

NATIONAL STATISTICIAN'S CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

UK Statistics Authority, Meeting room 3, Drummond Gate, London, SW1V 2QQ
Monday 14 December 2015, 14:00 – 16:00

Agenda Item No.	Timings	Order of Business			
1.	14:00 – 14:05			<i>Introduction and announcements</i> Adrian Smith (Chair)	
2.	14:05 – 14:10		NSCSAC(15)6	<i>Minutes and matters arising from the meeting held on 24 September 2015</i> Adrian Smith (Chair)	
3.	14:10 – 14:30	For Discussion		<i>Oral update on next steps for scrutiny of police crime recording accuracy</i> Mike Cunningham (HMIC) For information see Sir Tom Winsor's letter to Chief Constables, 6 November 2015 http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmic/wp-content/uploads/crime-recording-chief-inspectors-letter-to-police-force.pdf	
4.	14.30 – 15.00		NSCSAC(15)7	<i>Extending the CSEW to fraud & cybercrime</i> Joe Traynor	
5.	15:00 – 15:10			<i>Oral Update on mapping child abuse data</i> Allan Brimicombe and Fiona Glen	
6.	15:10 – 15:20			<i>Oral update from the Crime Index TFG</i> Chris Lewis	
7.	15:20 – 15:30		NSCSAC(15)8	<i>National Crime Registrar's Report</i> Steve Bond	
8.	15:30 – 15:50			<i>Regulatory aspects of crime statistics</i> Ed Humpherson	
9.	15:50 – 16:00		Any other business		All members

MINUTES OF
THE NATIONAL STATISTICIAN'S CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING ON 14 DECEMBER 2015
Meeting room 3, 1 Drummond Gate, Pimlico, London, SW1V 2QQ

CHAIR

Roma Chappell Office for National Statistics

MEMBERS PRESENT

David Blunt	Home Office
Steve Bond	Home Office
Allan Brimicombe	University of East London
Steve Ellerd-Elliott	Ministry of Justice
Jeff Farrar	National Policing Lead for Crime Statistics
Fiona Glen	Independent expert
Junaid Gharda	Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Staffordshire
Lisa Harker	NSPCC
Mike Levi	Cardiff University
Chris Lewis	University of Portsmouth
Patricia Mayhew	Independent Criminological Consultant
Stephen Shute	University of Sussex

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES

Mike Cunningham	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (for Tom Winsor)
Alaistair Windus	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (for Mark Stainforth)
Scott Clifford	Welsh Government (for Glyn Jones)

SECRETARIAT

John Flatley Office for National Statistics

APOLOGIES

Adrian Smith	UK Statistics Authority Board
Glyn Jones	Welsh Government
Mike Warren	Home Office
Tom Winsor	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
Mark Stainforth	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

1. Chair's Introduction and announcements

- 1.1. Roma Chappell opened the meeting by explaining that the Chair, Adrian Smith, had notified the Secretariat earlier in the day that he would be unable to attend the meeting and it had been agreed that she would take the chair on this occasion.
- 1.2. On behalf of the Chair, Roma Chappell welcomed Lisa Harker, the Director of Strategy, Policy and Evidence at the NSPCC, as a new non-executive member of

the committee. It was also announced that the Chair had appointed Gavin Hales, Deputy Director of the Police Foundation, as another new non-executive member.

- 1.3. Non-executive members who had replied to the Chair's invitation to renew their term of office were thanked for doing so.

2. Minutes and matters arising from meeting held on 24 September 2015- NSCSAC(15)6

- 2.1. The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as an accurate record.
- 2.2. With regard to Action 5 from the last meeting, Jeff Farrar reported that an email exchange between him and the College of Policing had been sent to the Secretariat. This confirmed that the College was intending to evaluate the training delivered to Force Crime Registrars.
- 2.3. The Chair noted that all the other actions, as summarised in the Action Log at the end of the minutes, had been completed or were to be covered by agenda items at this meeting.
- 2.4. With regard to minute 2.2 of the last meeting, Stephen Shute reported that the fourth and final annual report of the predecessor committee was being finalised following comments received from members. Stephen expected the report to be sent to the Home Secretary and the National Statistician before Christmas.

Action 1: Secretariat to send a link to members once the report had been finalised.
--

3. Next steps for scrutiny of police crime recording accuracy - Oral update

- 3.1. The Chair introduced this item by noting the letter sent by Sir Tom Winsor to Chief Constables in November which announced his intention to commence a series of unannounced inspections of crime recording and that the importance placed by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) on "accurate crime recording is undiminished".
- 3.2. In Sir Tom's absence, the Chair invited Mike Cunningham from HMIC to give the committee an update on their latest thinking. Mike Cunningham explained that he had recently taken on the role of Senior Responsible Officer within HMIC for this work and looked forward to working with this Committee and others on developing their methodology.
- 3.3. Mike Cunningham informed the Committee that HMIC were currently exploring options for taking this work forward and it was likely that there would be a rolling programme of inspections with not all forces inspected every year. However, the intention of the inspections being unannounced was that no forces could afford to relax as all were subject to inspection at any time.
- 3.4. When asked how many forces were likely to be inspected each year, Mike Cunningham said maybe as few as seven and this led Stephen Shute to express concern that this would mean that it would take around six years for all forces to be

inspected which may have implications for the restoration of National Statistics status.

- 3.5. Mike Cunningham was also asked how the unannounced element would work in practice. Mike Cunningham noted that it was not practical for inspectors to arrive at a police force without any notice at all. He said that it was likely that forces would be told perhaps some weeks in advance that they were subject to an inspection so there was time for them to provide HMIC with the required documentation for inspection.
- 3.6. Jeff Farrar welcomed the recent announcement by Sir Tom as sending an important signal to forces about the need for a continuing focus on accurate crime recording. Jeff also reported that he had asked all forces to provide him with an update on how they had responded to HMIC's national recommendations and would be collating this information.

4. Extending the CSEW to fraud and cyber crime – NSCSAC(15)7

- 4.1. Joe Traynor, from ONS, joined the meeting to present a paper on work being done to extend the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) to fraud and cyber crime. Joe took the Committee through the main points summarising the work that had been carried out to date which had concluded with the inclusion of new questions in the live survey from 1st October 2015.
- 4.2. Questions were raised about the handling of attempted frauds within the new CSEW questions and the extent to which this was consistent with Home Office Counting Rules. Joe explained that the survey was attempting to mirror the HOCR in, for example excluding the mere receipt of a phishing email but including attempts where the respondent had become a "specific intended victim" and had initially responded to the fraudster in the way that was intended but disengaged before falling victim.
- 4.3. However, it was noted that the CSEW would differ from the HOCR in counting some incidents as crimes against a respondent, for example a credit card fraud in which the card issuer had made good the financial losses suffered. Under HOCR this would only be included if reported by the card issuer rather than the card holder. It was agreed that it was important that as a household victimisation survey that excluded commercial organisations it was sensible for such an approach to be adopted. It was noted that it would be important for ONS to explain these differences as they may well lead to significant volume differences between the two series going forward.
- 4.4. Joe highlighted the two main issues that ONS was seeking advice on from the Committee:
 - whether or not threats should be incorporated into the headline CSEW estimates of crime; and,
 - how to handle the incorporation of new estimates of fraud and cyber crime into the headline CSEW estimates of crime.
- 4.5. There were differing views on the options presented. There were not strong views on the incorporation of threats though Pat Mayhew felt the status quo should remain. There was broad support for the initial labeling of the new fraud and cyber-crime figures as experimental statistics and keeping them separate from the existing time series at least for an initial bedding-in period.

- 4.6. The Chair thanked the Committee for the advice received and gave ONS an action to reflect on this advice when formulating their plans.

Action 2: ONS to reflect on the advice given and to inform the committee of their final proposals.

5. Mapping child abuse data – oral update

- 5.1. The Chair noted that since the last meeting, it had been decided to establish a formal Task and Finish Group (TFG) to take forward work the Committee had discussed at its last meeting. Allan Brimicombe had agreed to Chair this group and the Chair asked him to give an oral update on this work.
- 5.2. Allan reported that an informal meeting had taken place in September but the first formal meeting of the Task and Finish Group had taken place immediately prior to this Committee meeting. The core membership of the group comprised non-executive members of NSCSAC (Allan Brimicombe, Fiona Glen and Lisa Harker) supported by expertise outside of NSCSAC from ONS and the Home Office.
- 5.3. Allan described the objectives of the TFG as being to provide advice on the range of data available on child abuse which could be used to improve the official statistics on crime and to identify current gaps in these data and how they may be filled using new sources of information which could include both new administrative and survey data.
- 5.4. Allan said that he thought the work of the group could extend over 12 months and therefore was concerned with the suggestion that there would be something concrete to discuss at the next Advisory Committee meeting in May 2016. The TFG was next due to meet in February and would take stock of progress made at that point before committing to a paper for the May meeting of the NSCSAC.
- 5.5. A question was raised about how a child was to be defined, i.e. under 18 or under 16. Allan noted that this was one of the definitional issues that the TFG would be examining as data sources used different thresholds.

Action 3: Allan Brimicombe to provide an update at the May meeting.

6. Crime Index Task and Finish Group – oral update

- 6.1. The Chair invited Chris Lewis, Chair of the Crime Index Task and Finish Group, to give an update on its work.
- 6.2. Chris reminded members that an ONS paper discussed at the last meeting of the TFG had been circulated with the papers for this meeting and summarised the work that had been completed to date developing a prototype index.
- 6.3. Chris reported that the TFG had not met since that paper had been produced and there was little progress to report since then. However, ONS would be taking forward the suggestions made by the TFG and producing further analysis by the end of February. An update would be reported at the next meeting of NSCSAC.

Action 4: Chris Lewis to provide a progress report to the May meeting.

7. National Crime Registrar's Report - NSCSAC(15)8

- 7.1. Steve Bond introduced the National Crime Registrar's Report. The Committee noted the contents of the report.
- 7.2. The Chair invited Pat Mayhew to reflect on the Force Crime Registrar (FCR) Conference that she had attended in October. Pat said that she thought the conference had been good and the FCRs had welcomed Sir Tom Winsor's continuing commitment to focus on the quality of crime recording.

8. Regulatory aspects of crime statistics –Ed Humpherson guest appearance

- 8.1. The Chair introduced Ed Humpherson, the Director General for Regulation at the UK Statistics Authority, to the Committee and asked him to reflect on the work that the Authority had done in the area of crime statistics.
- 8.2. Ed highlighted three themes that had characterised the UK Statistics Authority's interest in crime statistics across the whole of the UK. These being:
 - trustworthiness;
 - quality; and,
 - public value.
- 8.3. Ed said that he thought the police recorded crime series were statistics of national significance and potentially valuable source of data to inform democratic accountability. Ed said he thought it possible for police recorded crime in England and Wales to attain National Statistics status, as had been achieved in Northern Ireland. However, Ed also noted that it was more challenging in England and Wales with 43 territorial police forces to achieve consistent recording as opposed to Northern Ireland that had a single police force.
- 8.4. Ed thought the committee would be interested in his views about when police recorded crime might be re-accredited as National Statistics. Ed said that an important test would be whether the producers of the statistics were confident that changes in levels of recorded crime reflected genuine changes in society rather than being an artefact of changes in recording practices.

9. Any other business

- 9.1. The Chair invited comments on the Issues log. Pat Mayhew asked with respect to the re-designation of police recorded crime (PRC) what items ONS were considering for possible inclusion in an evidence pack to support an application for a re-assessment by the UK Statistics Authority. The Chair reported that it comprised a range of measures including a comparison between the CSEW and PRC; ratio of recorded crimes to incident reports and process improvements flowing from the UK Statistics Authority requirements and HMIC recommendations.
- 9.2. The recent release of a review, carried out by Irene Curtis, of the use of targets in managing police performance was raised. This had included a recommendation that the Home Office should consider taking back ownership of the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR) and bring it into line with the standard for crime recording to create a single transparent recording framework. In the light of this it was agreed

that the committee should raise the importance of this issue on the log. The Chair actioned the Secretariat to do this and to circulate a link to the Curtis review with the minutes¹.

Action 5: Secretariat to raise the importance of NSIR on the issues log and consider how to take this work forward.

9.3. Members were informed that the next meeting is due in May and a date had yet to be confirmed

**NSCSAC Secretariat
23 December 2015**

1

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/466058/Review_Targets_2015.pdf

ACTION TABLE FROM MEETING OF 14 DECEMBER 2015

	ACTION	ACTIONEE	PRIORITY/COMPLETION DATE	PROGRESS
1	To send a link to fourth and final annual report of predecessor committee to all members	Secretariat	High – January 2016	Complete
2.	ONS to reflect on the advice given on handling of changes to the CSEW time series and to inform the committee of their final proposals.	ONS	High – before next meeting	On agenda for 5 th May meeting
3	To provide an update on TFG work mapping child abuse data	Allan Brimicombe	Medium – May 2016	On agenda for 5 th May meeting
4	To provide an update on TFG work exploring feasibility of a Crime Severity Index	Chris Lewis	Medium – May 2016 meeting	On agenda for 5 th May meeting
5	Secretariat to raise the importance of NSIR on the issues log and consider how to take this work forward.	Secretariat	High – before next meeting	This action has been dealt with by correspondence. Responses from committee members are due back by 4 th March.

Fraud and Cybercrime field trial and first estimates

NSCSAC(15)7

Purpose

1. To update the Committee on the recent Fraud and Cybercrime Field Trial and the dissemination plan for the release of future estimates on fraud and cybercrime.

Action

2. The Committee are asked to note the findings of the Field Trial and give their view on the future dissemination plan including on the future treatment of threats in CSEW headline estimates.

Background

3. In response to recommendations of the National Statistician, and following advice from its predecessor committee, ONS has made a number of changes to the coverage and presentation of statistics on fraud. This includes an 18 month programme of work to develop questions relating to fraud and cybercrime which will enable the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) to provide such estimates for the first time. The research has involved several stages of development. The most recent work included a successful field trial of the questions with a sample of over 2,000 households which took place between 20th May and 9th August 2015. The findings of the field trial were published alongside the quarterly update for the year to June published in October as research outputs¹.
4. The field trial showed that the structure and format of the new questionnaire worked well in the live environment. The new questions were found to have no impact (order effect) on the recording of traditional crimes, suggesting that their inclusion should not impact on core survey estimates for established crime types. As a result the fraud and cyber crime questions have been added to the survey instrument from October 2015. To minimise problems associated with extending the interview length the new fraud and cyber-crime questions will initially be asked on a half sample only.
5. The new questions worked well with both incident descriptions and follow up questions providing sufficient information for the accurate classification of offences; only minor amendments were recommended; mainly in relation to the language used in a few of the questions. All changes have been incorporated into the main CSEW questionnaire from 1st October 2015.

¹ <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/method-quality/specific/crime-statistics-methodology/methodological-notes/methodological-note---csew-fraud-and-cyber-crime-development--field-trial---october-2015.pdf>

6. Crime Statistics classify crimes according to which offence has been committed with reference to the Criminal Law. Cybercrime is not a specific legal offence but a modus operandi covering a range of different offences including Fraud, Computer Misuse Act Offences, harassment etc. In addition to the coding of incidents according to offence, the coding scheme will also capture whether or not **any incident** was a cyber related offence; thereby enabling the survey to provide a measure of cyber related criminal activity experienced by the household population.
7. Initial estimates were produced based on the field trial using a prototype fraud and computer misuse classification and published alongside the year to June quarterly update².
8. The fraud classification categorises fraud by fraud type, and according to whether the victim suffered a financial loss. Fraud offence types fall into four major fraud groups. These groups were developed using the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau (NFIB) classification used for police recorded crime to give greater coherence and comparability between the sources.
9. Following the field trial the offence classification coding and its guidance documentation has been reviewed and updated to ensure that all scenarios identified in the trial are covered by the guidance documentation. Details of the classification can be found in Annex A.

Threats

10. Sitting alongside the current development work relating to fraud and computer misuse the ONS have adapted existing questions relating to threats to more explicitly incorporate such incidents committed online (e.g. via social media). For historical reasons, estimates from these existing questions have not previously been included in the headline CSEW estimates of crime. The traditional question upon which these estimates are based was changed to include on-line threats in April 2015 (see Annex B for both the originally worded question and the adapted new question).
11. Extending the headline estimates to include threats is likely to add a further 1.5 million incidents of crime to the CSEW total. Preliminary analysis shows that the level of threats has remained fairly stable over time and it would be possible to produce a back-series for off-line threats back to 1981, thus reducing the amount of discontinuity to the existing time series.
12. These incidents comprise a wide spectrum of threats ranging from low level verbal threats to assault through sexual threats and threats to kill. The category is predominantly low level threats and this offence type has by far the lowest level of reporting to the police (around 10%).

² <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/method-quality/specific/crime-statistics-methodology/methodological-notes/methodological-note---csew-fraud-and-cyber-crime-development--field-trial---october-2015.pdf>

13. It would be incoherent to extend the CSEW estimate to include threats committed online but to continue to exclude those experienced offline. Thus, the views of the committee are welcome on the future treatment of threats and harassment in CSEW estimates.

Future publication plans

14. Since the full set of questions relating to fraud and cybercrime were introduced onto the survey questionnaire in October 2015 the first quarter's data will become available for analysis in early February 2016. This will be based on around 4,000 households interviewed. ONS are minded to use this first quarter's data to further test the survey coding and processing system. This first quarter's data will also allow us to consult with key users over the presentation of these statistics in our quarterly publication in advance of a first release, based on the first two quarters data, later in the year.

15. From the field trial it is clear that these new questions will have a substantial impact on the volume of crime measured by the CSEW and will introduce the first major discontinuity in the time series since the early 1980's. The field trial estimate, of around seven million incidents of Fraud and Computer Misuse Act offences is currently greater than the estimate for total CSEW crime. When the new estimates are incorporated in the ONS quarterly statistical release it will be important to communicate clearly that the inclusion of these new offences has led to a substantial rise in crime being measured by the survey, rather than crime per se.

16. Options for handling the release of these new estimates include, but not limited to:

- a. releasing as experimental statistics³ published alongside, but not incorporated into, the existing headline CSEW estimates until two year's data has been collected on a new basis;
- b. incorporating into the headline estimates with clear explanation that the new estimate is not comparable with the previous year's estimate and showing two trend lines on a new and comparable time series with appropriate caveats;
- c. model a ten year back series using questions previously asked about experience of bank and credit card fraud (included in the survey since 2005/06) and inflating based on the ratio of non bank and credit card fraud to other fraud suggested by the new CSEW questions or administrative sources.

17. Some combination of the above options might be possible such as using option b and c in combination to more clearly communicate the likely impact on the CSEW time series of extending the headline estimates to these new offences.

Joe Traynor

Office for National Statistics

7 December 2015

³ Experimental statistics refer to statistics that are in the testing phase and not yet fully developed.

Annex A Offence Coding Classification for Fraud and Computer Misuse Act Offences

Fraud

- **Bank and credit account fraud**
 - With Loss (200)
 - With full loss reimbursed (201)
 - No loss (202)
- **Advance Fee fraud**
 - With Loss (203)
 - With full loss reimbursed (204)
 - No loss (205)
- **Non-investment fraud**
 - With Loss (206)
 - With full loss reimbursed (207)
 - No loss (208)
- **Other Fraud (inc investment fraud)**
 - With Loss (210)
 - With full loss reimbursed (211)
 - Attempts (212)
- Out of scope fraud (219)

Computer Misuse

- Hacking and unauthorised access to personal information (320)
- Computer virus
 - With Loss (321)
 - With full loss reimbursed (322)
 - No loss (323)
- Out of scope computer misuse (329)

Annex B Questions on threats

Previous Threat question

And [apart from anything you have already mentioned], in that time, has anyone THREATENED to damage things of yours or THREATENED to use force or violence on you in any way that actually frightened you?

1. Yes
2. No

Adapted Threat question

And [apart from anything you have already mentioned], in that time, has anyone THREATENED you in any way that actually frightened you?

Please include threats that have been made by any means, for example in person, on-line or over the telephone.

1. Yes
2. No

NATIONAL STATISTICIAN'S CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Report of National Crime Registrar

NSCSAC(15) 8

Purpose/Issue

1. This paper is the regular report to the Committee from the National Crime Registrar., These reports are intended to either outline any proposed changes to the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) in detail where the committee's advice is sought or to inform the committee of non-significant changes for information. These reports have also been used to inform members of other developments that may impact on the quality of crime recording.

Action

2. No significant changes are proposed to the HOCR at this time. The Committee is invited to note the contents of this paper.

Background

3. In establishing the Crime Statistics Advisory Committee to give independent advice on proposed changes to the Home Office Counting Rules for police recorded crime it was agreed that the National Crime Registrar (NCR) had delegated authority to determine, in agreement with the Chair, whether changes proposed to the HOCR were significant enough that they required referral to it for consideration prior to implementation. It was agreed that minor changes would be reported to the committee for information only.

Crime Recording Strategic Steering Group

4. The National Crime Recording Strategic Steering group (NCRSSG) has met once since the last meeting of the committee, in October 2015. The SSG continues to focus on their oversight of Home Office actions in relation to the ONS re-designation project some of which may continue after re-assessment.
5. At their last meeting the SSG considered again the future uses for and presentation of incident data, a matter that the committee has also discussed, and the SSG was in general agreement that crime and incident recording needed to be more closely aligned. The national policing lead (CC Farrar) advised that he had been in discussions with other relevant policing leads with a view to bringing both recording standards under one over-arching NPCC business portfolio.
6. The SSG also considered plans for additions and revisions to the recorded crime outcomes framework for 2016/17 and agreed that, subject to ministerial approval, four new outcomes should be added.
 - Three outcomes to identify cases where the offence charged or cautioned is an alternative to that recorded.
 - One outcome to identify cases where despite there being a clearly identified suspect the police consider it not in the public interest to investigate.

Training for Force Crime Registrars

7. The committee has previously expressed a close interest in the plans for formal training and accreditation for registrars. Since the last meeting of the committee two training courses have been held each lasting for a full week. Twenty two delegates attended and all successfully achieved accreditation as being operationally competent (100% pass rate). Feedback from both courses has been extremely positive and all delegates advised that they found the assessment process challenging and stretching. Two further courses are scheduled for early in 2016 which are fully booked and additional courses are being scoped. The College continues to consider training for the wider community involved in crime recording.

Conference for Force Crime Registrars

8. The Home Office ran a two day conference for crime registrars at Ryton on October 15/16. This followed a similar format to last year's event and was welcomed by the registrar community. Keynote speakers included Sir Tom Winsor and Ed Humpherson. On behalf of the Chair, Pat Mayhew attended and gave a presentation on the work and achievements of the committee.

HMIC Inspection Plans

9. On the 5th November 2015 Sir Tom Winsor wrote to all PCCs and Chief Constables outlining plans for on-going inspections of police crime recording following on from their thematic report published in November 2014. The letter was copied to the National Statistician and is available to read below:



2015 11 05 - CDI -
Ltr to CCs and PCCs.i

Steve Bond
National Crime Registrar
27 November 2015

Sir Thomas Winsor WS
Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary

All chief constables (and MPS ACs and above)
All police and crime commissioners
& London local policing bodies

6 November 2015

Dear chief constable / police and crime commissioner

CRIME-RECORDING – ACCURACY – FURTHER INSPECTIONS

This letter tells you how HMIC will inspect forces' crime-recording practices in future.

2. It is almost a year since the publication of our report on the accuracy of crime-recording – *Crime-recording: Making the Victim Count*. It did not reveal an attractive picture.
3. As you know, the 2014 national average of under-recording of crimes – 19 per cent – was inexcusably poor. The position was even worse in the cases of sexual offences (including rapes) where under-recording was at 26 per cent, and the national rate of incorrect decisions to no-crime rapes was 20 per cent. In the case of violence against the person, 33 per cent of crimes went unrecorded.
4. This was the national picture. Of course some forces performed significantly better, and some much worse. Some forces, such as Kent and West Yorkshire, showed how rapidly a poor position should and could be remedied.
5. In our report, we said that failure properly to record crime is indefensible, and a continuation of the reported national failure rate would be deplorable.
6. We said that accurate crime-recording is essential if forces are to be able to make sound decisions on the deployment of resources, and to operate with the highest practicable levels of efficiency. Further pressures on police budgets will intensify the need for reliable information about crime. Public safety and the needs of victims must not be compromised by such failures.
7. The importance which HMIC – and those who hold police forces to account – attaches to accurate crime-recording is undiminished.
8. In future, in relation to crime-recording, HMIC will carry out unannounced inspections. These will not be confined to those forces in which crime-recording was found in 2014 to be especially bad. Every force will be inspected. The intensity of each inspection and the aspects of crime-recording inspected will be at HMIC's discretion. Forces will be told what is required when the inspectors arrive.
9. Any force which is found not to be taking all necessary steps to record crimes accurately and in accordance with the published rules and standards should expect appropriate criticism from HMIC. Our findings and judgment in each case will be published.

10. It is often objected that forces have to spend a lot of time preparing for HMIC inspections. In the case of our inspections of crime-recording, the only preparation which is necessary is to ensure crime-recording is always as good as it should be.
11. Our inspections will also assess the extent to which recommendations in HMIC's 2014 crime-recording inspection have been implemented.
12. It is in the interests of every force to ensure that materially adverse public criticism of any force is avoided.
13. This letter is published.

Yours faithfully,



SIR THOMAS WINSOR

Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary

Copies:

Home Secretary
Minister for Policing
Chair, Home Affairs Select Committee
Chair, Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Select Committee
Chief Executive, UK Statistics Authority
National Crime Registrar, Home Office
Chair, NPCC
Chair and CEO, College of Policing