- Austria
- Croatia
- Czech Republic (police level)
- Greece (police level)
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Poland
- Slovenia (police level)
- Sweden (police level)

Finally, *theft from a fenced meadow / compound* is included in the statistics of:

- Austria
- Croatia
- Czech Republic (police level)
- Greece (police level)
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Lithuania (police level)
- Poland
- Sweden (police level)
- Ukraine (conviction level)

1.14 Theft by means of domestic burglary

According to the standard definition, domestic burglary means theft from closed private premises after gaining access to them against the owner's will (e.g., by use of force against an object). Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Theft from an attic or basement in a multi-dwelling building
- Theft from a secondary residence (even if unoccupied)
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Theft from a factory, shop, office, etc.
- Theft from a detached garage, shed, barn or stable
- Theft from a fenced meadow/compound

1.14.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

Theft from an attic or basement in a multi-dwelling building is excluded in:

- Finland (police level)
- France (police level)
- Germany (conviction level)

Theft from a secondary residence (even if unoccupied) and attempts are included everywhere.

1.14.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

These countries *include theft from a factory, shop, office, etc.:*

- Bulgaria (police level)
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Poland (police level)

Theft from a detached shed, barn or stable is included for the following countries:

- Bulgaria (police level)
- Georgia (police level)
- Hungary (conviction level)
- North Macedonia (police level)
- Poland (police level)
- Serbia (police level)
- Spain (police level)

Theft from a fenced meadow / compound is included in the statistics of:

- Hungary (conviction level)
- Poland (police level)

1.15 Fraud

According to the standard definition, *fraud means deceiving someone or taking advantage of someone's error with the intent to unlawfully gain financial benefits, thereby causing the deceived person to enter any operation that will be damaging to his or a third person's financial interests.*

Where possible, the figures *include:*

- Cyber fraud (i.e., fraud committed by means of computer-mediated communication, e.g., via the internet)
- Attempts

They *exclude:*

- Receiving / handling stolen property
- Forgery of documents, passports etc.

- Tax and customs offences
- Subsidy fraud
- Fraud involving welfare payments
- Money laundering
- Forgery of money / payment instruments
- Consuming goods or services
- Breaching of trust / embezzlement

1.15.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

Cyber fraud is excluded in:

- Georgia
- Hungary
- Moldova (conviction level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Romania

Attempts are excluded in:

- Azerbaijan
- Georgia
- Moldova
- Montenegro (police level)
- Slovenia (conviction level)
- Sweden

1.15.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Azerbaijan, Montenegro (police level) and Turkey (conviction level) are the only countries to *include receiving / handling stolen goods*.

Forgery of documents, passports etc. is included in:

- Turkey (conviction level)
- UK: England & Wales (conviction level)
- UK: Northern Ireland (police level)

The following countries *include tax and customs offences*:

- Azerbaijan
- Turkey (conviction level)
- UK: Northern Ireland

A considerably large number of countries *include subsidy fraud*:

- Albania
- Armenia
- Azerbaijan
- Cyprus (police level)
- France (police level)
- Greece (police level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Poland
- Switzerland (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine
- UK: England & Wales
- UK: Northern Ireland
- UK: Scotland

Even more countries *include fraud involving welfare payments*:

- Albania
- Armenia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Cyprus (police level)
- France (police level)
- Greece (police level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Switzerland
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine
- UK: England & Wales
- UK: Northern Ireland (conviction level)
- UK: Scotland

Money laundering is only *included* in:

- Turkey (conviction level)

Forgery of money / payment instruments is *included* in the statistics of:

- Switzerland
- Turkey (conviction level)

- UK: England & Wales (conviction level)
- UK: Northern Ireland (police level)

The following countries follow a rather broad concept of deception, thus *including consumption of goods and services* in their fraud data:

- Czech Republic
- France (police level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Poland
- Spain (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)
- UK: Scotland

Breaching of trust / embezzlement is included in:

- Albania
- Azerbaijan
- France (police level)
- Georgia
- Poland
- Spain (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)

1.16 Cyber fraud

According to the standard definition, *cyber fraud* means *fraud committed by means of computer-mediated communication, e.g., via the internet*. Where possible, the figures include:

- online banking fraud (e.g., by phishing)
- online shopping fraud (e.g., by phishing, by selling goods without the intent of delivery, or by buying goods without the intent to pay for them)
- fraud by unauthorized online use of payment instruments (e.g., credit card or debit card data, PayPal or other payment accounts, Bitcoin)
- other forms of fraud committed via the internet
- fraud committed in other data networks (e.g., on an intranet or peer-to-peer network)
- attempts

They *exclude*:

- other cybercrimes
- fraud by unauthorized use of credit or debit cards at automated teller machines (ATM)

- fraud by unauthorized use of credit or debit cards at point of sale (POS) terminals (i.e.: electronic payment at retail locations)
- fraud by unauthorized offline use of payment instruments

1.16.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

Online banking fraud is included everywhere.

Online shopping fraud is only excluded in:

- Hungary (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)

Only three countries exclude fraud by unauthorized online use of payment:

- Hungary (conviction level)
- Portugal
- Romania

Other forms of fraud committed via the internet are only excluded in Portugal.

Germany (police statistics) is the only country to exclude fraud committed in other data networks.

Attempts are excluded in Sweden (police level) only.

1.16.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Other cybercrimes are included in:

- Czech Republic (police level)
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Slovenia (police level)
- Sweden (police level)

Albania and Slovenia (police level) are the only countries to include fraud by unauthorized use of credit or debit cards at automated teller machines and fraud by unauthorized use of credit or debit cards at point-of-sale terminals.

Only two countries include fraud by unauthorized offline use of payment instruments:

- Slovenia (police level)
- Sweden (police level)

1.17 Forgery of documents

According to the standard definition, *forger of documents* means *creation or use of a false⁵⁷ document or tampering of a genuine document with the intent to deceive*. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- forgery or use of passports and identity cards
- forgery or use of certificates
- forgery or use of contracts
- forgery or use of physical documents with the aid of a computer system
- attempts

They *exclude*:

- forgery or use of money or payment instruments
- forgery or use of electronic (i.e.: virtual, non-physical) documents
- preparatory offences to forgery (e.g., purchase of a computer program or copier in order to use it for forgery)
- mere written lies (untrue information in an original document)
- fraud

1.17.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

Cyprus (police level) is the only country to *exclude forgery or use of passports and identity cards and forgery or use of certificates*.

Two countries *exclude* forgery or use of contracts:

- Cyprus (police level)
- Czech Republic

Again, Cyprus (police level) is the only country to *exclude forgery or use of physical documents with the aid of a computer system*.

Attempts are *excluded* in the statistics of:

- Cyprus (police level)
- Moldova (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Sweden (police level)

⁵⁷ For the purpose of this definition, a document is only to be considered “false” if it seems to stem from a person or institution that actually has not created it and has also not authorized the contents. As an example, take a certificate that looks as if it was issued by a school, yet it was created by the student him- or herself to create the impression of better grades than actually achieved.

1.17.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Forgery or use of money or payment instruments is included in:

- Spain (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)

The following countries include forgery or use of electronic documents:

- Austria
- Croatia
- Czech Republic
- Estonia
- France (conviction level)
- Greece (police level)
- Moldova (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Portugal
- Spain (police level)
- Sweden
- Turkey (conviction level)

Preparatory offences to forgery are included in:

- Hungary
- Montenegro (police level)
- Spain (police level)
- Sweden
- Turkey (conviction level)

Mere written lies are included in:

- Albania
- Croatia
- France (conviction level)
- Hungary (police level)
- Lithuania
- Moldova (police level)
- Spain (police level)
- Sweden
- Turkey (conviction level)

Only one country includes fraud:

- Turkey

1.18 Money laundering

According to the standard definition, *money laundering* means *specific financial transactions to conceal the identity, source, and/or destination of money or non-monetary property deriving from criminal activities*. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Receiving and handling illegally obtained (but not stolen) non-monetary property
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Receiving / handling stolen property
- Violations of the ‘know-your-customer’ rule (i.e., negligence in identification of customer’s identity or origin of funds)

1.18.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

Receiving and handling illegally obtained (but not stolen) non-monetary property is only *excluded* in:

- Switzerland

Only two countries *exclude* attempts:

- Cyprus (police level)
- Slovenia (conviction statistics)
- UK: Scotland (conviction level)

1.18.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Receiving / handling stolen property is *included* in:

- Albania
- Belgium
- Cyprus (police level)
- Moldova
- Montenegro (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)

Four countries *include* violations of the ‘know-your-customer’ rule:

- Cyprus (police level)
- Hungary
- Sweden (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)

1.19 Corruption in the public sector

According to the standard definition, *corruption* means *offering or accepting financial or any other advantage in exchange of favourable treatment by public officials*. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Active and passive corruption
- Instigation to corruption
- Complicity
- Corruption of domestic officials
- Corruption of foreign officials
- Extortion by public officials
- Offering officials advantages without immediate interest
- (i.e.: in order to get them hooked on receiving gifts)
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Corruption in the private sector
- Extortion (except by public officials)
- Bribery of the electorate

1.19.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

All countries *include* both *active and passive* corruption in their data.

Instigation to corruption is *excluded* in:

- Albania
- Azerbaijan
- Portugal
- Slovenia (conviction level)

These countries *exclude complicity*:

- Portugal
- Slovenia (conviction level)

Corruption of *domestic officials* is *included* everywhere.

Almost all countries are also able to *include* corruption of *foreign* officials. This kind of behaviour is only *excluded* in:

- Greece (police level)
- Portugal

Extortion by public officials is excluded in the following countries:

- Albania
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Finland
- Sweden

Offering officials advantages without immediate interest is excluded in:

- Albania
- Bulgaria
- Greece (police level)

Attempts are excluded in:

- Albania
- Moldova
- Montenegro (police level)
- Slovenia (conviction level)

1.19.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Corruption data for the following countries *include corruption in the private sector*:

- Azerbaijan
- Estonia
- Georgia
- Hungary
- Lithuania
- Montenegro (police level)
- Norway (police level)
- Spain (police level)
- Sweden
- Turkey (conviction level)

Extortion (except by public officials) is excluded everywhere.

Bribery of the electorate is included only for Montenegro (police statistics)

1.20 Drug offences

According to the standard definition, *drug offences* mean *all illicit intentional acts in connection with narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances as defined in the international drug control conventions*.⁵⁸ Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Cultivation
- Production and manufacture
- Extraction and preparation
- Offering and offering for sale
- Distribution
- Purchase
- Sale
- Delivery on any terms whatsoever
- Brokerage
- Dispatch and dispatch in transit
- Transport
- Importation
- Exportation
- Financing of drug operations
- Possession not in connection with personal use
- Possession for personal use (i.e.: possession of small quantities)
- Consumption
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Offences with respect to precursor substances

1.20.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

Almost all countries are able to *include cultivation, production and manufacture, extraction and preparation, distribution, purchase, and delivery on any terms whatsoever in their data*. Only Slovenia excludes purchase and delivery on conviction level.

Offering and offering for sale and sale is *excluded* in Moldova (conviction level only).

Brokerage is *excluded* for:

- Albania
- Moldova

⁵⁸ Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the 1972 protocol, Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971, and Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 1988.

- Ukraine
- UK: Scotland

Dispatch, dispatch in transit, transport, importation, and exportation are again *included* for all countries.

Few countries *exclude* the *financing of drug operations*:

- Austria
- Belgium
- Czech Republic
- Germany (conviction level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Slovenia (conviction level)

Possession not in connection with personal use is only *excluded* in Germany (conviction level) and Georgia.

Possession for personal use / possession of small quantities is *excluded* in:

- Albania
- Croatia
- Czech Republic
- Estonia
- Georgia
- Germany (conviction level)
- Italy
- Netherlands
- Slovenia (police level)

Table 4. Upper limits for possession for personal use

	Cannabis	Heroin	Cocaine	Ecstasy	Ampheta- mines	Other syn- thetic drugs
Armenia	0.5g	0.03g	0.005g	0.05g	0.025g	-
Azerbaijan	0.5g	0.15g	0.02g	0.03g	0.15g	-
Czech Republic	10g	1.5g	1g	4 tablets or 0.4g	2g	different amounts for different sub- stances
Georgia	250g at least 6g (in some Federal States, the limit is higher)	-	-	-	-	-
Germany	prosecutorial discretion	prosecutorial discretion	prosecutorial discretion	prosecutorial discretion	prosecutorial discretion	prosecutorial discretion
Iceland	<i>all included</i>	<i>all included</i>	<i>all included</i>	<i>all included</i>	<i>all included</i>	<i>all included</i>
Italy	0.5g	0.15g	0.75g	0.75g	0.5g	-
Lithuania	5g	0.02g	0.2g	0.2g	0.2g	-
Netherlands	5g	-	-	-	-	-
Portugal	personal use not restricted by the quan- tity	personal use not restricted by the quan- tity	personal use not restricted by the quan- tity	personal use not restricted by the quan- tity	personal use not restricted by the quan- tity	personal use not restricted by the quan- tity
Ukraine	5g (grams)	0.005 g	0.02 g	0.15 g	0.15 g	-

Table 4 shows the upper limits of the “small quantity” for the countries that stated that *possession for personal use* is excluded. Typically, possession for personal use is pragmatically defined via a maximum quantity that may be possessed. However, as the example of *Portugal* shows, this is not necessarily always the case. In *Germany* no clear limits for the small quantities exist for heroin, cocaine, ecstasy, and amphetamines. For cannabis, on the other hand, a more definite limit has been fixed, which is, however, only set down in prosecutorial guidelines that differ between Federal States. *The Netherlands* also has a fixed upper limit for the small quantity of cannabis. Others have such a limit for all common drugs (e.g., *Armenia*, *Czech Republic*). The amounts that make up a “small” quantity differ significantly between countries, e.g., for heroin between 0.03 g (*Armenia*) and 1.5g (*Czech Republic*), which is factor 50, for cannabis even between 0.5 g (*Armenia*, *Azerbaijan*, and *Italy*) and 250 g (*Georgia*) – factor 500.

The following countries *exclude consumption* from their data:

- Albania
- Austria
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Georgia

- Germany
- Lithuania
- Moldova (conviction level)
- Poland
- Portugal
- Slovenia (police level)
- Ukraine
- UK: Scotland

In many of these countries, consumption will not constitute an offence at all.

Attempts are only *excluded* in Georgia, Moldova, and UK: Scotland.

1.20.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

The following countries *include offences with respect to precursor substances*:

- Albania
- Armenia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Belgium (police level)
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus (police level)
- Czech Republic
- Greece (police level)
- Hungary
- Iceland (police level)
- Latvia
- Moldova (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Poland (police level)
- Portugal
- Romania (police level)
- Slovenia (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine

1.21 Drug trafficking

According to the standard definition, *drug trafficking* means *drug offences which are not in connection with personal use*. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Cultivation
- Production and manufacture
- Extraction and preparation
- Offering and offering for sale
- Distribution
- Purchase
- Sale
- Delivery on any terms whatsoever
- Brokerage
- Dispatch and dispatch in transit
- Transport
- Importation
- Exportation
- Financing of drug operations
- Possession
- Attempts

They *exclude*:

- Offences with respect to precursor substances
- Possession for personal use (i.e.: possession of small quantities)
- Consumption

1.21.1 Countries deviating from include rules:

Only Albania, France (conviction level) and Hungary (police level) *exclude cultivation, production, manufacture, extraction, and preparation*.

All countries *include offering, offering for sale*.

Distribution is *excluded* in Albania.

Purchase is again *excluded* in Albania, France, Hungary (police level) and Turkey (conviction level).

Sale is *excluded* in Turkey (conviction level).

Delivery on any terms whatsoever is excluded by:

- Albania
- Poland
- Turkey (conviction level)

Brokerage is excluded by Albania, Moldova (police level) and Ukraine.

Dispatch and dispatch in transit is excluded in Albania.

Transport, importation, and exportation are included everywhere.

Financing of drug operations is excluded in:

- Albania
- Belgium (police level)
- Czech Republic
- Montenegro (police level)

The following countries *exclude* possession:

- Albania
- Belgium (police level)
- Hungary (police level)
- Poland
- Sweden (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)
- UK: England & Wales (police level)

Attempts are only *excluded* in Moldova (police level).

1.21.2 Countries deviating from exclude rules:

Offences with respect to precursor substances are included in:

- Armenia
- Belgium (police level)
- Croatia
- Cyprus (police level)
- Czech Republic
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Poland
- Portugal

- Romania (conviction level)
- Slovenia (police level)
- Turkey (conviction level)
- Ukraine

The following countries *include possession for personal use / possession of small quantities* in drug trafficking data, which makes it dubious for these countries whether the data reported actually refer to trafficking:

- Armenia
- Cyprus (police level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Romania (conviction level)

Finally, there are even countries which state to *include consumption*:

- Croatia
- Cyprus (police level)
- Hungary (conviction level)
- Iceland (police level)
- Montenegro (police level)
- Portugal (conviction level)

1.22 Firearm involved

According to the standard definition *firearm involved* means that *a firearm has been involved in committing the crime, regardless of whether it has been shot, used as a blunt weapon or threat, or just been carried or in any other way been ready to hand*. This definition is used as a subcategory for homicide (completed and total) and robbery. Data were collected on police level only. Where possible, the figures *include*:

- Firearm shot
- Firearm used as a blunt weapon
- Firearm used as a threat
- Firearm carried
- Firearm ready to hand, even if not carried
- (e.g.: lying readily available on a table directly at the crime scene)

They *exclude*:

- Offences involving weapons not considered as firearms
- Offences involving other dangerous objects

There is a separate standard definition used for the *firearm* itself, which is defined as *a weapon that launches a bullet or other projectile (or several at a time), making use of an explosive charge as a propellant, and that can be carried and used by a single person*. Where possible, figures on the involvement of firearm *include*:

- Pistols, revolvers
- Rifles, shotguns
- Sub-machine guns, light, and medium machine guns
- Improvised and special firearms (e.g., pen guns)
- Unloaded firearms carried with ammunition at hand
- Legally owned firearms

They *exclude*:

- Heavy machine guns
- Hand grenades, Molotov cocktails
- Air guns, gas pistols, paintball rifles
- Crossbows, bows and arrows
- Replica firearms and other fakes
- Unloaded firearms carried without ammunition at hand

1.22.1 Deviations from the firearm definition

1.22.1.1 Countries deviating from *include* rules:

Pistols, revolvers, rifles, and shotguns are included everywhere.

Unloaded firearms carried with ammunition and legally owned firearms are excluded in France.

Sub-machine guns, light and medium machine are excluded in:

- Spain

The following countries *exclude manportable grenade launchers*:

- Hungary
- Montenegro
- Sweden

Improvised and special firearms are excluded in:

- France
- Lithuania
- Montenegro

1.22.1.2 Countries deviating from *exclude* rules:

Heavy machine guns are – at least theoretically – *included* in:

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Cyprus
- France
- Poland
- Serbia
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- UK: Northern Ireland

The following countries *include hand grenades*:

- Armenia
- Austria
- France
- Montenegro
- Serbia
- Slovenia
- Spain
- UK: Northern Ireland

Air guns, gas pistols and/or paintball rifles are *included* in:

- Armenia
- Austria
- Cyprus
- France
- Germany (for robbery offences only)⁵⁹
- Montenegro
- Spain
- Sweden
- UK: Northern Ireland

Crossbows, bows, and arrows are – probably only theoretically – *included* in Armenia, France, Spain, and Sweden.

⁵⁹ This means: *Excluded* for homicide offences and homicide and robbery suspects.

The following countries *include replica firearms and other fakes*:

- Armenia
- Germany (for robbery offences only)⁶⁰
- Spain
- Sweden
- UK: Northern Ireland

Unloaded firearms carried without ammunition at hand are included in:

- Armenia
- Austria
- Belgium
- Cyprus
- France
- Germany (for robbery offences only)⁶¹
- Hungary
- Lithuania
- Poland
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden
- UK: Northern Ireland

1.22.2 Deviations from the definition of involvement

1.22.2.1 Countries deviating from *include* rules:

Firearm shot is excluded in Montenegro.

Firearm used as a blunt weapon is excluded in:

- Germany (for homicide offences only)⁶²
- Lithuania
- Montenegro

Firearm used as a threat is excluded in Montenegro only.

⁶⁰ This means: *Excluded* for homicide offences and homicide and robbery suspects.

⁶¹ This means: *Excluded* for homicide offences and homicide and robbery suspects.

⁶² This means: *Included* for robbery offences and homicide and robbery suspects.

The following countries *exclude* firearm carried:

- Germany (for offences only)⁶³
- Hungary
- Lithuania
- Poland

Firearm ready to hand, even if not carried, is excluded from the statistics of:

- Albania
- Armenia
- Germany (for offences only)⁶⁴
- Hungary
- Lithuania
- Montenegro
- Poland

1.22.1.2 Countries deviating from *exclude* rules:

Offences involving weapons not considered as firearms are included in:

- Armenia
- Montenegro
- UK: Northern Ireland

Offences involving other dangerous objects are included in Armenia and UK: Northern Ireland.

2 Young offenders and state reactions to their offending

The following definitions refer to young offenders and the reactions of the state on offences committed by them. Young offenders are minors (persons who have not yet reached the age of adulthood) on the one hand and young adults on the other. The definitions assembled here have an impact on the recording of data on minors and young adults in all sections of this book. In addition, chapters 1 to 4 also feature specific information on minors. This information refers to the inclusion of minors in the reported data and on the relevant age brackets applied. The special metadata provided there should always be read against the backdrop of the overarching results presented here.

⁶³ This means: *Included* for homicide and robbery suspects.

⁶⁴ This means: *Included* for homicide and robbery suspects.

2.1 Age of criminal responsibility

Table 5. Age of criminal responsibility

10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Switzerland	-	Ireland	France	Albania	Czech Republic	Armenia ⁶⁵
UK: England & Wales		Netherlands	Greece	Austria	Denmark	Luxembourg
UK: Northern Ireland		Turkey		Azerbaijan	Finland	Portugal
		UK: Scotland		Bosnia-Herzegovina	Iceland	Ukraine ⁶⁶
				Bulgaria	Norway	
				Croatia	Poland	
				Cyprus	Sweden	
				Estonia		
				Georgia		
				Germany		
				Hungary ⁶⁷		
				Italy		
				Latvia		
				Lithuania		
				Malta		
				Moldova		
				Montenegro		
				North Macedonia		
				Romania		
				Russian Federation		
				Serbia		
				Slovak Republic		
				Slovenia		
				Spain		

Table 5 shows the age of criminal responsibility for minors in the different countries. While there are some countries which apply an early age of criminal responsibility of ten years (Switzerland, UK: England & Wales, UK: Northern Ireland) and there are also a few countries which use a late age of criminal responsibility (16 in Armenia, Luxembourg, Portugal, and Ukraine), in the vast majority of countries minors reach criminal responsibility at the age of 14.

⁶⁵ 14 for specific offences, including homicide, theft, robbery, joyriding, bodily injury, and rape.

⁶⁶ 14 for specific offences, including murder, bodily injury of at least medium severity, rape, robbery, and theft.

⁶⁷ 12 for specific offences, including homicide, voluntary manslaughter, terrorism, robbery, life-threatening bodily injury and plundering, if the perpetrator had the capacity to understand nature/consequences of the act.

2.2 Age of adulthood in penal law

In almost all countries, persons are no longer considered as minors, but as adults when they reach the age of 18. The penal law in some countries, however, uses a lower or a higher age:

- Cyprus: 16
- Poland: 17
- Portugal: 21
- UK: Scotland: 21

2.3 Treatment of young adults

In some countries, it is possible to apply juvenile criminal law on persons which have already reached adulthood before they committed their offences. Where this possibility is available, it is always restricted to *young* adults. Typically, the conditions for young adults are not *identical* to those for minors. One common possibility for this group of offenders is that juvenile criminal law competes against adult criminal law and the court has to decide which law to apply depending on the special characteristics of the offence and the offender. Another possibility is that the criminal law applied for young adults is a kind of intermediate criminal law that is milder than the criminal law for older adults, but also differs from the criminal law applicable for minors.

In the following countries, such specific rules for the treatment of young adults exist. The maximum age below which these rules can be applied is indicated:

- Albania: 21 (only specific rules regarding probation service and prison)
- Austria: 21
- Finland: 21
- Germany: 21
- Greece: 21
- Italy: 21⁶⁸
- Lithuania: 21
- Netherlands: 21
- North Macedonia: 21
- Poland: 18⁶⁹
- Portugal: 22
- Serbia: 21
- Slovenia: 18⁷⁰

⁶⁸ Although it was not indicated whether or not juvenile criminal law is applied, an age was given.

⁶⁹ Note that the age of adulthood in criminal law for Poland is 17.

⁷⁰ Although it wasn't indicated whether or not juvenile criminal law is applied, an age was given.

The following countries stated in the questionnaire that juvenile criminal law is applied but didn't provide an age:

- Croatia
- Georgia
- Moldova
- Netherlands

2.4 State reactions to criminal acts of minors

In this edition of the ESB the *state reactions to criminal acts of minors* were not examined. An overview is, however, provided on pp. 404-407 of the 5th edition.

Appendix II: Population

Table 1. Population by country from 2011 to 2016 (in thousands)

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Albania	2907.4	2903.0	2897.8	2892.4	2885.8	2875.6
Armenia	3262.7	3274.3	2894.0	2906.0*	3010.6	2998.6
Austria	8375.2	8408.1	8451.9	8507.8	8584.9	8700.5
Azerbaijan	9111.1	9235.1	9356.5	9477.1	9593.0	9705.6
Belgium	11000.6	11075.9	11138.0	11180.8	11237.3	11311.1
Bosnia-Herzegovina	3843.2	3839.3	3542.6*	3482.1*	3429.4*	3386.3*
Bulgaria	7369.4	7327.2	7284.6	7245.7	7202.2	7153.8
Croatia	4289.9	4276.0	4262.1	4246.8	4225.3	4190.7
Cyprus	839.8	862.0	865.9	858.0	847.0	848.3
Czech Republic	10486.7	10505.4	10516.1	10512.4	10538.3	10553.8
Denmark	5560.6	5580.5	5602.6	5627.2	5659.7	5707.3
Estonia	1329.7	1325.2	1320.2	1315.8	1314.9	1315.9
Finland	5375.3	5401.3	5426.7	5451.3	5471.8	5487.3
France	64978.7	65277.0	65600.4	66166.0	66458.2	66638.4
Georgia	4469.3	4497.6	4046.0	4490.5	3729.5	3720.4
Germany	80222.1	80327.9	80523.7	80767.5	81197.5	82175.7
Greece	11123.4	11086.4	11003.6	10926.8	10858.0	10783.7
Hungary	9985.7	9931.9	9908.8	9877.4	9855.6	9830.5
Iceland	318.5	319.6	321.9	325.7	329.1	332.5
Ireland	4570.9	4589.3	4609.8	4637.9	4677.6	4726.3
Italy	59364.7	59394.2	59685.2	60782.7	60795.6	60665.6
Kosovo	1794.2	1805.0**	1824.0**	1822.0**	1802.0**	1771.6
Latvia	2074.6	2044.8	2023.8	2001.5	1986.1	1969.0
Lithuania	3052.6	3003.6	2971.9	2943.5	2921.3	2888.6
Luxembourg	511.8	524.9	537.0	549.7	563.0	576.2
Malta	415.0	417.5	422.5	429.4	439.7	450.4
Moldova	3560.4	3559.5	3559.5	3557.6	3555.2	3728.0
Montenegro	619.9	620.3	620.9	621.5	622.1	622.2
Netherlands	16655.8	16730.3	16779.6	16829.3	16900.7	16979.1
North Macedonia	2057.3	2059.8	2062.3	2065.8	2069.2	2071.3
Norway	4920.3	4985.9	5051.3	5108.0	5166.5	5210.7
Poland	38062.7	38063.8	38062.5	38017.9	38005.6	37967.2
Portugal***	10542.4	10487.29	10427.3	10374.82	10341.33	10309.57
Romania	20199.1	20096.0	20020.1	19947.3	19870.6	19760.6
Russia	142856.5	143056.4	143500.0*	143666.9*	144100.0*	144300.0*
Serbia	7251.5	7216.6	7181.5	7146.8	7114.4	7076.4
Slovakia	5392.4	5404.3	5410.8	5415.9	5421.3	5426.3
Slovenia	2050.2	2055.5	2058.8	2061.1	2062.9	2064.2
Spain	46667.2	46818.2	46727.9	46512.2	46449.6	46440.1
Sweden	9415.6	9482.9	9555.9	9644.9	9747.4	9851.0
Switzerland	7870.1	7954.7	8039.1	8139.6	8237.7	8327.1
Turkey	73723.0	74724.3	75627.4	76667.9	77695.9	78741.1
Ukraine	45598.2	45453.3	45372.7	45245.9	42759.7	42590.9
UK: England and Wales	56170.9	56567.8	56948.2	57408.7	57885.4	58381.2
UK: Northern Ireland	1814.3	1823.6	1829.7	1840.5	1851.6	1862.1
UK: Scotland	5299.9	5313.6	5327.7	5347.6	5373.0	5404.7

Source: Eurostat Database, retrieved on 24 February 2020

*UN Population Statistics

**World Bank Data

***Data provided by national correspondent.

This is the sixth edition of a data collection initiative that started in 1993 under the umbrella of the Council of Europe and has been continued since 2000 by an international group of experts. These experts also act as regional coordinators of a network of national correspondents whose contribution has been decisive in collecting and validating data on a variety of subjects from 42 countries. The Sourcebook is composed of six chapters. The first five cover the current main types of national crime and criminal justice statistics – police, prosecution, conviction, prison, and probation statistics – for the years 2011 to 2016, providing detailed analysis for 2015. The sixth chapter covers national victimization surveys, providing rates for the main indicators every five years from 1990 to 2015. As with every new edition of the Sourcebook, the group has tried to improve data quality as well as comparability and, where appropriate, increase the scope of data collection. This new edition will continue to promote comparative research throughout Europe and make European experiences and data available worldwide.



ISBN: 978-3-86395-519-9
ISSN: 1864-2136
eISSN: 2512-7047

Göttingen University Press