![UNODC - United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime]

# PRINCIPLES AND FRAMEWORK FOR AN INTERNATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF CRIMES FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES

REPORT OF THE
UNODC/UNECE TASK FORCE ON CRIME CLASSIFICATION
TO THE CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS

**June 2012**

**PRINCIPLES AND FRAMEWORK FOR AN INTERNATIONAL CLASSIFICATION
OF CRIMES FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES**

REPORT OF THE UNODC/UNECE TASK FORCE ON CRIME CLASSIFICATION
TO THE CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS

June 2012

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The main objectives of the Task Force on Crime Classification were to develop a set of principles on international crime classification systems for statistical use, in particular to improve consistency and international comparability of crime statistics, and to undertake a case study of defining and classifying selected offences. In addition the Conference of European Statisticians requested the Task Force to collaborate with the European Commission on the development of an EU level classification.

The Task Force considers that the five principles of exhaustiveness, structure, mutual exclusiveness, description, and progressive implementation represent an appropriate basis on which to found an international classification of crimes for statistical purposes. The Task Force finds that an *act/event-based* classification is the required unit of classification and that in order to accurately describe crime acts/events, any international crime classification would need to examine attributes of the *target* of the act/event, the *seriousness* of the act/event, the *intent* of the perpetrator, the *modus operandi* of the act/event, the *degree of completion* of the act/event, the *degree of co-responsibility* of other persons involved in the act/event, the *sex and age* of victims and perpetrators, and the *policy area* of the act/event.

When these principles are tested through the construction of a *framework* for an international crime classification, the Task Force finds that an appropriate structure may consist of classification levels described by act/event elements, with accompanying horizontal attribute 'tags', i.e. attributes assigning additional labels to identify crimes according to their seriousness/policy relevance (such as intimate partner violence or organized crime). Guidance as to common legal crime definitions which may be included in each classification category may be required in the form of 'legal inclusions', which will assist countries in assigning crimes classified according to national penal codes to the international framework classification. An international crime classification built on the identified principles and in a manner similar to the framework presented in this report should be capable of classifying both data at the point of recording and existing statistical data, for both administrative and survey-based systems. In principle, such an international crime classification could be applied throughout the criminal justice system.

In June 2012, the Conference of European Statisticians endorsed the principles for, and framework approach to, the international classification of crimes for statistical purposes presented in this Report.

# I    BACKGROUND

## The need for an international crime classification

There is often an interest in comparing crime statistics across time, between sources within one country, with statistics from other countries, or with regional or global averages for discerning whether changes in crime levels have occurred over time, for evaluating the effects of policy, and as a starting point for understanding the underlying factors that may be responsible for different crime rates in different contexts.

Meaningful and effective comparison of crime statistics is subject to a number of challenges however. One of the most important of these is the issue of crime *definition*. Crime statistics from different sources are typically generated using different definitions. As a result, simple comparison of the number of crimes in different countries under similar headings may be misleading.

The *purpose* of a classification is to group and organize information meaningfully and systematically into a standard format that can be used to determine the similarity of ideas, events, objects or persons.[1] A classification of 'crime' developed at the international level would have the potential to serve as a common *definitional framework* both for the initial *recording* and/or subsequent *reporting* of data.

The idea of developing a standard classification of crimes for statistical purposes has been recognized by the international community for decades.[2]

More recently, at the regional level, as part of the EU Action Plan on developing a comprehensive and coherent EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice, a study on the development of an EU-level offence classification system (EULOCS) was carried out.[3] As noted in the terms of reference of the Task Force, work on EULOCS represented a fresh impetus for examination of the possibilities for crime classification at the global level.

## The nature of crime and criminal justice statistics

From the legal perspective, an event is only a crime when defined as such by law. Although national legal systems vary and there are different sources of criminal law (common law, continential law, Islamic law), the range of actions considered to constitute crimes is most usually codified in the form of a national criminal law or penal code.[4]

National criminal laws are not homogeneous however. Different legal traditions deal with basically similar events in different ways or use similar terms for different events.  Some actions may be a crime in one country but not another. Nevertheless, a core set of actions that are universally considered to constitute crimes can be identified. Basic acts such as taking a person's property without consent, or killing a person, are defined as offences in the law of every country.

These two conceptions of 'crime' – the technical legal definition and the 'common unacceptable action' – represent the foundation of two primary sources of crime statistics: police-recorded crime and victimization survey-based data. Both are considered in this paper with respect to the issue of crime classification.

*Administrative* crime statistics from police, prosecution, court and corrections records are, in the first place, administrative working statistics of the relevant authorities. Crime statistics from police records suffer from three main

---

[1]    *Ibid.*

[2]    See, for example: United Nations Economic and Social Council, Social Commission, Criminal Statistics: Recommendations of the Secretary-General. UN Doc. E/CN.5/233, 8 January 1951

[3]    Developing a comprehensive and coherent EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice: An EU Action Plan 2006-2010. COM (2006) 437 final.  Study on the development of an EU-level offence classification system and an assessment of its feasibility to support the implementation of the Action Plan to develop an EU strategy to measure crime and criminal justice. UNISYS/IRCP, 2009.

[4]    Differences in the source of criminal law vary depending upon national legal traditions and origins, whether roman or civil law, common law or Islamic law. Some jurisdictions do not have one single criminal or penal code, and certain offences may not even be codified. For an overview see Legal Traditions and Systems: An International Handbook. Katz, A.N. (Ed), Greenwood Press (1986).

limitations on cross-national comparability: (a) differences between the definitions and classifications of crime events; (b) differences in recording practices and counting and coding rules; and (c) differences in reporting behaviours of crime victims and witnesses. Thus, statistics on police-recorded crime, do not 'measure crime' as such, but provide information about crimes that have come to the attention of and have been recorded by the police . Whilst some police record systems simply reproduce all relevant articles of the criminal code, others have categories created from aggregation of particular criminal code articles. In addition, reporting rates to the police vary significantly between countries and between crime types. Average reporting rates across a number of crime types are typically found to average less than 50 percent.[5]

The development of a common classification for statistical purposes may go some way towards addressing (a) – comparability challenges arising from differences in definitions. However, a common classification alone would not solve comparability issues arising from (b) - differences in recording practices.

The effect of counting rules and recording practices on the comparability of police-recorded crime statistics is outside the scope of this report. Nonetheless, this report recognizes that in order for an international crime classification to increase the comparability of crime statistics, such a classification must be applied in a common manner in national contexts. This implies the development of further (cross-national) guidance and standards on data collection procedures and the *way* in which events are counted and recorded by national police institutions. [6]

In addition to police statistics, an international crime classification would also be relevant for statistics collected from population-based victimization surveys. Crime events captured by such surveys do not rely on legal code definitions but use a 'behavioural' or 'event' based approach, as survey instrument questions aim to describe the crime event in straightforward language, focusing on the main 'attributes' of the offence.. Crime statistics derived from victimization surveys using equivalent questionnaire wording in different countries may thus be comparable to some extent. However, this is heavily dependent upon factors such as the choice of sample frame, survey mode, and survey methodology. In addition, survey data are also subject to their own limitations, including those of response rate and correct recall of events by respondents.[7]

# II    DEVELOPING AN INTERNATIONAL CRIME CLASSIFICATION

## Principles of classification

A statistical classification represents an "*exhaustive* and *structured* set of *mutually exclusive* and *well-described* categories"[8]. This definition makes reference to four distinct elements:

- Exhaustiveness: The classification should include every possible manifestation of the phenomenon under study;

- Structure: To create a structure, all possible values of the classification should be grouped in homogeneous categories, which will be eventually aggregated at different hierarchical levels. A classification is different from a list of values of the variable under examination;

- Mutual exclusiveness: Every elementary manifestation of the phenomenon under study should be assigned to one and only one category of the classification such that there are no overlaps;

- Description: Every unit of the classification needs to be described in objective and detailed terms so that observable occurrences can be unequivocally assigned to categories of the classification.

Criminal laws by themselves cannot automatically be assumed to strictly correspond to a (national) crime classification.

---

[5]    Reporting to the police for theft from a car, theft a bicycle, burglary, attempted burglary and theft of personal property. Criminal Victimization in International Perspective. Key findings from the 2004-2005 ICVS and EU ICS.  van Dijk, J., van Kesteren, J., and Smit, P. WODC (2007).

[6]    See for example, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Developing standards in Justice and Home Affairs Statistics: International and EU acquis.* Vienna (2009).

[7]    See further UNODC/UNECE Manual on Victimization Surveys. United Nations (2009).

[8]    United Nations Statistical Commission, Standard Statistical Classifications: Basic Principles. Paper presented at Thirtieth session, New York, 1-5 March 1999.

Offences may exist in multiple, sector-specific, laws, or as uncodified common law, such that the primary criminal code does not fulfill the principle of exhaustiveness. In addition, criminal code articles are unlikely to be organized hierarchically, but rather may be grouped in thematic chapters or sections.

## Background research

In order to determine how these principles could be applied to the development of an international crime classification system, and to identify further applicable principles, the Task Force started by reviewing existing work, including the EULOCS and national crime classification schemes. A brief questionnaire was sent by the Task Force Secretariat to members of the Eurostat Working Group on Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics. Some 27 responses were received, together with 20 complete national crime classification systems.[9] In addition, the Task Force examined publicly available crime classification systems from Australia, Ireland and the United States of America.

From the collected responses, two different approaches to classification at the national level can be identified: (a) an approach based on legal code definitions, whether reproducing all criminal code articles or aggregated categories of articles (around 40 percent of national crime classifications examined); and (b) a 'mixed approach' classification, based on both legal and behavioural criteria (60 percent). The one regional example examined (that of EULOCS) appeared to show a primarily legal code based approach, in an attempt to achieve compatibility with national criminal codes.

In addition to the main variable of the 'type' of offence (described by the national crime classification), countries also reported using descriptive variables, including whether the offence was completed or attempted, the date, time and location of the offence, the means (or *modus operandi*) by which the offence was committed, objects or weapons used in the offence, the nature and value of damage caused, as well as case/investigation progress variables. All countries also indicated that they collected basic suspect/offender data such as sex, age, nationality, residence status, employment and education. Some countries included influence of drugs/alcohol, motive, and relationship to the victim(s). Whilst most countries reported collecting some basic data on victims, not all did so, and the number of victim descriptive variables was typically lower than for suspects/offenders.

## Unit of classification

In spite of their many limitations, crime statistics – whether police-recorded or derived from victimization surveys – are often used as proxies for the true underlying number of crime events. The Task Force decided that the unit of classification should be the _act or event_ that may constitute a crime. For a crime classification at international level, under the principle of exhaustiveness, it would be necessary to cover, so far as possible, all possible acts or events that could carry criminal responsibility and sanctions anywhere in the world.

As such, an international crime classification system would be primarily _event-based_. That is, the range of entities classified would have behavioural and contextual attributes, rather than strictly legal attributes. This approach would also enable an international crime classification system to be used irrespective of the source of input data – whether crimes registered by the police, or incidents reported by respondents in a crime victimization survey.

The same international crime classification system could *also* be used to describe the crime event *for which* a *person* is suspected, arrested, or accused, or *of which* a *person* has been a victim. Indeed, it is important that crime and criminal justice information systems allow the possibility to *link* crime *events*, *perpetrators* and *victims*. As set out below, a 'vertical' crime event classification could be supplemented by 'horizontal' information on perpetrators and victims.

## Application of the principles

Application of the basic classification principles to the development of an event-based crime classification system suggests the following:

---

[9] Responses were received from Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Latvia (National Statistical Office and Ministry of Interior), Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, and the United Kingdom (England and Wales).

### Exhaustiveness

The principle of exhaustiveness must be balanced against the practicality and policy-relevance of an international crime classification. The range of events that may constitute offences under national and international criminal law is extensive and continuously changing (as new laws are developed). Whilst aiming to capture all possible criminal events, the scope of the classification must necessarily be limited in practice to those events that are generally known to constitute offences.

It must also be borne in mind, however, that some countries may criminalize events that are not considered to be crimes by the majority of countries. These events may even be specifically *prohibited* from being defined as crimes by international law or standards. The question remains whether such events should be included in an international crime classification system. The international collection of data on such cases is important from a policy perspective. At the same time, however, the Task Force considers it important that an international crime classification system should not be perceived to legitimize the criminalization of conduct in a manner incompatible with international law and standards, including international human rights law.

Finally, the principle of exhaustiveness must be interpreted in light of a *de minimis* principle. Events that constitute crimes are often assigned different legal labels depending upon their seriousness. National legal systems may characterize serious crimes for example, as felonies or indictable offences. Less serious crimes may be characterized as misdemeanours, summary offences, or contraventions. Under the *de minimis* principle, an international crime classification would *not* include classification categories for events that generally constitute *administrative* offences. Neither would it include specific categories for *very* minor crimes that are typically not recorded by police systems.

### Structure

In order to ensure manageability, there should not be too many hierarchical levels in an international crime classification system. As many crimes contain multiple attributes – such as appropriation of property and injury to a person – broad divisions such as 'crime against the person' may not be suitable as structural classes. Rather, the top-level class may itself already consist of a reasonably high number of divisions based on attributes of the act or event and in accordance with the principles of simplicity and clarity that would make it understandable at the police station level in a very broad range of country and capacity contexts.

### Mutual exclusiveness

One behaviour, or series of behaviours, can have the potential to breach a number of provisions of criminal law, with the result that several offences are committed. A person who uses a computer to access another person's credit card number which he then uses to purchase goods, for example, may be charged with an offence both of fraud, and misuse of computer systems under national criminal law.

In order to avoid ambiguity as to how this behaviour is classified, it is important that an international crime classification system is able to assign the *constituent acts/events* of this behaviour to discrete categories. Each constituent act or event must have a distinct start and end, and be identifiable (and therefore describable) by particular attributes. Possible act/event attributes are discussed under the principle of 'description' below. With respect to the principle of mutual exclusiveness and the example at hand, however, an international crime classification must ensure that the *act/event* of unauthorized computer access is capable of being coded to one discrete category. The *act/event* of use of the credit card number must be capable of being coded to another category.

The classification may further provide a means to *link* the events, such that the dishonest use of the credit card number could be identified as enabled by computer misuse. This could be achieved, for example, by the use of a 'tag' for 'computer facilitated crime'. The important point is that discrete acts/events can be successfully coded in a mutually exclusive way.

As long as an international crime classification system is able to make such distinctions clear, then the question as to whether (in this example) the behaviour results in *one or two* recorded *act/events* in practice is (at least *vis-à-vis* the design of the classification) almost immaterial. As discussed above, an international crime classification system alone is not able to solve all problems related to the comparability of crime statistics. For police-recorded statistics, the way in which this particular behaviour is recorded will depend primarily upon counting rules (such as the 'principal offence' rule). Indeed, the example highlights the fact that the *effectiveness in practice* of an international crime classification system will depend upon the *way* in which it is used.

This principle of classification requires that every unit of the classification must be described in objective and detailed terms. To describe *acts or events* that may constitute crimes, a number of act/event *attributes* may be defined that assist in the description of classification categories. The criteria underlying an attribute must be defined such that they give room to 'typify' the whole act/event. An attribute always predicates something of the act/event as a whole. For example, an object characterized by its color and its shape would require that attribute lists for *both* colours and shapes are needed to describe/typify the object[10]. Some attributes may be *composite*-attributes, in so far as several criteria are required to describe the attribute. Possible attributes for an event-based international crime classification may include:

- The 'target' of the act/event: The target of the act or event describes the main entity against which the act is directed or which the event primarily involves. This may be a person, a tangible object, an intangible object (such as computer data), an animal, a state institution, or a communal value, such as public safety or morals.

- The 'seriousness' of the act/event: The seriousness of an act or event is determined by its harm and consequences for the victim(s) and the community. Indications of the seriousness of a particular event may be defined in law, in terms of concepts such as indictable/non-indictable offences or in the severity of sentences. For the purposes of an event-based classification, it is important that the attribute reflects the inherent damage caused by the act/event. At the top of this scale, the death of a person is almost certainly the most serious event. Events involving bodily injury may also be ranked according to seriousness using established medical scores to assess trauma severity (such as the injury severity score). Crimes may also have serious consequences however that do not involve death or bodily injury. Crimes involving restriction on freedom of movement, involving the use of weapons, and where significant monetary loss occurs also may rank highly under the seriousness attribute.

- The 'intent' of the perpetrator of the act/event: An act cannot be divorced from the perpetrator of the act. As such, the intent of the perpetrator is an important attribute of classification categories. This is because the mere facts of the act/event alone are not sufficient to fully describe the nature of the act/event. 'Death of a person' for example can occur under many different circumstances, ranging from the non-intentional (or negligent), to the intentional. 'Intent' also covers the *motivation* of the perpetrator. In this respect, the distinction between sexual motivation and non-sexual motivation is one important attribute criteria, as is the motivation of provoking a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons.

- The *'modus operandi'* of the act/event: An act may be enabled by the use of force, threats, deception or pretence, dishonesty, intimidation, or unauthorized access. These attributes are central to the nature of the event and represent an important element in describing and classifying the event.

- The 'degree of completion' of the act/event: A particular act can be planned, attempted or completed. As these different degrees of completeness result in different consequences of the act, it is important that they are included as an act/event attribute.

- The 'degree of co-responsibility' of other persons involved in the act/event: An act or event constituting a crime is not always carried out in isolation by one person. Where other persons are involved, their actions may include incitement to carry out a criminal act/event, aiding or abetting the criminal act/event, or acting as an accessory or accomplice to the act/event. The acts of these co-responsible persons are usually themselves criminal events which require classification.

- The 'sex and age' of victims and perpetrators of the act/event: These are important attributes of the act or event as they provide context to the full nature of the event. They often have implications with respect to the characterisation of the event under criminal law.

- The 'policy area' of the act/event: Acts or events that constitute crimes cannot be divorced from the surrounding policy environment. Particular acts or events, such as those with sexual motivation or those involving the offering of undue incentives (bribes) in many countries have a particularly high policy relevance, necessitating reflection of this attribute in an international crime classification, especially at higher aggregation levels.

---

[10] Bayram, V., van der Hoeven, J., van Hooff, H., Kroese, B., Struijs, P., Willeboordse, A. A model-based approach to the design and application of classification systems. Statistics Netherlands: 2002.

### Progressive implementation

In addition to the four principles of classification identified in the work of the United Nations Statistical Commission, the Task Force considered that a fifth principle of 'progressive implementation' is required with respect to the development of an international crime classification system. According to the Task Force, the eventual development of a full international crime classification should be carefully piloted using a limited number of crimes in the first instance. To apply the framework, substantial work would be required to either 'parallel-code' recorded crime events using an international classification, or to 'cross-code' from existing national classifications to an international classification. In order to ensure that lessons-learned are integrated into this process, any international crime classification should be developed in a consultative manner and implemented progressively both within and across countries.

## A proposed framework for an international crime classification system

To test the application of the principles outlined and as starting point for further future work on the progressive development of a full international crime classification system, the Task Force considered it integral to construct a proposed 'framework' for a classification system. Such a framework would allow stakeholders to more effectively assess the appropriateness and legitimacy of the principles through a working model.

As such, the framework presented in this report consists of:

- Three 'event-based' classification levels for the classification of crimes for statistical purposes;

- Horizontal attribute 'tags';

- Accompanying 'act/event *elements*'; and

- Accompanying 'legal inclusions'.

### The framework levels

Level one of the proposed framework consists of ten categories with descriptions based primarily on the *target*, *seriousness*, *modus operandi* and *policy relevance* attributes. On the basis of seriousness, the categories make a distinction, for example, between acts leading to death and acts causing harm to the person. They also recognize that an act/event may have multiple targets and distinguish between acts against property involving violence against a person and acts against property only. Acts against public order or authority are distinguished on the basis of the target attribute. On the basis of public policy relevance, level one also contains separate categories for acts linked to terrorism or organized crime, acts involving illicit drugs or other substances, injurious acts that are sexually motivated, and acts under universal jurisdiction. The category of acts for financial/personal gain is distinguished on the basis of the enabling *modus operandi* of deceit or dishonest conduct. Under the principle of exhaustiveness, level one is intended to cover the universe of known acts/events that commonly constitute crimes under national and universal jurisdictions.

The approach of a relatively broad level one with ten categories was taken to avoid the difficulties of highly aggregated act/event categories such as 'acts against the person' or 'acts against property'. Should such aggregate values be required, the framework offers the flexibility for subsequent summing.

Level two of the framework consists of sub-categories for each of the level one categories. The number of level two categories varies between one and ten sub-categories. The level two categories are based primarily on the attributes of *seriousness, modus operandi, intent, target* and *policy relevance*. Level two contains the distinction, for example, between intentional and non-intentional killing under 'acts leading to death', according to the attribute of intent.

Whereas levels one and two of the framework are intended to be complete, level three of the framework is not complete but rather contains key categories that should be included at this level in any full international crime classification scheme. Again, similar principles apply at level three. Serious and minor bodily harm, for example, are distinguished under the attribute of seriousness. Other categories are distinguished according to the target attribute (unauthorized entry to business premises) or the policy relevance attribute (e.g. infanticide),.

As the proposal consists of a framework and not a complete crime classification system further levels have not been added. Additional classification categories may be added both at level three and at putative levels four and five. Indeed, as discussed below, the ' legal inclusions' presented together with the framework represent a strong starting point for further disaggregation of the event categories.

### Horizontal attribute 'tags'

In addition to attributes that are inherent to the different classification categories, a number of attributes – such as the degree of completion of the act/event, the degree of co-responsibility of persons involved in the act/event, the location of the event (residential premises, business premises, or public area (urban/rural)), and the sex and age of victims and perpetrators of the act/event – can be considered to apply at the horizontal level, *across* all classification categories. In addition, three criteria for the seriousness/policy relevance attributes are coded horizontally: where the victim-offender relationship is that of current or former intimate partner (taken to include both boyfriend/girlfriend and husband/wife or living together), use of a firearm, and the involvement of the perpetrator in an organized criminal group. Development of the definition of 'involvement of the perpetrator in an organized criminal group' will require further work, but may be based upon the definition developed by Europol.[11]

These attributes are coded in the framework as 'tags' that can be added to (almost) any individual category. For example an act such as a member of an organized criminal group shooting at a female with intent to kill or seriously injure but missing, would be coded as "1.1.At.Fi.FV.OC" where 1.1 is the category for intentional homicide, 'At' represents the tag for attempted, 'Fi' for use of a firearm, 'FV' for female victim, and 'OC' for involvement of an organized criminal group.

The effective application of a future international crime classification will require further work to develop guidance on the links between recorded acts/events and the perpetrators and victims involved.[12] One act/event, for example, may involve more than one victim or perpetrator. Similarly, one perpetrator may be responsible for multiple acts/events. Being primarily event-based, an international classification should remain oriented around the *act*, rather than the numbers of persons involved. In principle, however, the horizontal tag system could take account of numbers of victims and perpetrators where guidance is also available on counting rules. An event where 3 men rob 2 women in the same 'course of action' for example, could either be coded as 1 x "4.1.(2FV).(3MP)" or 2 x "4.1.(FV).(3MP)", depending upon the application of counting rules (where 4.1 is the category for robbery and 'FV' and 'MP' are the horizontal tags for female victim and male perpetrator respectively).

In so far as the framework represents a starting point for further development of a full international classification, the horizontal attribute tags are not exhaustive. Further tags that might be added could include tags concerning *modus operandi* such as CF for a 'computer facilitated' act/event, or tags relating to geographic location or time of day of the act/event. A computer facilitated tag, in particular, would serve to provide the link (in the example used previously) between use of a computer to access another person's credit card number which is then used to purchase goods. The act of obtaining money goods by deceit or dishonest conduct using a consumer finance produce could be coded as "7.1.1.CF", where 7.1.1 is the category for consumer finance fraud and CF indicates that this act was facilitated by the misuse of computer systems. If all 'computer facilitated' crimes are classified by a horizontal attribute tag indicating their relation to the use of computers or networks, the totality of what is often called 'cybercrime' can easily be identified within the current framework without adding a separate category for 'cybercrime' as a top-level category to the classification.

### Accompanying act/event 'elements'

The framework is an event-based classification. That is, it classifies the universe of actions or events that are commonly criminalized under national and international law. So far, the act/event categories of the framework have almost always been referred to in full. In practice, many acts/events are already recognized, defined and provided with a specific shorthand name in criminal legislation – for example: 'rape' for 'the act of sexual intercourse without consent'.

In the presentation of the framework in this report, level one, two and three categories are presented using such shorthand terminology. Not only does this provide brevity of language, but it is also an *indication* of the typical legal category which most closely matches the act/event classified. As such, the naming of category 3.1 as rape, is both shorthand for the act of sexual intercourse without consent, and a 'flag' that crimes registered by the police under this heading *could* (and not without careful consideration of the national definition) be coded to this classification category.

However, as the legal meanings ascribed to such shorthand attributes may vary between jurisdictions the use of such shorthand alone would be insufficient for an event-based classification scheme. The framework therefore has the crucial feature of '*Act/event Elements*'. These are not intended to be a strict definition of the act/event, but rather an indication of the attributes and elements that make up the act/event and include a description of the core nature of the action and attributes such as the intent of the perpetrator. For example, "*taking away or limiting movement of a person, against that*

---

[11]    Cf. the criteria set out by Europol (Doc. 6204/2/97 ENFOPOL 35 REV 2).

[12] In the currently proposed framework only the sex of the victim and the perpetrator is recorded in the tags 'FV', 'MV', 'FP', 'MP' for female/male victims/perpetrators, respectively, while age is distinguished only very roughly by the additional tags 'ChV' and 'ChP' for minor victims and perpetrators. A refinement of the recording system could include additional age categories and additional descriptive elements on the offender-victim relationship.

*person or his legal guardian's will*".for the category of 'abduction, hijacking or kidnapping'. The act/event elements are a first attempt to capture the essence of each act/event and will require further development and fine-tuning in order to generate a full international crime classification system.

## Legal inclusions

Whilst the framework adopts an event-based approach, one of the likely uses of a full international crime classification (discussed further in Part IV below) would be the coding of crimes already registered by the police or criminal justice institutions into the international system.

Where registered crimes have been described by the police or prosecutor according to a national system based primarily on the criminal code, there is a need to provide guidance on the 'translation' of such records into the event-based international system.

The '*legal inclusions*' of the framework are designed to provide exactly this. For each category of the framework, the 'legal inclusions' list typical criminal code offences that *may* fall into corresponding category of the framework. Of course, whether this is the case in practice will depend upon whether the definition of each crime in national law contains the act/event elements of serious assault, as set out in the framework. While the 'legal inclusions' provided are not exhaustive, they are intended to provide broad guidance on the *type* of criminal code offences that may fall within the event-based category.

Interestingly, the approach of listing offence types from different countries that could be *included* (and indeed, excluded) in categories of an international crime classification was found to be a constructive approach in a working paper of the United Nations Secretariat as far back as 1957.[13] More recently, the inclusion/exclusion approach of the 1957 work has been adopted by cross-national collections of crime statistics such as the European Sourcebook on Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics.[14] The legal inclusions suggested in this report represent a starting point for 'translation' of national statistics into an international event-based classification.

Finally, the legal inclusions also represent a possible basis for the development of further levels (four, five, six..) of the framework. In particular, some level two categories (such as 'acts contrary to regulatory provisions') are very broad and will require disaggregation along the lines of the legal inclusions (such as betting and gambling offences, corporate or companies offences etc.) in order to provide a clear classification structure and description in these act/event areas.

---

[13] United Nations, Social Defence Section, Bureau of Social Affairs. Criminal statistics: Standard Classification of Offences. Working Paper prepared by the Secretariat. July 1957. The Working Paper lists proposed inclusions and exclusions of national criminal code offences for the international classification categories of homicide, aggravated assault, robbery and burglary, for almost fifty jurisdictions.

[14] WODC. European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics -2010. Fourth edition.

# A proposed framework for an international crime classification system

| Descriptive Tags | | Victim Tags | Perpetrator Tags |
|---|---|---|---|

**Descriptive Tags**

| | |
|---|---|
| **At -** Attempted | **In -** Incitement to |
| **Th -** Threatened | **Ac -** Accessory/ Accomplice |
| **AA -** Aiding or abetting | **Ag -** Aggravated |
| **CF –** Computer facilitated | **Fi -** With firearm |
| **CP -** Conspiring or planning | **Lo -** Location |

**Victim Tags**

**MV -** Male victim
**FV -** Female victim
**ChV -** Child victim

**Perpetrator Tags**

**MP -** Male perpetrator
**FP -** Female perpetrator
**ChP -** Child perpetrator
**IPP –** Intimate partner perpetrator
**OC -** Perpetrator part of an organized criminal group

| Level 1 | | Level 2 | | Level 3 | Act/Event Elements | | Legal Inclusions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Acts leading to death | 1.1 | Murder/intentional homicide | | Death of a person | Perpetrator intended death [or serious injury] | Felony murder; Assassination; Parricide ; Serious assault leading to death |
| | | | | 1.1.1 Infanticide | Death of a child under one year of age | Perpetrator intended death [or serious injury] | Infanticide |
| | | 1.2 | Non-intentional homicide | | Death of a person | Perpetrator was careless, reckless, negligent or dangerous | Loss of control or diminished responsibility or capacity; Voluntary manslaughter/non-negligent manslaughter; Excessive use of force in self-defence; Unlawful act manslaughter; Criminally negligent manslaughter; Involuntary/constructive manslaughter; Bodily injury leading to death where no serious harm intended; Corporate manslaughter; Allowing death/failure to offer aid leading to death; Causing death by dangerous driving; Vehicular manslaughter; Gross negligence manslaughter |
| | | 1.3 | Assisting suicide/euthanasia | | Death of a person | Perpetrator causes, aids or assists death of a person who wishes to die, or with the intent to relieve intractable suffering | Assisting suicide; Voluntary euthanasia; Non-voluntary euthanasia; Involuntary euthanasia |
| 2 | Acts causing harm to the person | 2.1 | Assault | | Unwanted physical contact [or apprehension of harm] | Perpetrator intended to cause injury or harm to another person with no sexual or acquisitive element | |
| | | | | 2.1.1 Serious assault | Serious bodily harm | Perpetrator intended to cause injury or harm to another person with no sexual or acquisitive element | Wounding; Inflicting grievous bodily harm; Battery; Poisoning; Child cruelty; maltreatment in the household |
| | | | | 2.1.2 Minor assault | No or minor bodily harm | Perpetrator intended to cause injury or harm to another person with no sexual or acquisitive element | Actual bodily harm; Apprehension of immediate harm |
| | | 2.2 | Abduction, hijacking, and kidnapping | | Taking away or limiting movement of a person | Against that person's or his legal guardian's will | Taking of hostage in robbery/siege situation; False imprisonment; Hijacking of aircraft, vessel or other public transport (not amounting to an act linked to terrorism); [Abduction by legal guardian in child custody dispute] |

| Code | Category | Description 1 | Description 2 | Examples |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.2.1 | **Kidnapping for ransom/gain** | Taking away or limiting movement of a person against that person's or his legal guardian's will | For the purposes of demanding for their liberation an illicit gain or other economic or material benefit, or in order to oblige someone to carry out or not carry out a particular course of action (excluding child custody dispute) | 'Express kidnapping'; Child abduction |
| 2.3 | **Slavery and exploitation** | Taking away or limiting movement of a person against that person's or his legal guardian's will | For the purposes of exploitation for financial or other gain | Slavery, Debt bondage, Bonded labour or servitude |
| 2.3.1 | **Trafficking of persons** | Recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, through the threat or use of force, coercion, abduction, fraud, deception, abuse of power or vulnerability, or giving payments or benefits to a person in control of the victim | For the purpose of exploitation, sexual exploitation, forced labour, slavery or similar practices or removal of organs | Trafficking of persons for the purposes of exploitation into or out of the country; Trafficking of persons for the purpose of exploitation within the country |
| 2.4 | **Dangerous/negligent acts** | Bodily harm or potential for bodily harm | Perpetrator was careless, reckless, negligent or dangerous | Negligent bodily injury; Neglect of a person under care; Child neglect; Abandoning a child; Jaywalking and other pedestrian offences; Gross negligent conduct of medical procedures; Adulteration of food or medicines |
| 2.4.1 | **Dangerous/ negligent driving/ drunken driving** | Bodily harm or potential for bodily harm | Perpetrator was careless, reckless, negligent or dangerous whilst in control of a motor vehicle | Dangerous or negligent driving or operation of a vehicle; Driving or operating a vehicle under the influence of alcohol or drugs |
| 2.5 | **Harassment/stalking** | Unwanted following, watching, communication with or harassment of a person | | Causing alarm or distress; Menacing phone calls; Private nuisance; Invasion of privacy; Stalking |
| 2.6 | **Coercion** | Demanding a particular course of action | By intimidation or threat of physical harm or violence or harm to reputation | Extortion; Blackmail |
| 2.7 | **Defamation** | Publication (spoken or otherwise) of a false statement | Causing harm to reputation | Libel; Slander; Insult; False accusation of crime |
| 3 | **Injurious acts that are sexually motivated** | | | |
| 3.1 | **Rape** | Sexual intercourse | Without consent, with consent as a result of intimidation or fraud, or where incapable of consent by reason of fact or law | Statutory rape; Deception to procure sex; forced marriage |
| 3.2 | **Sexual assault** | Physical contact or harassment of a sexual nature | Without consent, with consent as a result of intimidation or fraud, or where incapable of consent by reason of fact or law | |
| 3.2.1 | **Physical sexual assault** | Physical contact of a sexual nature not amounting to sexual intercourse | Without consent, with consent as a result of intimidation or fraud, or where incapable of consent by reason of fact or law | Sexual assault of a child; Sexual abuse of a child for the purposes of producing child pornography; Sexual abuse of persons incapable of consenting/resisting; Female genital mutilation; sexual harassment (involving physical contact) |
| 3.2.2 | **Non-physical sexual assault** | Following, watching, communication with or harassment of a person for sexual purposes | Without consent, with consent as a result of intimidation or fraud, or where incapable of consent by reason of fact or law | Sexual harassment (not involving physical contact); Voyeurism; Exposure |

| | | | | Description | Qualifier | Examples |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3.3 | Sexual exploitation of children | Exploitation of a child for sexual purposes | Not amounting to sexual assault or rape of a child | Procuring, arranging, facilitating or controlling a child for prostitution/pornography; Production, creation, distribution, dissemination, broadcast, transmission, exhibition, sale of child pornography; Possession of child pornography; Forcing a child to witness a sexual act or to view pornography; Sexual grooming of a child; Gross indecency with a child; Creating indecent images of a child; Paying for sexual services of a child |
| 4 | Acts against property involving violence against a person | 4.1 | Robbery | Taking of property with intent to permanently deprive from immediate possession, control, custody or care of a person | By use, and/or threatened use of immediate force or violence | |
| | | 4.1.1 | Robbery of business property | Taking of business property with intent to permanently deprive from immediate possession, control, custody or care of a person | By use, and/or threatened use of immediate force or violence | Robbery of an establishment or institutions; Bank robbery; Robbery of a post office; Robbery of a petrol/gas station; Robbery of cash or goods in transit |
| | | 4.1.2 | Robbery of personal property | Taking of personal property with intent to permanently deprive from immediate possession, control, custody or care of a person | By use, and/or threatened use of immediate force or violence | Force of threat of force used to steal during course of a residential burglary; Street robbery; Car jacking (not involving kidnapping/abduction); Assault on motorists with intent to rob |
| 5 | Acts against property only | 5.1 | Burglary | Unauthorized entry of a structure, whether forced or unforced | With intent to commit an offence | |
| | | 5.1.1 | Burglary of business premises | Unauthorized entry of a business structure, whether forced or unforced | With intent to commit an offence | Breaking and entering business premises; Ram raid/smash and grab; Unlawful entry with intent; Break, enter and steal (business premises) |
| | | 5.1.2 | Burglary of residential/ private premises | Unauthorized entry of a residential structure, whether forced or unforced | With intent to commit an offence | Breaking and entering residential premises; Residential burglary; Unlawful entry with intent; Break, enter and steal (residential premises)/theft by burglary of a dwelling; Burglary of a shed/garage with connecting door to a dwelling; Distraction/deception burglary |
| | | 5.2 | Theft | Taking or obtaining of property with intent to permanently or temporarily deprive | Not involving the use of force against a person, threat of force or violence, coercion or deception | Shoplifting; Theft from shop/retail premises; Theft/unauthorized taking of bicycle; Theft of livestock; Theft of money from an automatic machine or meter; Theft of mail; Stealing from premises where authorized to be present not amounting to robbery or burglary; Theft of intellectual property; Larceny; Theft from garages, sheds and lock-ups with no connecting door to a dwelling; Keeping lost money or goods which could reasonably be returned; Theft of electric power; Theft of telephone pulses |
| | | 5.2.1 | Theft of a motor vehicle | Taking or obtaining a motor vehicle with intent to permanently or temporarily deprive | Not involving the use of force against a person, threat of force or violence, coercion or deception | Joyriding/unlawful vehicle taking; Larceny of motor vehicle; Theft of an aircraft or vessel; |
| | | 5.2.2 | Theft from a motor vehicle | Taking or obtaining any property from a motor vehicle with intent to permanently or temporarily deprive | Not involving the use of force against a person, threat of force or violence, coercion or deception | Theft from a motor vehicle (not amounting to car jacking), including theft of parts |
| | | 5.2.3 | Theft from a person | Taking or obtaining any property that is not a motor vehicle with intent to permanently or temporarily deprive | Not involving the use of force against a person, threat of force or violence, coercion or deception | Theft from a person (without use of force, threat, violence, coercion or deception); Pick pocketing or bag snatching not amounting to robbery |
| | | 5.3 | Property damage | Wilful destruction, damage or defacement of public or private | | Arson; Property damage by fire or explosion; Criminal damage, including to a dwelling or vehicle; Graffiti; Vandalism; |

| | | | | | | Description | Condition | Examples |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | property | | Sabotage (not amounting to a dangerous or negligent act) |
| 6 | Acts involving illicit drugs or other substances | 6.1 | Personal use | | | Possession or use of illicit drugs, psychotropic substances or precursors | For personal consumption | Drug possession |
| | | 6.2 | Non-personal use | | | Cultivation, production, manufacture, extraction, preparation, offering for sale, distribution, purchase, sale, delivery, brokerage, dispatch, dispatch in transit, transport, importation, exportation and possession of illicit drugs, psychotropic substances or precursors | Not only for personal consumption | Drug trafficking |
| 7 | Acts for financial/personal gain | 7.1 | Fraud | | | Obtaining money or other benefit or evading a liability | By deceit or dishonest conduct | Making off without payment; Fare evasion; Avoiding payment for services; Fraudulent failure to supply consumer goods or obtaining goods by fraud; Dishonest use of electricity or utilities; False accounting; Insider trading; Fraud involving holdings and investments; Social welfare, tax and insurance fraud; Use of forged articles/possession of an article for use in fraud or deception; Unlicensed/unregistered practice in a trade or profession; Abuse of function/nepotism; Identity theft; Fraudulent pretence of marriage |
| | | | | 7.1.1 | Consumer finance fraud | Obtaining money or other benefit or evading a liability by deceit or dishonest conduct | Using consumer financial products including bank accounts, credit cards, cheques, storecards and online banking systems | Cheque/credit card fraud; Store cared fraud; Online banking fraud |
| | | 7.2 | Forgery/counterfeiting | | | Creating, manufacturing, passing, or possessing a false good or instrument | | Counterfeit document offences; Counterfeit product offences (including bags, shoes and prescription goods); Possession of an article for creation of counterfeit goods or instruments |
| | | | | 7.2.1 | Counterfeit means of payment | Creating, manufacturing, passing, or possessing counterfeit means of payment | | Counterfeit means of payment offences other than cash; Counterfeit coins or notes; Possession of an article for the creation of counterfeit means of payment |
| | | 7.3 | Bribery | | | Promising/offering/giving or soliciting/accepting an under advantage | In order that a person takes or refrains from taking a particular course of action | Active and passive bribery of a public official; Bribery in the public sector |
| | | 7.4 | Dishonest appropriation | | | Dishonestly appropriating money or goods | Which are already in the control of the perpetrator without the use of deception or taking without consent | Embezzlement; Misappropriation; Illicit enrichment ; |
| | | 7.5 | Acts involving proceeds of crime | | | Receiving, handling or processing property | Derived from or obtained, directly or indirectly, though the commission of an offence | Possession of stolen goods or money |
| | | | | 7.5.1 | Money laundering | Converting, transferring, concealing or disguising proceeds of crime | With knowledge of illicit origin of property | |
| 8 | Acts against public order or authority | 8.1 | Acts against public order behavioural | | | Act contrary to accepted public order | | Public drunkenness and other alcohol possession/use offences; Disorderly conduct; Riot; Violent Disorder; Affray; |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | standards | | | | Public fight; Causing public nuisance; Offensive language or behaviour; Vagrancy; Begging; Litter offences; Public mischief; Criminal trespass; Forcible entry and occupation |
| 8.2 | Acts against public order sexual standards | | Act of a sexual nature or with a sexual motivation | Contrary to accepted public order | Prostitution offences; Public indecency; Performing a sexual act in public; Unlawful sexual intercourse; Incest or familial sexual offences; Consensual acts between persons of the same sex; Sexual acts with an animal or corpse; Bigamy |
| 8.3 | Acts contrary to controls on freedom of expression | | Publication, expression, production, possession, distribution, or display of prohibited or controlled views or material | Excluding child pornography | Promotion of ethnic, racial or religious hatred; Obscene material (excluding child pornography; Political views or material; Glorification of violence |
| | | 8.3.1 Acts contrary to controls on religious belief/views | Publication, expression, production, possession, distribution, or display | Of prohibited or controlled religious beliefs/views or material | Blasphemy |
| 8.4 | Acts involving weapons and explosives | | Possession, use, manufacture, import/export, acquisition, sale, delivery, movement or transfer of firearms, their parts and components and ammunition, other weapons or explosives | | Possession of firearm; Possession of weapon; Possession of explosives; Possession of items to endanger life; Manufacturing and trafficking of firearms, parts, components and ammunition; Falsifying, obliterating, removing or altering markings on a firearm; Trafficking in firearms; Manufacture or production of explosives |
| 8.5 | Acts against the environment, and health and safety | | Act with potential to cause harm to the environment or human health and safety | Not falling under a specific negligent/dangerous injurious act | |
| | | 8.5.1 Acts against the environment | Act with potential to cause harm to the environment | Not falling under a specific negligent/dangerous injurious act | Pollution/acts against the environment; Offences against protected species; Dangerous, nuclear, and chemical and substance offences; |
| | | 8.5.2 Acts against health and safety | Act with potential to cause harm to human health and safety | Not falling under a specific negligent/dangerous injurious act | Liquor and tobacco offences (not covered under acts against public order behavioural standards); Planning/building/housing offences including unlawful eviction; Health and safety at work offences; Road vehicle licensing, driving, registration, or road worthiness offences; Public transport safety offences; Abortion offences and concealing a death or birth; Public health offences/communicating infectious disease; Medical malpractice not amounting to gross negligence; Pharmaceutical offences |
| 8.6 | Acts contrary to regulatory provisions | | Act involving behaviour that is regulated or prohibited on moral or ethical grounds | Not falling under specific fraud offences or specific negligent/dangerous injurious acts | Betting and gambling offences; Cultural and artistic property offences (other than theft or property damage); Corporate or companies offences including competition and insolvency offences; Trade, trade descriptions or import/export offences; Investment or stock/shares offences (not amounting to fraud); Usury; Customs, taxation and revenue offences; Employment law offences; Use of personal data offences; Intellectual property offences (not amounting to theft); Animal ownership or welfare offences; Acts against public administration |
| 8.7 | Acts against information systems | | Unauthorized access, interception, interference, or misuse of computer data or computer systems | Excluding specific offences under fraud, theft or sexual exploitation of children | Access to a computer system without right; Interception of computer data without right; Damaging, deletion, alteration, suppression of computer data; Hindering of functioning of a computer system; Production, sale, procurement, import or distribution of devices for acts against information systems |

| # | Category | # | Subcategory | Description | Condition | Examples |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 8.8 | Acts involving immigration and migration | Act related to entry to or exit from the country, right to remain or movement within the country | | Smuggling of migrants; Unlawful entry/illegal border crossing; Harbouring; Visa offences not involving theft or fraud or forgery/counterfeiting |
| | | 8.9 | Acts against the justice system | Act contrary to the operation of the law enforcement or justice system | | Resisting arrest/assault of a police office; Breach of bail conditions; Perverting the course of justice; Perjury; Escape from custody; Breach of court order; Failure to comply with jury summons; Contempt of court/insulting the court; Prison regulation offence; Feigning commission of a crime/fabricating evidence |
| | | 8.10 | Acts against the state | Act directed against the integrity of the state | | Treason; Spying; Disclosure of official secrets; Election offences; Attack against the sovereign; Insult of the state, nation or state symbols; Offences against government security or operations; Military offences/military service offences |
| 9 | Acts linked to terrorism or organized crime | 9.1 | Terrorism | Acts, including supporting acts, intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons | | Committing a terrorist act; Participation/membership in a terrorist group; Recruitment/training for terrorism; Financing terrorism; Incitement to terrorism |
| | | 9.2 | Organized crime | Participating in the activities of an organized criminal group | | Participation in an organized criminal group (only). Note: other acts involving organized crime to be classified according to the act itself and 'tagged' using the OC horizontal tag. |
| 10 | Acts under universal jurisdiction | 10.1 | Torture | Any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing him, intimidating him or coercing him, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind | When such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity | |
| | | 10.2 | Piracy | Violence, detention, rape or depredation committed for private ends by the crew or the passengers of a private ship or aircraft | Directed on the high seas against another ship, aircraft or against persons or property on board a ship or aircraft | |
| | | 10.3 | War crimes, genocide, crimes against humanity | Acts contrary to international criminal law as expressed in the Rome Statute | | War crimes under international humanitarian law; Genocide; Crimes against humanity; rape in armed conflict |

# III    USE OF AN INTERNATIONAL CRIME CLASSIFICATION

The principles and case studies presented in this report represent a starting point for the development of a full international crime classification. Even at this early stage, however, it is important to be clear about the uses to which a full international classification may be put, since the design of a full classification must be informed by its end uses. As noted above, a major challenge to comparability of crime statistics is the issue of differing definitions. Whilst crime victimization surveys may use largely similar question wording, crime registration systems used in different national jurisdictions often rely on different underlying criminal codes and offence definitions.

An international crime classification system would offer three possible solutions to this challenge:

- As a common basis for (parallel) coding and recording of acts/events *at the point of reporting* to and registration by the police; or

- As a common basis for re-coding individual records, as registered according to national practices/classifications

- As a common basis for *translation* or *mapping* of existing statistical data into a standard, agreed format.

The first of these uses would offer the greatest potential in terms of gains in comparability. If an international crime classification system were to be *event-based* in the same way as the framework, then it could be used by police officers *at the point of act/event reporting* to classify the event in an equivalent manner in all contexts. Where national crime registration systems cannot easily be changed due to the need to reflect reported events according to criminal code articles, coding under the international classification system could be carried out in parallel.

Such event-based *parallel coding* need not be quite as onerous in terms of time and resources as it may seem. In the first instance, only a limited set of acts/events particularly relevant to crime prevention initiatives or where a strong cross-national interest exists – those leading to death or harm to a person for example – may be subject to parallel coding. Where coding 'at source' is not possible, another option would be to *re-code* existing records of criminal acts and to map them into those provided for in the international crime classification. This process should be easier where an existing national crime classification system is already founded partly on event-based principles.

A third option is represented by the mapping of existing statistical data into the categories indicated by the international classification. This would involve comparison of the content of existing statistical categories in which data was stored with the international crime classification 'act/event elements' in order to assign – so far as possible – existing data to the relevant international categories.

In so far as an international crime classification is proposed to be *event-based* this could be adopted for both police crime statistics and victimization survey data. Indeed, an international crime classification system may offer a standard format for comparison not only of police statistics across countries, but also for statistics derived from crime victimization surveys with police statistics. The table below shows an example of how this may work in practice.

## Use of an International Crime Classification System for Standard Re-Coding of Existing Data

| Crime Victimization Survey Question | International Crime Classification | Police-Recorded National Crime Classification (Irish example) |
|---|---|---|
| Have you been personally attacked or threatened by someone in a way that really frightened you either at home or elsewhere, such as in a pub, in the street, at school, on public transport, or at your workplace? = **yes**<br><br>(The last time) can you tell me what actually happened = **force used**.<br><br>Did (any of) the offender(s) have a knife, a gun, another weapon or something used as a weapon? = **yes**<br><br>Did you suffer injury as a result? = **yes** | 2.1.1<br>Serious Assault | Assault causing harm<br>(0321) |
| Have you been personally attacked or threatened ...<br><br>(The last time) can you tell me what actually happened? = **force used**<br><br>Did (any of) the offender(s) have a knife, a gun, another weapon or something used as a weapon? = **no**.<br><br>Did you suffer an injury as a result? = **no** | 2.1.2<br>Minor Assault | Minor assault<br>(0324 |
| People sometimes grab, touch or assault others for sexual reasons in a really offensive way…. An incident of this sort might also have involved your partner, family member or a close friend. Has anyone done this to you? = **yes**<br><br>How would you describe the incident? = **a rape** | 3.1<br>Rape | Rape of a male or female<br>(0211) |
| First, a rather personal question. People sometimes grab, touch or assault others for sexual reasons in a really offensive way...<br><br>How would you describe the incident? = **indecent assault**<br><br>Did any of the offender(s) have a knife, a gun, another weapon or something used as a weapon? = **yes**<br><br>What was the weapon = **gun** | 3.2.1 F<br>Physical sexual assault with firearm | Aggravated Sexual Assault<br>(0214) |
| Did anyone actually get into your house or flat without permission and steal or try to steal something? I am not including here thefts from garages, sheds or lock-ups. = **yes**<br><br>Was any member of your household aware of the presence of the burglars the last time this happened? = **no** | 5.1.2<br>Burglary | Burglary (not aggravated)<br>(0712) |
| Did anyone actually get into your house or flat without permission...<br><br>Were any members of your household intimidated (threatened), assaulted, etc. In other words, would you describe the situation as a house robbery, i.e. you or your household were robbed in your own home? = **yes** | 4.1.2<br>Robbery | Robbery from the person<br>(0613) |
| Has any public official, for instance a customs officer, police officer, traffic officer, court official, pensions officer or building inspector, asked you or expected you to pay a bribe for his service? = **yes** | | Corruption (involving public office holder)<br>(0941) |
| Were you the victim of a consumer fraud? In other words, has someone when selling something to you or delivering a service cheated you in terms of quantity or quality of the goods/service? = **yes**<br><br>What type of fraud was it = **a worthless cheque** | 7.1.1<br>Consumer finance fraud | Fraud, deception, false pretence offences<br>(0911) |

The tactic of translation or re-coding to the international crime classification would further offer a standard approach to reporting of crime statistics at the international level. It may be possible, for example, to produce a number of accompanying 'legal inclusions' to the classification, specialized for different legal heritages – such as roman, civil law, common law, and Islamic law. Where clear guidance can be given on the translation of common national criminal code articles to the international crime classification, the potential for error in re-coding may be significantly reduced.

Translation or re-coding of existing data is unlikely to produce the same levels of comparability as (parallel) coding at source or re-coding of individual data. There may always be some concept in national criminal law, or a national classification system, that 'splits across' categories of the international classification. Nonetheless, if an international

classification is adopted by *all* global and regional data collections, the impetus to ensure as accurate a translation as possible is increase, as once the re-coding is complete, the same codes could be used for all international and cross-national data reporting and exchange.

An international crime classification system may also offer assistance at the level of prosecution, court and penal statistics. Whilst the discussion in this report has focused primarily on police and victimization survey statistics, an event-based international classification system would further be relevant for categorizing the acts/events for which an individual is prosecuted or convicted. In this respect, the classification system may offer a route to increased comparability *across* the criminal justice system.

Finally, the existence of an international crime classification, even in the form of a framework classification, will offer important reference and guidance to countries wishing to develop or review their national crime classification. An event-based classification of offences is extremely valuable also in a national context, because of increased comparability across time and space, lower dependence on legal definitions and their modifications, increased consistency with survey-based data and for easier communication of statistical data and analyses. The finalization and broad dissemination of an international classification of crime will be beneficial to a large number of countries and national agencies working on crime prevention and law enforcement.