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Introduction

The International Classification of Crimes for Statistical Purposes (ICCS) is a hierarchical classification based on established criteria where data on all forms of crime can be allocated into categories that have a certain degree of similarity in relation to conceptual, analytical and policy areas. The ICCS aims to provide a standard for the systematic production and comparison of data across different criminal justice institutions and jurisdictions. When finalized, it will be possible to use the ICCS for data on all forms of crime that are collected at different stages (recording, investigation, arrest, prosecution, conviction, imprisonment, victim surveys, etc.). The purpose of the ICCS is to enhance consistency and international comparability of crime statistics and improve analytical capabilities at both the national and international levels.¹

Work on the ICCS started in 2009 when a Task Force of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe started to develop a crime classification framework based on behavioural descriptions rather than legal codes². The need for developing a full-fledged international crime classification was further discussed by the United Nations Statistical Commission and the United Nations Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice in 2012. In 2013, the two commissions above requested UNODC to develop the international classification of crime for statistical purposes.³

The ICCS is the result of close collaboration between national statistical offices, other national government institutions, regional and international organizations, branches and sections of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the National Institute of Statistics and Geography of Mexico (INEGI), and the Center of Excellence (COE).

Following similar exercises in 2009 and 2012, the development of the ICCS has progressed far enough to submit the draft classification to a final testing at the global level. This testing has been carried out in March-May 2014 through written questionnaires sent to participating countries as described below.

The results of the testing will be discussed at the Expert Group Meeting (EGM) on 28-30 May 2014, Vienna. The following analysis gives an overview of the responses, comments and suggestions provided by countries in the ICCS Testing protocols and is intended to facilitate the discussions at the EGM.

Overview of the ICCS Testing

The final test of the International Classification of Crime for Statistical Purposes (ICCS) before it is submitted to the UN Statistical Commission and the UN Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice for endorsement in 2015 aimed at reviewing the global applicability of the ICCS for all national statistical systems, identifying items that need clearer treatment and areas where special care are needed in developing the ICCS implementation manual. The testing was conducted among countries that, following a request by the United Nations Statistical Division and by UNODC, indicated their interest and availability to participate. In total, 66 countries had indicated their interest and availability to participate in the testing. Each participating country was requested to provide information on at least criminal offences as recorded by the police and fill in an optional second response referring to either prosecution, court or prison data.

The ICCS testing protocol consisted of three separate questionnaires:

1) ICCS Testing
2) Homicide Testing
3) Questionnaire on accessibility of crime data

The ICCS Testing questionnaire is the main testing questionnaire covering all categories of crimes currently included in the ICCS. It is an Excel workbook divided into 11 sheets that correspond to the 11 main categories of the ICCS (Level 1). In each sheet, the names, definitions and exemplary legal inclusions/exclusions are listed for crimes at levels 2, 3 and 4 of the classification. Respondents were asked to respond, for each crime type to what extent data on recorded crime can be produced in their country according to definitions and categories of the ICCS, to provide data wherever available or to provide explanations for the lack of data and to describe differences in categories or definitions used.

In addition to the main ICCS Testing questionnaire, the Homicide Testing questionnaire collected data and other information to build a more precise definition of intentional homicide and to explore feasibility of three different classification criteria of homicide.

Finally, the questionnaire on accessibility of crime data aims to collected information on the statistical infrastructure and production process of crime and criminal justice statistics, and on their adaptability for the adoption of the ICCS. It is a word document with separate question parts for police, prosecution, court and prison data.

The Testing of the ICCS was carried out from 15 March to 21 May 2014. In total 41 countries provided a substantive response by filling in at least one of the three testing protocols. The total number of

---

4 Note Verbale CU 2013/177/DPA/RAB/SASS of 15 August 2013.
responses by questionnaire as well as the geographical distribution of answers can be seen from the Figure 1:

**Figure 1: Geographic distribution of responses to the ICCS Testing**

The following analysis, structured by the main topics of the Homicide Testing protocol, gives an overview of the responses, comments and suggestions provided by countries in the Homicide Testing protocol and is intended to facilitate the discussions at the EGM.
Results of the Homicide Questionnaire Testing

Homicide questionnaire part 1

Data
Data submitted by countries in the homicide questionnaire refer to various stages of the criminal justice procedure. 75% (18/24) of countries commented that data refer to police recorded crime data, 13% (3/24) of countries submitted prosecution data, and 13% (3/24) of the countries provided court data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data refer to the following stage of the criminal justice procedure:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police-recorded Crime Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The counting unit used for statistics significantly varied between countries. 32% of countries used cases as the counting unit, while another 28% of countries used victims. Additionally, 20% of countries used offences, 4% of countries used investigations, 4% of countries used persons suspected/arrested, and another 8% of countries used persons convicted as their counting unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the counting unit used for the homicide statistics provided?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intentional homicide
75% (24/32) of countries reported that data comply with the definition of intentional homicide. From these countries, 75% (18/24) reported that the definition is fully compatible, while 25% (6/24) commented that data comply with the definition but with definitional differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do data comply with this definition?</th>
<th>A. Yes</th>
<th>B. No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Intentional homicide&quot; means unlawful death inflicted upon a person with the intent to cause death or serious injury.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, ‘intentional homicide’ received a positive response with most countries commenting that data are compatible with the definition. One country differentiated killings between homicide and murder and only murder was compatible with the intentional homicide definition. Others submitted data on “killing with the intent to kill” and “killing with the intent to kill with premeditation”. One country commented that murder and homicide “are not distinguished by presence of intent to cause death or serious injury. Murder is distinguished from homicide with the presence of certain elements such as treachery, premeditation, cruelty, etc.”
Comments were also collected on ‘intentional homicide’ within the three tested classifications: type of homicide, relationship between victim and perpetrator, and mechanism of killing. Under the “mechanism of killing” classification, one country explained that weapon use is disaggregated into "Firearm", "Knife", "Syringe", "Bottle/glass", "Bat/bar/club", "Chemical", "Other Weapon", "Weapon NFD", "No Weapon used" and "Unspecified." Other countries commented on the inability to produce data on the relationship between the victim and perpetrator. One country noted that such data collection is in development but currently not available.

**Summary/conclusion**
Test responses do not indicate a need to change this category.

**Homicide questionnaire part 2**

Among the different types of homicide categories and definitions tested in this part of the testing protocol, most countries either count these categories of killings as ‘intentional homicide’ or as a separate offence (with the exception of ‘dowry-related killings’ and ‘honour killings’ which most countries found ‘not applicable’). Quantitative counts of such homicides were provided for all categories by at least one or more countries, with the exception of ‘femicide’ where no responding country supplied concrete data.

**Assisted suicide**

15% (5/33) of countries considered this offence as intentional homicide, while 52% (17/33) of countries commented that this is a separate offence, 21% (7/33) noted that it is not applicable, and 12% (4/33) do not know. 45% (9/20) of countries answered that data comply with the provided definition, 67% (18/27) of countries did not include this type of killing in the total number of intentional homicides, while 37% (13/27) of countries can separately produce data for this offence.

Comments focused on two concepts: the ability to only provide partial data and the inability to disaggregate assisting suicide from other categories. Definitional differences from the ICCS included “persuasion” within the definition of assisting suicide. Similarly, another country included “suicide instigation” and noted the inability to separately identify this data, while another country only collected data for abetment to suicides of children. One country can provide data from an alternative source, while another country commented that they cannot specify on the degree or method of the assistance.

A few countries were unable to disaggregate assisting suicide from other categories. Many included assisting suicide within manslaughter or intentional homicide while others included assisting suicide into “not helping a person in need” and “grave offences against general safety.”

**Summary/conclusion**
Test responses indicate not considering this category as intentional homicide. The ICCS definition of assisting suicide should be altered to include “persuasion.” The current definition stipulates the “death of a person who wishes to die” which is different from persuading a person to commit suicide.
Death as a result of terrorist activities
56% (18/32) of countries considered this offence as intentional homicide, while 19% (6/32) of countries commented that this is a separate offence, 22% (7/32) noted that it is not applicable, and 3% (1/32) do not know. 53% (10/19) of countries answered that data comply with the provided definition, 72% (21/29) of countries included this type of killing in the total number of intentional homicides, and 36% (10/28) of countries can separately produce data for this offence.

Countries generally commented that this offence is included in intentional homicide and data are not separately available. One country provided data on the total number of “civilians murdered by terrorist/extremists”, while another country commented that data indicate terrorism with death as an aggravating circumstance. Others noted that capacity to collect data for this offence is an ongoing development or only homicides considered “an act of war” are excluded.

Summary/conclusion
Test responses indicate considering this category as intentional homicide.

Dowry related killing
45% (15/33) of countries considered this offence as intentional homicide, while 3% (1/33) of countries commented that this is a separate offence, 48% (16/33) noted that it is not applicable, and 3% (1/33) do not know. 37% (7/19) of countries answered that data comply with the provided definition, 64% (16/25) of countries would included this type of killing in the total number of intentional homicides, while 92% (24/26) of countries cannot separately produce data for this offence.

Countries generally commented that this offence is included in intentional homicide and data are not separately available. One country defined dowry death as “death of women caused by any burns or bodily injury or occurs otherwise than normal circumstances within seven years of marriage and it is shown that before her death she was subjected to cruelty or harassment by her husband or any relative of her husband for, or in connection with, any demand for dowry.” Another country includes homicides “for motives deserving particular reprobation.”

Summary/conclusion
Test responses indicate considering this category as intentional homicide. One country’s definition of ‘dowry death’ specifically stipulates that the “the death is caused by any burns or bodily injury, or occurs other wise than normal circumstances within 7 years of marriage.” The ICCS definition for ‘dowry death’ is a more general definition that fully encompasses definitions provided by countries and should be kept unchanged.

Euthanasia
24% (8/33) of countries considered this offence as intentional homicide, while 33% (11/33) of countries commented that this is a separate offence, 33% (11/33) noted that it is not applicable, and 9% (3/33) do not know. Among those that have a definition of ‘euthanasia’, 31% (5/16) of countries answered that data comply with the provided definition. 46% (12/26) of countries included this type of killing in the total number of intentional homicides, and 81% (21/26) of countries cannot separately produce data for this offence.
Countries commented on the difficulty to separately identify euthanasia from manslaughter or intentional homicide. Other countries included euthanasia with assisting suicide or described their data as “whoever kills a human being on his demand and under the influence of compassion for him.”

Summary/conclusion
Based on the quantitative and qualitative data, it is not clear whether this category should be considered as intentional homicide or not. This category should be further discussed in the EGM before identifying this killing as intentional homicide or a separate offence. In any case, to be statistically meaningful, mutual exclusivity should be strengthened between euthanasia and assisting suicide. The current definition of euthanasia is broad and can technically include assisting suicide. The definition of euthanasia should specify that the death of the person is brought about by another person with or without consent of the person dying, in order to be mutually exclusive from assisting suicide where the person is facilitated to commit suicide and “wishes to die.”

Femicide
67% (22/33) of countries considered this offence as intentional homicide, while 6% (2/33) of countries commented that this is a separate offence, 24% (8/33) noted that it is not applicable, and 3% (1/33) do not know. Among those that have a definition of ‘femicide’, 53% (10/19) of countries answered that data comply with the provided definition. 76% (22/29) of countries included this type of killing in the total number of intentional homicides, and 86% (25/29) of countries cannot separately produce data for this offence.

This category received only a few comments. Many comments explained that data are included as part of ‘intentional homicide’ and data are not separately available.

Summary/conclusion
Test responses indicate considering this category as intentional homicide.

Honour killing
61% (20/33) of countries considered this offence as intentional homicide, while 0% (0/33) of countries commented that this is a separate offence, 36% (12/33) noted that it is not applicable, and 3% (1/33) do not know. Among those that have a definition of ‘honour killing’, 39% (7/18) of countries answered that data comply with the provided definition. 73% (29/26) of countries included this type of killing in the total number of intentional homicides, and 88% (3/26) of countries cannot separately produce data for this offence.

This category received only a few comments. Comments explained that there is no separate article for ‘honour killing’ in their criminal code and data are included as part of ‘intentional homicide’, but data are not separately available.

Summary/conclusion
Data indicate considering this category as intentional homicide.

Infanticide
42% (14/33) of countries considered this offence as intentional homicide, while 48% (16/33) of countries commented that this is a separate offence, 9% (4/33) noted that it is not applicable,
and 0% (1/33) do not know. Among those that have a definition of ‘infanticide’, 38% (10/26) of countries answered that data comply with the provided definition. 58% (19/33) of countries included this type of killing in the total number of intentional homicides, and 67% (22/33) of countries can separately produce data for this offence.

Comments described definitional differences between the ICCS definition of ‘infanticide.’ One country defined infanticide as “killing of a new-born by his/her mother”, while another country’s definition was “homicide committed on a child when born or immediately after.” One country commented that their definition was “unlawful killing of a child by his/her mother immediately after the birth because of birth giving related depression.”

One country noted that their definition stipulates the “mother was of unsound mind at the time.” Others stipulated that the perpetrator of the infanticide are always “mothers and other helpers” and another country defined the offence as “a mother who kills her infant due to the intense emotional circumstances connected with the course of the delivery, or significant malformation of the infant or in particularly difficult personal circumstances.”

**Summary/conclusion**

Based on the quantitative and qualitative data it is not clear whether this category should be considered as intentional homicide or under another category given that the state of mind of the mother plays an important role in some definitions. The ‘infanticide’ definitions provided by countries have several commonalities. The definitions stipulate that the killing is done by the mother, the child is a new-born, the killing happened immediately after birth, and some countries include “intense emotional circumstances” or an “unsound mind.”

The ICCS definition of infanticide is “unlawful death purposefully inflicted upon a child less than one year of age by his or her mother.” A decision should be take whether this definition should be changed (for example, by replacing “a child less than one year of age” with “a new-born child, immediately or shortly after birth”, and/or by including extreme emotional circumstances of the mother) and whether ‘infanticide should be included in intentional homicide.

**Negligent manslaughter**

6% (2/33) of countries considered this offence as intentional homicide, while 67% (22/33) of countries commented that this is a separate offence, 18% (6/33) noted that it is not applicable, and 9% (3/33) do not know. Among those that have a definition of ‘negligent manslaughter’, 45% (10/22) of countries answered that data comply with the provided definition. 17% (5/30) of countries included this type of killing in the total number of intentional homicides, and 50% (14/28) of countries can separately produce data for this offence.

Countries commented on the inability to separately identify negligent and non-negligent manslaughter. Many countries, however, do make a distinction between manslaughter and driving causing death. Another country defined negligent manslaughter as “whoever causes the death of any person by doing any rash or negligent act not amounting to culpable homicide”, while another country defines the offence as “a person who through carelessness causes the death of another.”

**Summary/conclusion**

Test responses indicate not considering this category as intentional homicide.
**Non-negligent or involuntary manslaughter**
18% (6/33) of countries considered this offence as intentional homicide, while 67% (22/33) of countries commented that this is a separate offence, 15% (5/33) noted that it is not applicable, and 0% (3/33) do not know. Among those that have a definition of ‘non-negligent or involuntary manslaughter’, 43% (10/23) of countries answered that data comply with the provided definition. 39% (12/21) of countries included this type of killing in the total number of intentional homicides, and 45% (14/31) of countries can separately produce data for this offence.

Comments drew attention to the inability to distinguish between negligent and non-negligent manslaughter in their data. One country noted that it cannot identify types of manslaughter until the case has passed through the court. A more fundamental comment came from one country that noted that in its system non-negligent manslaughter is considered as intentional homicide. One country provided data on “homicide not amounting to murder.”

**Summary/conclusion**
Test responses indicate not considering this category as intentional homicide.

**Serious assault leading to death**
73% (24/33) of countries considered this offence as intentional homicide, while 21% (7/33) of countries commented that this is a separate offence, 6% (2/33) noted that it is not applicable, and 0% (0/33) do not know. Among those that have a definition of ‘serious assault leading to death’, 75% (18/24) of countries answered that data comply with the provided definition. 91% (29/32) of countries included this type of killing in the total number of intentional homicides, and 50% (16/32) of countries can separately produce data for this offence.

Countries commented that this offence was included in ‘intentional homicide’ but data are not separately identified. Others provided definitions on ‘serious assault leading to death’, such as “intentional beating a person, without the goal to kill the person, but the victim dies” or “unlawful death due to an assault committed with the intent to cause very serious injury.”

**Summary/conclusion**
Test responses indicate considering this category as intentional homicide.

**Voluntary manslaughter**
55% (18/33) of countries considered this offence as intentional homicide, while 33% (11/33) of countries commented that this is a separate offence, 12% (4/33) noted that it is not applicable, and 0% (0/33) do not know. Among those that have a definition of ‘voluntary manslaughter’, 52% (12/23) of countries answered that data comply with the provided definition. 75% (24/32) of countries included this type of killing in the total number of intentional homicides, and 45% (14/31) of countries can separately produce data for this offence.

Countries noted that voluntary manslaughter is included into ‘manslaughter’ or ‘intentional homicide’ and data are not separately available, while another country noted that manslaughter cases can be separately identified after it goes through court. One country provided data on both completed and attempted voluntary manslaughter. A few countries noted that data collection for this offence is an ongoing development.
Summary/conclusion
Data indicate considering this category as intentional homicide.

Homicide questionnaire part 4

Death due to legal interventions
27% (8/30) of countries included ‘death due to legal interventions’ in the total number of intentional homicide, while 60% (18/30) of countries did not include this killing in the total number of intentional homicide and 13% (4/30) found it ‘not applicable’. Additionally, 14% (4/28) of countries indicated that statistical data can be produced for ‘death due to legal interventions’, but 86% (24/28) of countries cannot produce statistics.

Summary/conclusion
Test responses indicate not considering this category as intentional homicide.

Justifiable homicide in self-defence
33% (10/30) of countries included ‘justifiable homicide in self-defence’ in the total number of intentional homicide, while 53% (16/30) of countries did not include this killing in the total number of intentional homicide and 13% (4/30) found it ‘not applicable’. Additionally, 14% (4/28) of countries indicated that statistical data can be produced for ‘justifiable homicide in self-defence’, but 86% (24/28) of countries cannot produce statistics.

Summary/conclusion
Test responses indicate not considering this category as intentional homicide.

Killings during civil unrest
48% (14/29) of countries included ‘killings during civil unrest’ in the total number of intentional homicide, while 28% (8/29) of countries did not include this killing in the total number of intentional homicide and 24% (7/29) found it ‘not applicable’. Additionally, 9% (3/25) of countries indicated that statistical data can be produced for ‘killings during civil unrest’, but 83% (21/25) of countries cannot produce statistics.

Summary/conclusion
If applicable, test responses indicate considering this category as intentional homicide.

Killings between parties to an internal armed conflict
34% (10/29) of countries included ‘killings between parties to an internal armed conflict’ in the total number of intentional homicide, while 31% (9/29) of countries did not include this killing in the total number of intentional homicide and 34% (10/29) found it ‘not applicable’. Additionally, 9% (2/23) of countries indicated that statistical data can be produced for ‘killings between parties to an internal armed conflict’, but 83% (19/23) of countries cannot produce statistics.

Summary/conclusion
Quantitative data indicated mixed results with 36% of countries including this killing into the total amount of intentional homicide and 32% of countries excluding this killing from intentional
homicide. This category should be further discussed in the EGM before identifying this killing as intentional homicide or a separate offence.

**Killings of civilians during internal armed conflict**
38% (11/29) of countries included ‘killings of civilians during internal armed conflict’ in the total number of intentional homicide, while 28% (8/29) of countries did not include this killing in the total number of intentional homicide and 34% (10/29) found it ‘not applicable’. Additionally, 9% (2/23) of countries indicated that statistical data can be produced for ‘killings of civilians during internal armed conflict’, but 83% (19/23) of countries cannot produce statistics.

**Summary/conclusion**
Quantitative data indicated mixed results with 38% of countries including this killing into the total amount of intentional homicide and 28% of countries excluding this killing from intentional homicide. This category should be further discussed in the EGM before identifying this killing as intentional homicide or a separate offence.
Intentional homicide classification (Type of homicide)

When homicide classifications are tested for data availability concerning the type of homicide, between 10% and 47% of countries stated that data for the requested relationship are available when ICCS definitions are fully complied with, rising to 17-50% of countries with available data when some differences in definitions are allowed for. Quantitative counts of homicides by victim-perpetrator relationship were provided for all categories by at least three or more countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can statistical data currently be produced for this offence in your country?</th>
<th>A. Yes</th>
<th>B. Yes, but with differences in the definition</th>
<th>Total Yes (A+B)</th>
<th>C. No</th>
<th>D. Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Intentional Homicide</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Int. Homicide related to other criminal activities</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.1 Int. Homicide related to organized criminal groups and gangs</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.1.1 Homicide related to organized criminal groups</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.1.2 Homicide related to gangs</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.2 Int. Homicide related to other criminal activities</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.2.1 Homicide related to robbery</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.2.2 Homicide perpetrated during the commission of another criminal offence</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Interpersonal homicide</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.1 Intimate partner/family member</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.2 Other interpersonal homicide</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Socio-political homicide</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.1 Homicide related to social prejudice</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.2 Homicide related to political agendas</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.3 Homicide related to other socio-political agendas</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 Other types of homicide</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Intentional homicide
See homicide questionnaire part 1.

1.1.1 Intentional homicide related to other criminal activities
21% (7/33) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for intentional homicide related to other criminal activities. This increases to 33% (11/33) with the addition of countries that can produce statistics but with differences in the definition. 22/33 countries cannot produce statistics for which 17 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 1 has available
data but could not produce a statistical count, 3 countries have other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

Level 4 and 5 categories of 1.1.1 indicated lower data availability with 30% (10/33) of countries for 1.1.1.1 intentional homicide related to organized criminal groups and gangs, 25% (8/32) for 1.1.1.1.1 intentional homicide related to organized criminal groups, 22% (7/32) for 1.1.1.1.2 intentional homicide related to gangs, 38% (12/32) for 1.1.1.2 intentional homicide related to other criminal activities, 45% (14/31) for 1.1.1.2.1 intentional homicide related robbery, and 39% (12/31) for 1.1.1.2.2 intentional homicide perpetrated during the commission of another criminal offence.

Several comments explained that data on intentional homicide in the course of a robbery, burglary, and other related crimes are available. Others noted that this is included into intentional homicide and not separately identified or capacity to collect this data are under development.

One country included data on “contract killing” under 1.1.1.1 ‘homicide related to organized criminal groups and gangs’, while another country started collecting data on “homicide for the purposes of gain.” One country also submitted data on “intentional homicide, caused by corporal injuries” under 1.1.1.2.2 Homicide perpetrated during the commission of another criminal offence.

Summary/conclusion
Finalized definitions, inclusions, and exclusions are not yet established for this categorization. Note that ‘contract killing’ may be included in 1.1.1.1 ‘homicide related to organized criminal groups and gangs’ or other categories, depending on who contracted the killer or if this is not known to 1.1.4 ‘other types of homicide.’

1.1.2 Interpersonal homicide
24% (8/33) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for interpersonal homicide. This increases to 39% (13/33) with the addition of countries that can produce statistics but with differences in the definition. 20/33 countries cannot produce statistics for which 17 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 1 has available data but could not produce a statistical count, 1 country has other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

Level 4 categories of 1.1.2 indicated higher data availability with 50% (16/32) of countries for 1.1.2.1 intimate partner/family member and 29% (9/31) for 1.1.2.2 other interpersonal homicide.

A few countries commented that data on the relationship between victim and offender are only available from some (federal) states or capacity to increase data collection is under development. One country submitted data on “intentional homicide committed for the purpose of property disputes and personal vendetta/personal enmity”, while another country noted that there is a registration guideline for cases that involve violence within the family that requires recording the type of relationship between the perpetrator and victim, but the guideline is not always followed.
Summary/conclusion
Test responses do not indicate a need to change this category.

Note that “intentional homicide for the purposes of property disputes and personal vendetta/personal enmity” can be coded to 1.1.2 ‘interpersonal homicide’ but more information is required to code the offences into disaggregations of 1.1.2 ‘interpersonal homicide.’

1.1.3 Socio-political homicide
16% (5/31) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for socio-political homicide. This increases to 23% (7/31) with the addition of countries that can produce statistics but with differences in the definition. 20/33 countries cannot produce statistics for which 17 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 1 has available data but could not produce a statistical count, 1 country has other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

Level 4 categories of 1.1.3 indicated lower data availability with 27% (8/30) of countries for 1.1.3.1 homicide related to social prejudice, 17% (5/30) for 1.1.3.2 homicide related to political agendas, and 17% (5/30) for 1.1.3.3 homicide related to other socio-political agendas.

Comments explained that data on the motivation to commit homicide or the relationship between victim and offender is an area of ongoing development. One country provided data on “victims of bias motivated murder/non-negligent manslaughter” but data cannot be further disaggregated.

One country provided data for “intentional homicide due to witchcraft” under 1.1.3.1 ‘homicide related to social prejudice’, while another country commented that flags exist for “race, religious and sexuality.” One country also submitted data on “intentional homicide due to political reasons” under 1.1.3.2 ‘homicide related to political agendas’ and “intentional homicides due to communalism, casteism and class conflicts” under 1.1.3.3 ‘homicide related to other socio-political agendas.’

Summary/conclusion
Finalized inclusions and exclusions are not yet established for this categorization. It is noted that the definition for ‘socio-political’ should encompass “race, religion, sexuality, and other attributes.” Additionally, inclusions for 1.1.3 ‘socio-political homicide’ should list “bias motivated murder”, 1.1.3.1 ‘homicide related to social prejudice’ should list “intentional homicide due to witchcraft”, 1.1.3.2 ‘homicide related to political agendas’ should list “intentional homicide due to political reasons”, and 1.1.3.3 ‘homicide related to other socio-political agendas’ should list intentional homicide due to “communalism, casteism, and class conflicts.”

1.1.4 Other types of homicide
19% (6/32) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for other types of homicide. This increases to 28% (9/32) with the addition of countries that can produce statistics but with differences in the definition. 26/32 countries cannot produce statistics for which 17 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 1 has available data but could not produce a statistical count, 2 countries have other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.
This category received very few comments. One country included data on “intentional homicides due to love affairs/sexual causes, dowry, lunacy and other unclassified motives of intentional homicide.” Another country submitted data on “homicides with no info” and homicides “without data on circumstance.”

Summary/conclusion
Test responses do not indicate a need to change this category.

Note that “intentional homicide due to love affairs/sexual causes, dowry and lunacy” should be coded to 1.1.2.1 ‘intentional homicide by intimate partner/family member.’
Intentional homicide classification (Relationship between victim and perpetrator)

When homicide classifications are tested for data availability concerning the relationship between victims and perpetrators, between 21% and 42% of countries stated that data for the requested relationship are available when ICCS definitions are fully complied with, rising to 24-48% of countries with available data when some differences in definitions are allowed for. Quantitative counts of such homicides by victim-perpetrator relationship were provided for all categories by at least three or more countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can statistical data currently be produced for this offence in your country?</th>
<th>A. Yes</th>
<th>B. Yes, but with differences in the definition</th>
<th>Total Yes (A+B)</th>
<th>C. No</th>
<th>D. Don't know</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Intentional Homicide</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Intimate partner or family member</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.1 Intimate partner</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.2 Family member</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Other perpetrator known to the victim</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.1 Friend/Acquaintance</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.2 Colleague/business or work relationship</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.3 Authority/care relationship (doctor/nurse/teacher/police/public official, clergy, etc.)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.4 Other perpetrator known to the victim</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Identified perpetrator with no relation and unknown to victim (stranger)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 Identified perpetrator but no information on victim-perpetrator relationship</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5 Unknown perpetrator (crime without identified perpetrator)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Intentional Homicide
See homicide questionnaire part 1.

1.1.1 Intimate partner or family member
42% (14/33) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for intentional homicide by intimate partner or family member. This increases to 48% (16/33) with the addition of countries that can produce statistics but with differences in the definition. 16/33 countries cannot produce statistics for which 12 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 2 have available data but could not produce a statistical count, 1 country has other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.
Level 4 categories of 1.1.1 indicated lower data availability with 39% (12/31) of countries for 1.1.1.1 intimate partner, and 39% (13/33) for 1.1.1.2 family member.

Comments conveyed the ongoing development of data collections for the relationship between victim and offender. One country commented that data are available for only some (federal) states, while another country noted that the perpetrator/victim relationship is a requirement under registration guidelines for violence within the family but it is not always followed. One country included data on adulterous relationship, lover’s spouse, and emotional rivals.

Summary/conclusion
Finalized inclusions and exclusions are not yet established for this pilot classification. However, it is noted that “adulterous relationship, lover’s spouse, and emotional rivals” could be mentioned in inclusions under 1.1.1.1 ‘Intimate partner.’

1.1.2 Other perpetrator known to the victim
30% (10/33) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for intentional homicide by other perpetrator known to the victim. 22/33 countries cannot produce statistics for which 15 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 5 have available data but could not produce a statistical count, 1 country has other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

Level 4 categories of 1.1.2 indicated lower data availability with 27% (9/33) of countries for 1.1.2.1 friend/acquaintance, 24% (8/33) for 1.1.2.2 colleague/business or work relationship, 27% (9/33) for 1.1.2.3 authority/care relationship, and 21% (7/33) for 1.1.2.4 other perpetrator known to the victim.

This category and its disaggregations received similar comments as 1.1.1 ‘intimate partner or family member.’ Comments conveyed the ongoing development of data collections for the relationship between victim and offender. One country commented that data are available for only some (federal) states, while another country noted that submitting relationship data on offences in a non-family context are not required. One country noted that data are included in a broader category called “homicide by other perpetrator known to victim” but not separately identified, while another country submitted data on extra-judicial killings under 1.1.2.3 ‘authority/care relationship.’

Summary/conclusion
Finalized inclusions and exclusions are not yet established for this pilot classification. Note that “extra-judicial killings” requires more detail on the perpetrator to code it into a category.

1.1.3 Identified perpetrator with no relation and unknown to victim (stranger)
24% (8/33) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for intentional homicide by identified perpetrator with no relation and unknown to victim. 23/33 countries cannot produce statistics for which 15 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 6 have available data but could not produce a statistical count or data are confidential, 1 country has other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

This category received similar comments as 1.1.1 ‘intimate partner or family member.’ Comments conveyed the ongoing development of data collections for the relationship between
victim and offender. One country noted that information is available from case reports but not in statistics.

Summary/conclusion
Test responses do not indicate a need to change this category.

1.1.4 Identified perpetrator but no information on victim-perpetrator relationship
30% (10/33) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for intentional homicide by identified perpetrator but no information on victim-perpetrator relationship. 21/33 countries cannot produce statistics for which 14 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 5 have available data but could not produce a statistical count or data are confidential, 1 country has other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

Comments conveyed the ongoing development of data collections for the relationship between victim and offender. One country submitted data by subtracting the cases where the victim and perpetrator relationship is known from the total amount of solved cases of intentional homicide.

Summary/conclusion
Test responses do not indicate a need to change this category.

1.1.5 Unknown perpetrator (crime without identified perpetrator)
33% (11/33) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for intentional homicide by unknown perpetrator (crime without identified perpetrator). This increases to 36% (11/33) with the addition of countries that can produce statistics but with differences in the definition. 20/33 countries cannot produce statistics for which 12 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 6 have available data but could not produce a statistical count or data are confidential, 1 country has other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

Comments conveyed the details of the submitted data. One country noted that homicides with an unknown perpetrator are included in “homicide by unknown relationship”, while another country provided data on homicides with no information.

Summary/conclusion
Finalized inclusions and exclusions are not yet established for this category. Note that “homicide with no information” should be counted under 1.1.5 unknown perpetrator (crime without identified perpetrator).
Intentional homicide classification (Mechanism of killing)

When homicide classifications are tested for data availability concerning the mechanism of killing, between 21% and 53% of countries stated that data for the requested relationship are available when ICCS definitions are fully complied with, rising to 21-59% of countries with available data when some differences in definitions are allowed for. Quantitative counts of such homicides by victim-perpetrator relationship were provided for all categories by at least four or more countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can statistical data currently be produced for this offence in your country?</th>
<th>A. Yes</th>
<th>B. Yes, but with differences in the definition</th>
<th>C. No</th>
<th>D. Don't know</th>
<th>Total Yes (A+B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Intentional Homicide</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 With firearms</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.1 Handgun discharge</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.2 Rifle, shotgun and larger firearm discharge</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.3 Other and unspecified firearm discharge</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 With explosives</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 With another weapon</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.1 Sharp object</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.2 Blunt object</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.3 Other</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 Without a weapon</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4.1 Asphyxiation</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4.2 Bodily force</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4.3 Other attack without a weapon</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5 Other</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5.1 Drugs and chemical substances</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5.2 Other</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6 Assault by unspecified means (Y09)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Intentional homicide
See homicide questionnaire part 1.

1.1.1 With firearms
41% (14/34) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for intentional homicide with firearms. This increases to 59% (20/34) with the addition of countries that can produce statistics but with differences in the definition. 16/34 countries cannot produce statistics for which 12 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 2 have available data but could not produce a statistical count, 1 country has other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.
Level 4 categories of 1.1.1 indicated lower data availability with 46% (16/35) of countries for 1.1.1.1 handgun discharge, 46% (16/35) for 1.1.1.2 rifle, shotgun and larger firearm discharge, and 45% (15/33) for 1.1.1.3 other and unspecific firearm discharge.

Comments conveyed the ability to provide data on homicide with firearms but with differences in definition. One country noted that “homicide with a firearm” is not further disaggregated, while another country noted that their database allows inputting “objects used to kill or modus operandi” but data are not reliable. Others noted the definitional differences of a firearm, with one country including “sharp knife” and another country including non-explosive weapons, such as a crossbow.

Comments conveyed the inability to disaggregate firearms by the type of firearm. One country noted that data included the “involvement of firearm” which can refer to the sheer presence of a firearm during the killing as differentiated from a firearm used as the main method of killing. Another country collected data on intentional homicide by unlicensed firearms.

**Summary/conclusion**
Finalized inclusions and exclusions are not yet established for this categorization. Note that crossbow should be stipulated under 1.1.3.3 ‘other’. Additionally, the definition of ‘intentional homicide with a firearm’ should not be expanded to include the “involvement of firearm.”

### 1.1.2 With explosives

43% (15/35) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for intentional homicide with explosives. 21/35 countries cannot produce statistics for which 17 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 3 have available data but could not produce a statistical count, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

This category received very few comments. Comments conveyed that homicide with explosives is included into broader categories such as “homicide with other weapons” but not separately identified.

**Summary/conclusion**
Test responses do not indicate a need to change this category.

### 1.1.3 With another weapon

47% (16/34) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for intentional homicide with another weapon. This increases to 50% (17/34) with the addition of countries that can produce statistics but with differences in the definition. 18/34 countries cannot produce statistics for which 14 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 3 have available data but could not produce a statistical count, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

Level 4 categories of 1.1.3 indicated higher data availability with 51% (18/35) of countries for 1.1.3.1 sharp object, 51% (18/35) for 1.1.3.2 blunt object, and 32% (11/34) for 1.1.3.3 other.

Comments conveyed the inability to disaggregate this level by type of weapon. One country commented on the ability to provide data by subtracting “homicide by firearms” from total amount of homicides with a weapon but this figure includes homicide by explosives. Another country commented that data under 1.1.3.1 sharp objects only include knife and syringe or
glass, while another country has a separate category called “stabbing/cutting weapons.” Countries also noted that “bat and club” are categorized under “other weapon.” Some comments conveyed that ‘blunt objects’ are included in “other weapons” but quantitative data indicated the ability for countries to separately identify this category, which should then not be aggregated into a residual category.

Summary/conclusion
Finalized definitions, inclusions, and exclusions are not yet established for this categorization. The definition for ‘sharp object’ also needs further clarification but could include a knife or a weapon with a blade fixed into a handle, syringe, and glass.

1.1.4 Without a weapon
53% (18/34) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for intentional homicide without a weapon. 17/34 countries cannot produce statistics for which 12 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 4 have available data but could not produce a statistical count, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

Level 4 categories of 1.1.4 indicated lower data availability with 39% (13/33) of countries for 1.1.4.1 asphyxiation, 45% (15/33) for 1.1.4.2 bodily force, and 21% (7/33) for 1.1.4.3 other attack without a weapon.

This category and its disaggregations received very few comments. Comments explained that data are available for homicide without a weapon but further disaggregations are not available.

Summary/conclusion
Test responses do not indicate a need to change this category.

1.1.5 Other
48% (16/33) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for other. 18/33 countries cannot produce statistics for which 13 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 3 have available data but could not produce a statistical count, 1 country has other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

Level 4 categories of 1.1.5 indicated lower data availability with 47% (15/32) of countries for 1.1.5.1 drugs and chemical substances, and 44% (14/32) for 1.1.5.2 other.

Comments for this category focused on the inability to provide data for this category. However, one country included data on “nuclear, biological, chemical weapons, bombing, fire, flood, destruction and sinking.”

Summary/conclusion
Finalized definitions, inclusions, and exclusions are not yet established for this categorization. Inclusions for 1.1.5.2 ‘other’ should include intentional homicide by fire, sinking, nuclear, and biological weapons. Chemical weapons should not be listed under the inclusions for 1.1.5.1 ‘drugs and chemical substances.’

1.1.6 Assault by unspecified means
45% (15/33) of countries reported that statistics can be produced for intentional homicide by assault by unspecified means. This increases to 48% (16/33) with the addition of countries that can produce statistics but with differences in the definition. 22/33 countries cannot produce statistics for which 18 countries indicate that information is not stored/available, 1 has available data but could not produce a statistical count, 2 countries have other reasons for the lack of data, and 1 does not know whether it can produce statistics.

This category received very few comments. One country commented that data are included in a broader category called “other murder” and not separately identified. Another country included homicides for which data were not reported, while one country submitted data on “crimes against the rules of safety of traffic and use of motor vehicles.”

**Summary/conclusion**
Test responses do not indicate a need to change this category.

One country submitted data on “crimes against the rules of safety of traffic and use of motor vehicles.” Note that this offence should be coded to other established categories in the ICCS. Depending on the details of the offence, it can be coded to 1.3.2.1 ‘vehicular homicide’, 2.7.2 ‘operating a vehicle under the influence of psycho-active substances’ or 2.6.3 ‘negligence related to operating a vehicle’.