

CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Thursday 19 September 2013, from 14:00 until 16:00
UK Statistics Authority Meeting, Room 3, 1 Drummond Gate, London, SW1V 2QQ

Agenda Item No.	Timings	Order of Business		
1.	14:00 – 14:15	Welcome	CSAC(13)13	Welcome, announcements and matters arising from the meeting held on 8 May 2013 Stephen Shute (Chair)
2.	14:15 – 14:20		CSAC(13)14	Cutting Local Bureaucracy in Respect of Additional Verifiable Information (AVI) for No Crimes and Reclassification of Crimes Jeff Farrar, ACPO
3.	14:20 – 14:40		CSAC(13)15	Changing the PRC Threshold for Inclusion in Notifiable Offences and Weeding the Existing Notifiable offences Steve Bond, Home Office
4.	14:40 – 14:55		CSAC(13)16	Review of Notifiable Offence Data Collection for State based Offences Jeff Farrar, ACPO
5.	14:55 – 15:20		CSAC(13)17	HMIC's Crime Data Integrity Inspection Olivia Pinkney, HMIC
6.	15:20 – 15:35		CSAC(13)18	Improving the measurement of fraud in crime statistics John Flatley, ONS
7.	15:35 – 15:45		CSAC(13)19	Process for renewing committee membership Philippa Brimicombe, NSO
8.	15:45 – 15:50		CSAC(13)20	National Crime Registrar's Report Steve Bond, Home Office
9.	15:50 – 16:00	Any other business		All members

Date of the next meeting:

- Tuesday 3 December 2013 14:00 – 16:00

**MINUTES OF THE
CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING ON 19 SEPTEMBER 2013**

BOARDROOM, UK STATISTICS AUTHORITY, DRUMMOND GATE, LONDON, SW1V 2QQ

CHAIR

Stephen Shute University of Sussex

MEMBERS PRESENT

David Blunt	Home Office
Steve Bond	Home Office
Allan Brimicombe	University of East London
Roma Chappell	Office for National Statistics
Giselle Cory	Victim Support
Mike Elkins	Ministry of Justice
Jeff Farrar	Association of Chief Police Officers
Junaid Gharda	Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Staffordshire
Mike Hough	Institute for Criminal Policy Research, School of Law, Birkbeck
Glyn Jones	Welsh Government
Mike Levi	Cardiff University
Jil Matheson	National Statistician
Patricia Mayhew	Independent Criminological Consultant
Mike Warren	Home Office

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES

John Flatley	Office for National Statistics
Olivia Pinkney	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (for Tom Winsor)
Dominic Smith	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

SECRETARIAT

Philippa Brimicombe	National Statistician's Office
Nicola White	Office for National Statistics

APOLOGIES

Chris G Lewis	University of Portsmouth
Tom Winsor	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary

1. Welcome

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced two new members, Roma Chappell and Mike Warren. The later is the temporary replacement for Jae Samant. The Chair offered thanks to Jae for all her work on the Committee since it was formed.
- 1.2. The Chair reflected on the workshop that had preceded the formal meeting. He explained that he felt that similar sessions prior to future meetings would be beneficial. The consensus was that this would be useful and that the focus should be on one or two topics, which could

be considered in detail. The Chair will reflect on the topics and prioritise in order of importance.

- 1.3. The Chair reported that the Committee's second annual report had been submitted to the Home Secretary and had been published on the Committee's webpage.
- 1.4. It was noted that the Chair had appointed Allan Brimicombe as deputy Chair of the Committee.
- 1.5. The Chair updated members on his meeting with the UK Statistics Authority's Committee for Official Statistics explaining that he had informed them on the work of CSAC, what it had achieved so far and the challenges it faced. It was noted that this had been well received and there were suggestions that this model might be considered for other statistical themes working in contentious areas.

Action 1: Chair to consider future topics for the workshop sessions and prioritise as necessary.

2. Minutes of the meeting held on 8 May 2013 and matters arising – CSAC(13)13

- 2.1. It was noted that the minutes had been approved via correspondence and were available on the Committee's webpage.
- 2.2. All actions from the meeting of 8 May 2013 have been actioned or are in progress.
- 2.3. David Blunt updated members on the open meeting being hosted by the Royal Statistical Society to discuss divergence in trends between the Crime Survey for England and Wales and Police Recorded Crime. This meeting has come about following discussions at the last Committee meeting in May 2013. It was noted that the meeting is being held on 28 October 2013 and David agreed to circulate a flyer for the meeting to members. An update on the event will be provided at the Committee's December meeting.

Action 2: David Blunt to circulate flyer for the divergence event at the RSS to CSAC members.

Action 3: An update on the RSS event on divergence between CSEW and PRC to be provided for the next meeting of the Committee.

3. Cutting Local Bureaucracy in Respect of Additional Verifiable Information (AVI) for No Crimes and Reclassification of Crime – CSAC(13)14

- 3.1. Jeff Farrar introduced the paper which invited the Committee to approve a definition of Additional Verifiable Information (AVI) and encourage its adoption across police forces. The following points were made in discussion:
 - it was noted that there would be no changes to the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) and this recommendation is to provide clarity and advice for Force Crime Registrars;
 - to understand how the guidance would be helpful, members were informed of examples from across different forces on interpretation of AVI and how this guidance could be used to solve the issue;

- it was proposed that paragraph two of the guidance be amended to refer to the need to meet requirements rather than exceed them. Members agreed to this change.

3.2. The Committee endorsed the proposals set out in the paper and the Chair agreed that he would write to the Home Secretary giving advice on this matter.

Action 4: CSAC Chair to write to the Home Secretary to inform her that the Committee has agreed to the guidance for AVI and to set out the reasons for this change.

4. Review of the Threshold for Inclusion on the Notifiable Offences List and Weeding of Rarely Recorded Offences – CSAC(13)15

4.1. Steve Bond introduced the paper explaining that it sets out two separate but inter-linked proposals. The first proposal is to change the Notifiable Offence List (NOL) threshold. The recommendation is that in future only new Indictable Only (IO) offences should automatically be added to the NOL and the addition of any other new offences should be assessed on a case by case basis. The following points were made in discussion:

- the Committee was supportive of the proposal. There was agreement that the Committee should review any proposed changes to the NOL and give advice to the Home Secretary on inclusions/exclusions before implementation;
- concerns were raised over the impact on time series, with agreement that this was an important consideration for the Committee. It was agreed that information should be presented on the impact of any proposed changes to aid discussion;
- the Committee were re-assured that the ONS presents information on trends in offences outside the notifiable offence list by incorporating data from the Ministry of Justice in its quarterly bulletin.

4.2. The Committee approved the first proposal to change the mechanism for determining which new offences entered the NOL.

4.3. Steve Bond explained that the second proposal is to remove from the NOL offences that had not been used over the last two years, along with offences that had been only used on less than 1,000 incidents. It was noted that those removed would need careful consideration. For example, riot has a low count but will still need to be recorded. The following points were made in discussion:

- it was noted that although some offences were rarely reported they may still be good grounds for keeping them as to remove them might undermine trust in the statistics;
- although this is a small change it will be welcome by the police as a reduction in burden;
- there was acknowledgement that in the short-term there would be an extra burden to all those involved (for example, changing IT systems) but in the long-term this would make the job of all those concerned easier.

4.4. The Committee endorsed the proposal in principle and it was agreed that a list should be prepared for consideration at the Committee's next meeting.

Action 5: Steve Bond to present a paper at the next Committee meeting which sets out the

list of offences to be removed from the NOL, along with a list of offences that are rarely used but need to be retained.

5. Review of the Notifiable Offence Data Collection for State Based Offences – CSAC(13)16

5.1. Jeff Farrar introduced this paper which set out proposals to reduce the burden on forces by excluding from the NOL those offences which were not victim-based. He explained that he believed around 80 per cent of these offences could be obtained from other sources and incorporated into the crime statistics. The following points were made in discussion:

- the Committee is supportive of the use of other data sources to reduce burden on the police. Concerns were raised of the loss of 20 per cent of non-victim based offences and how this would impact on the statistics;
- using other data sources will provide a different count of crime as other suggested systems were offender-based. For example, one offence recorded by the police could have multiple offenders associated with it and thus would potentially introduce further discontinuities to time series. This proposals needs further consideration before being adopted;
- a feasibility study would provide the Committee with more evidence as to which would be the best data source to use and how much of a saving would actually be made.

5.2. The Committee agreed that a Task and Finish group should be set up to provide advice on the proposals for a feasibility study. The group will provide an interim report to the Committee at the December meeting.

Action 6: CSAC Secretariat to set up a Task and Finish group to consider further a feasibility study for reducing the recording of non-victim based crime. The group will provide an interim report to the December meeting.

6. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary's Crime Data Integrity Inspection – CSAC(13)17

6.1. Olivia Pinkney introduced the paper which provided background to the proposed HMIC inspection and outlined the proposed methodology. It was noted that an overall report will be produced by April 2014 with more detailed reports by autumn 2014. The following points were made in discussion:

- the pilot work that had been undertaken had been successful;
- each force will be inspected and reported on in phases. It was noted that a forces towards the end of the reporting process would have the advantage of knowing what they are being inspected on so can put preventative actions in place. This was viewed as a positive as the key objective of the inspection was to improve performance;
- the inspection would only provide a snapshot of the situation at the present and there was value in HMIC repeating these inspections;
- would there be value in sub-national reporting, even if it was just at regional level;

6.2. The Committee welcomed and endorsed the work being carried out by HMIC.

7. Improving the measurement of fraud and cyber-crime – CSAC(13)18

7.1. John Flatley presented the paper, with it noted that the National Statistician's review of Crime Statistics had identified the need to improve the measurement of fraud and cyber-crime. He outlined the steps that had been taken by ONS to draw in additional sources of data and the steps taken recently to improve the recording of fraud by the police, via the roll-out of Action Fraud.

7.2. The Committee noted the plans to explore the feasibility of adding new questions to the main victimisation module of the Crime Survey for England and Wales to capture some elements of fraud and cyber-crime. John explained that the current plan is to carry out investigations over the next year and then to report back to the Committee in the autumn of 2014. The following points were made in discussion:

- the plan was welcomed by all members of the Committee as a step in the right direction;
- in addition to looking at plastic card fraud the Committee suggested investigating if other types of cyber fraud could be captured such as stalking, harassment and sexual exploitation;
- members were concerned over the timings and asked if ONS could do anything sooner given the demand for better information and evidence;
- this work should be linked up with academic research and work being undertaken within the Home Office research team that was seeking to map the evidence base;
- given the long time frame of this work the Committee felt that a position statement should be drawn up to inform others of how this gap was being addressed. It was agreed that a position statement should be produced setting out the plans for how the Committee are intending to improve the measurement of fraud and cyber crime.

7.3. The Committee welcomed the progress that is being made and endorsed the future plans for work in this area.

Action 7: ONS to consider further the recording of additional cyber-crimes such as stalking and sexual exploitation in the CSEW.

Action 8: Home Office to share its research on mapping the evidence base with the Committee.

Action 9: ONS to draft a position statement on how the Committee is addressing the e-crime issue.

8. Process for Renewing Committee Membership – CSAC(13)19

8.1. The Committee endorsed the proposals to renew Committee membership as set out in the paper.

9. National Crime Registrars' Report – CSAC(13)20

The Committee noted and approved the proposed changes to be made to the Home Office Counting Rules from 1st April 2014 with the exception of the outstanding question on the new classification for offences of stalking and the threshold to apply to that offence type where other crimes may also be involved.

The Committee agreed to consider the stalking issue further either at its December meeting or via correspondence.

<p>Action 10: Steve Bond to produce a paper setting out the stalking recording threshold issue in more detail for further consideration by the Committee either at the December meeting or via correspondence.</p>

10. Any other business

10.1. The next meeting is to be held on 3 December 2013 and will include a workshop session prior to the main meeting.

**CSAC Secretariat
September 2013**

**ACTIONS FROM CSAC MEETING HELD ON 19th SEPTEMBER 2013
AT DRUMMOND GATE, LONDON**

No	ACTION	ACTION OFFICER	PROGRESS
1	Chair to consider future topics for the workshop sessions and prioritise as necessary	Stephen Shute / Secretariat	In progress. CSAC Secretariat to prepare a amended work programme for 2013/14 which will include topics for discussion by priority
2	David Blunt to circulate flyer for the divergence event at the RSS to CSAC members	David Blunt	Actioned David Blunt circulated information on the RSS event to members on 23 rd September 2013
3	An update on the RSS event on divergence between CSEW and PRC to be provided for the next meeting of the Committee.	David Blunt	In progress The meeting at the RSS scheduled for 28 October 2013 was cancelled due to the extreme weather conditions on the day. The meeting has been rearranged for Monday 27 January 2014
4	CSAC Chair to write to the Home Secretary to inform her that the Committee has agreed to the guidance for AVI and to set out the reasons for this change.	Stephen Shute	Actioned. A letter was sent to the Home Secretary in October 2013. The correspondence was made available on the Committee's webpage.
5	Steve Bond to present a paper at the next Committee meeting which sets out the list of offences to be removed from the NOL, together with a list of offences that are rarely used but need to be retained.	Steve Bond	In progress An update on the latest position in relation to weeding offences from the NOL is provided in paragraph 7 of the National Crime Registrar's Report (agenda item 6).
6	CSAC Secretariat to set up a Task and Finish group to further consider the feasibility study for reducing the recording of non-victim based crime.	Philippa Brimicombe	Actioned Information from the task and finish group will be discussed under agenda item 3.
7	ONS to consider further the recording of additional cyber-crimes such as stalking and sexual exploitation in the CSEW.	Roma Chappell, ONS	Actioned. A position paper on the on-going work in relation to cyber-crime data is to be discussed at the meeting on 3 December 2013.

8	Home Office to share its research on mapping the evidence base with the Committee	Home Office	<p>Actioned.</p> <p>A link to information published by the Home Office was circulated to members.</p>
9	ONS to draft a position statement on how the Committee is addressing the e-crime issue.	John Flatley, ONS	<p>Actioned.</p> <p>A paper will be presented to the Committee at the meeting on 3 December 2013</p>
10	Steve Bond to produce a paper setting out the stalking issue in more detail for further consideration by the Committee either at the December meeting or via correspondence.	Steve Bond	<p>Actioned.</p> <p>A paper will be presented to the Committee at the meeting on 3 December 2013</p>

CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**Cutting Local Bureaucracy in Respect of Additional Verifiable Information (AVI)
for No Crimes and Reclassification of Crimes****Purpose**

1. This paper invites the Committee to consider an opportunity to reduce bureaucracy in crime recording without eroding the quality of the data, particularly in high risk areas. The contents have been agreed with the Home Office, the ACPO lead for Crime Recording and consultation has taken place with HMIC.

Action

2. The Committee is invited to approve a definition of 'Additional Verifiable Information' and to encourage its adoption by police forces.

Background***Introduction***

3. The HMIC report "Cutting the Blue Tape - Tackling Police Bureaucracy Associated with Crime Recording" published in January 2011 identified that a significant and unnecessary bureaucracy in respect of crime recording has been created by Police Forces. The entry of data for 'No Crimes and 'Crime Reclassification' decisions to comply with the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) was further identified as the greatest consumer of time. The report identified there was an opportunity to reduce bureaucracy in the way these requirements are met.
4. The NPIA study 'Understanding Crime Recording' published in December 2011 built on this by recognising the main source of perceived unnecessary bureaucracy in crime recording was the work relating to Reclassification and No Crimes. It also found a key overarching theme relating to this was a culture of risk aversion, which could explain the high levels of internal supervision and audit that accompany recording 'Reclassifications' and 'No Crimes'.
5. The study found differing understanding within forces of what constituted Additional Verifiable Information (AVI) to support Reclassification or No Crime decisions. This had a twofold effect. Firstly, officers were gathering insufficient further evidence and secondly, were wasting time debating the standard of information required.

Additional Verifiable Information

6. One area of contention specifically identified was the amount of information required to justify a reclassification of a crime or a decision to no crime a previously recorded offence.
7. In both cases the HOCR make reference to Additional Verifiable Information (AVI) which sounds a simple descriptor but substantial evidence in the independent reviews outlined above show it is not widely understood.

8. Internal force processes vary considerably in the requirements to meet AVI. The Guidance at Annex 1 is intended to provide a clear non technical explanation of what constitutes AVI and how the minimum data requirement should be presented.
9. The intention of this document, in setting out what is required, is to encourage forces to ensure that no policies, procedures or internal/ external audit requirements are exceeding this requirement.

Jeff Farrar
ACPO
September 2013

Practitioners Guide to Additional Verifiable Information (AVI)

1. The intention of this guidance is to set out what constitutes AVI and how the minimum data requirement can be produced.
2. Its purpose is to encourage Forces and Force Crime Registrars to ensure that no policies, procedures or internal/ external audit requirements are exceeding this requirement.
3. The content of this has been agreed with the Home Office National Crime Registrar and the National Policing Portfolio Lead for Crime Recording. HMIC was consulted during the drafting of this guidance.
 - **Additional** – Is exactly that. It is additional information that was not available to the Crime Recorder or Investigating Officer at the time the original crime recording decision was made.
 - **Verifiable** – The additional information is capable of verification in terms of the origin, the reliability and the relevance of the information source .
 - **Information** – As a general rule, the information does not need to meet an evidential standard. However, it must be relevant to the specific crime to which it is being applied to the extent that it can determine that the original crime classification (when viewed against the Additional Verifiable Information) was incorrect, or that no notifiable crime was in fact committed.
4. When AVI is used as a basis to reclassify or apply a no crime decision the crime record should contain a succinct but informative summary of when the information became available, where it came from, how it can be verified and how that information impacts on the status of the crime.
5. The documenting of the information will vary dependant upon the seriousness of the case and the extent to which a formal investigation has been undertaken.

Low Seriousness – The only documentation required is a simple log entry in the Force Crime Recording database providing the time and date of the update from an identifiable and relevant source (for example, the victim).

High Seriousness – The documentation required will be of a higher standard, such as a formal statement from a relevant witness containing the information, a pathologist report detailing the cause of death being natural causes rather than homicide, or a log entry in the Force Crime Recording database from a Senior Investigating Officer.
6. It is the responsibility of the Force Designated Decision Maker (DDM) to evaluate the value of the information and the reliability of the source and take a **proportionate** approach which recognises the seriousness of that which is alleged and the potential impact of an incorrect decision based on that information (and in doing so fully assessing the level of risk). In the majority of cases the level of risk to the victim, the community and the reputation of the Force will be low and cases should be treated accordingly.

Example of theft

7. A member of the public telephones to report a car stolen from a multi storey car park – Details are taken, a crime record created and details circulated on the PNC.
8. The victim later re-contacts the police using the same telephone number as was used to report the crime, is able to provide a crime reference number and vehicle details and advises that they have located the vehicle on a different level of the car park – the vehicle is intact and has not been moved from where they originally parked it. The owner had simply forgotten where they parked it
9. The AVI requirement:

Additional – The owner realised that they had actually forgotten where they left the car.

Verifiable – The call taker is satisfied the call came from the victim given they used the same phone number and were able to provide the crime reference number.

Information – Information from the caller clearly shows no notifiable crime committed
10. Based on this AVI the force can legitimately record a No Crime with a simple log entry in the Force Crime Recording database with no further work required.
11. This is a low risk area of business and the action taken is proportionate.

Example of burglary

12. An officer attends a suspected burglary. On arrival, the home owner has discovered a ladder in her garden and an insecure, upstairs bedroom window.
On examination of her house she discovers that her son's laptop computer is missing along with £20 from her purse. On the balance of probabilities the incident is recorded as a crime of domestic burglary.
13. The following day the house owner rings up quoting her crime reference number. The lady states that she has since discovered that her son had returned from university and unable to access the property without a key he had used the ladder to climb up to the insecure window where he gained entry. He had taken his computer and borrowed £20 from his mother's purse. The caller confirms that her son had lawful access to the house and that it was accepted practice for him to borrow money from her purse. Based on this additional information it is clear that this was not a burglary.
14. At this point the temptation would be to send an officer back to the address to record a further statement to this effect. However consider the AVI factors:

Additional – The house owner has realised that the burglar was in fact her son who was lawfully on the premises

Verifiable – The lady has quoted a crime reference number and stated facts only the victim would know i.e. £20 was stolen

Information – The latest information received is directly relevant to the original report and clearly determines that no crime has occurred.

15. There is no need for a written statement to document this AVI – A record of the time, date, source, information given and the fact it was verified to come from the victim would have been sufficient for AVI and met data requirement.
16. This is a medium risk area of business and given the circumstances as reported this would be a proportionate approach.

Example of Serious Assault

17. The Ambulance Service attend a report of a potentially serious assault – a male has been found with a wound to the forehead. Police attend and a crime report is created for assault with injury. The victim was walking along and appears to have been hit on the head. However, he is intoxicated through drink and cannot remember what has happened.
18. A member of public called the Ambulance and confirms that they found the person lying on the floor. The alleged victim is taken to hospital where it is discovered he has a bleed on the brain. This is a very serious injury and an investigation is launched led by a Senior Investigative Officer (SIO).
19. The investigation includes a detailed review of the CCTV covering the area. The CCTV clearly shows the same man falling over and hitting his head on the pavement. No assault has taken place. The camera is monitored and shows a member of public providing aid to the victim.
20. Consider the AVI factors:

Additional – CCTV highlights that the injuries were caused to the male accidentally, there was no foul play or other third party involvement.

Verifiable – CCTV footage fits exactly within the time frame of the incident and shows the identified male falling over. The footage is further corroborated by the appearance on film of the witness who provides first aid.

Information – This new information clearly shows that the males injuries were the result of an unfortunate accident and therefore not a crime.

21. This was a potentially serious offence of High Risk. Given the serious nature of the offence a Senior Investigative Officer (SIO) was appointed. The SIO documents in the crime record a brief summary of the closing report outlining the circumstances and the AVI.
22. The level of documentation required here is significantly higher. This has been a criminal investigation conducted by a SIO into a serious offence as opposed to a crime recording requirement.
23. Forces should note the risk based level of requirement and documentation required and ensure local requirements are not exceeding this.

Example of a Crime Reclassification using AVI

24. The same process can be followed when reclassifying a crime as a result of AVI. The decision making process must be recorded appropriately according to the risk factors. If we look at the below example:
25. A house owner reports that some one has walked into his insecure house and taken £30 from a purse in the kitchen. Due to the hot weather the back door to the property was left open.

Police attend and on the balance of probabilities crime it as a domestic burglary. The offence is investigated in line with force policy.

26. The next day the owner re contacts the police and states that the missing money has been returned to him. He explains that his wife is a registered child minder who looks after children aged 5-11. An 11 year old child in his wife's care has walked into the kitchen whilst being looked after and taken the money. Later on, the boy's parents find out about the missing money and return it. The child apologises. The house owner rings the police to update them. The owner confirms that the boy had free access to the kitchen area but he was not entitled to take the money. However, he chooses not to make a formal complaint of theft against the boy.
27. Even though the owner does not wish to pursue a complaint there would still be a requirement to record a crime. However, the additional information shows that the offence of burglary was not made out.
28. Clearly the circumstances have changed and it is legitimate to re-consider the offence classification. Consider the AVI factors-

Additional – it has emerged that the money was taken from someone who had a right to be in the property, as opposed to an offender who enters the building as a trespasser

Verifiable – The house owner rings the police and quotes the incident and crime number, he also mentions details about the offence which only the victim would know.

Information – The new information means the recorded offence has now changed to theft due to the fact that there was no trespasser involved with the theft. The offender had a right to be in the kitchen as he was in the occupier's care

29. This is an area of low seriousness and as such there is no need to obtain a statement from the house owner. The AVI threshold is met and the crime can be reclassified as a theft. This would be a proportionate response. The reclassification needs to be recorded in a suitable place, i.e. the Force Crime Record.

CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Review of the Threshold for Inclusion in the Notifiable offences List and Weeding of Rarely Recorded Offences

Purpose/Issue

1. This paper seeks to obtain the Committee's advice in advance of these matters, which have been recommended by the National Crime Recording Strategic Steering Group, being considered by Ministers. There are two separate but inter-linked proposals. Firstly to revise the threshold by which new offences enter the Notifiable List and secondly to consider weeding from the list rarely recorded offences.

Action

2. The Committee is invited to consider these proposals.

Background

3. The Police Recorded Crime (PRC) collection comprises offences contained with the Notifiable Offences List (NOL). This list is currently made up of all those offences in law that: i) must be heard at Crown Court (known as Indictable Only) and ii) those that can be heard at either crown or magistrates court (known as Triable Either Way (TEW)) and iii) a small number of offences heard only at Magistrates Courts (known as Summary Only).
4. When drafting legislation lawmakers consider the nature of the matters being addressed and the appropriate level of sanction necessary to provide both a realistic deterrent and appropriate punishment. As part of this drafting process the matter is also considered by the Ministry of Justice. Ultimately it is then a matter for Parliament to consider the draft bill and agree the provisions therein. The sanction that is made available to the courts, as laid down in each individual statute, determines whether the offence is Indictable, Triable Either Way or Summary. Essentially, more serious offences (as determined by sanction) form the NOL.
5. Every year a number of new offences are routinely added to the NOL as they come onto the statute book whilst others are removed when they are repealed. It has been conventional since at least 1996 for new offences that are either Indictable or Triable Either Way (TEW) to be automatically added to the NOL with any new Summary Only offences being considered by exception. The automatic addition of TEW offences is now considered out of date and no longer in the best interests of stakeholders and this was considered by the National Crime Recording Strategic Steering Group (SSG) at their July meeting. As a result the SSG determined that they would recommend the following revisions to Ministers.

Changes to the Notifiable List Threshold

6. The automatic threshold routinely sees a number of new TEW offences being added to the NOL every year. In many cases these are related to matters which rarely, if ever, fall within the remit of the Police. Increasingly other agencies, such as Local Authorities or Border Force, have investigatory and prosecuting authority for a range of crimes. Whenever a new offence is added to the NOL this places a small, but nonetheless real, burden on forces and the Home Office to make IT changes, monitor recording and quality assure processes. It is helpful to note that inclusion in the NOL has other implications – only NOL crimes appear on the public facing transparency media such as the maps on police.uk, compare my area tool and the HMIC comparator.
7. In April 2012 Parliament changed the maximum sentencing powers that are available to magistrates for new offences entering the statute book as Summary only raising the previous maximum custodial sentence from 6 months to 51 weeks. As a result any new offence with that new 51 week maximum would previously have been created as TEW and automatically entered the NOL.
8. To address these issues the SSG proposes to recommend to Ministers that the following revised threshold for the NOL be applied with effect from April 2014. Firstly only new Indictable Only offences to be added automatically. Secondly all new TEW offences to be subject of case by case consideration. This would be an initial assessment by the National Crime Registrar, in consultation with Home Office policy colleagues, to determine those offences to be excluded and those to be considered for inclusion. That assessment will be based on the relevance of the offence to the police and any broader public interest in statistics becoming available. Both lists would be reviewed routinely by the SSG before implementation. Thirdly all new Summary Only offences will also be subject of the same process as TEW offences. This will ensure that any significant new offences that would previously have been enacted as TEW are given due consideration. Any cases of significant statistical interest would be advised to this committee for information or advice before implementation and all cases where Summary Only offences are proposed for inclusion will be referred to the committee prior to implementation..

Weeding of Rarely Recorded Offences

9. The NOL consists of approximately 1480 offences in law and that number has been slowly increasing over the years. The vast majority are TEW offences. With the introduction of the Home Office data hub, which extracts record level data from force systems, it has been possible to assess the extent to which each of those offences is recorded by the police. An early assessment shows that there are 150-200 offences which have never been recorded in the last 2 years and a further 150-200 which between them account for at most 1,000 recorded crimes annually and as such make up 0.03%.of PRC overall. Many of these are offences which have become somewhat historic in nature or are now largely in the remit of other agencies (a small number of examples are provided at annex 1). Retaining up to 400 offences on force and other systems presents a continuing small but real burden whilst their removal has no impact of significance on the resulting statistics.
10. To improve this and bring about some reduction in burden the SSG intends to propose to Ministers that (on the basis the revised threshold above is to be adopted) a weeding of the NOL is carried out to remove all TEW offences not now being recorded by police and to further remove those which are rarely recorded. This weeding exercise will be conducted by the Home Office Statistics unit and the National Crime Registrar and will

initially be based on identifying those which have had 5 or fewer recorded in the last 2 years. In all cases offences will also be considered against the wider public interest before being proposed for removal to consider cases that even if never or rarely recorded by police there remains a robust case for their retention.

11. It is useful to note that, in the majority of cases, these rarely if ever recorded offences are state based matters that constitute part of the "Other Crimes against Society" published classification and within that in "Miscellaneous Crimes against Society". A full listing of all offences proposed for removal would be provided to the SSG before the removal takes effect to allow for any stakeholder consideration and a summary report would be provided to CSAC as part of the NCR routine report at the next meeting.

Steve Bond
National Crime Registrar
4 September 2013

Examples of Rarely Recorded Notifiable Offences

Taking or sending a ship to sea with load line submerged (Merchant Shipping Act) – matter for maritime Agencies

Neglecting to provide for a Servant (Offences Against the Person Act 1861) – if it arose would almost certainly be recorded as an assault or health and safety matter

Provide False Information re Disused Tips (Mines and Quarries (Tips) Act 1969) – matter for local authorities

Selling food not complying with food safety requirements (Food Safety Act 1990) – matter for Trading Standards/Local Authority

Publish a Tobacco Advertisement (Tobacco Act 2002) – matter for Trading Standards

CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary's
Crime Data Integrity Inspection****Purpose**

1. This paper sets out Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary's (HMIC) plans for its inspection of crime integrity during 2013/14 with the overall aim of improving the police service's recording of crime which, in turn, should lead to increased public trust in crime statistics.

Action

2. The Committee is invited to comment on HMIC's plans and give their approval.

Background

3. Sections 44(2) and (3) of the Police Act 1996 state that the Home Secretary can require Chief Constables of forces in England and Wales to provide statistical data, and that he or she can specify the form in which these data are provided. The Home Secretary uses these powers to require Chief Constables to regularly provide data on the number of crimes they record. These data must be recorded in accordance with the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR), which aim to bring consistency to the process of creating and maintaining crime records at force level.

Why the quality of crime records is important

4. The effectiveness of both the system of police force accountability and of police forces' ability to serve victims and prevent crime is dependent on the accuracy of recorded crime data:
 - **Accurate crime records help the police service to anticipate and prevent crime.** Police forces use the data contained in crime records to analyse the number, nature and location of crimes in their force area. This allows them to identify trends, which can inform decisions about where resources should be deployed: for instance, if a particular street has seen an increase in burglaries, a force can send extra foot patrols to the area.
 - **The police use crime records to direct resources towards helping the victims of crime.** For example, when a crime is recorded, the victim becomes entitled to a minimum level of service as set out in the Code of Practice for Victims of Crime.
 - Because crime data are published, they also provide a source of information for **the public and their elected representatives to use when holding their force to account** for their performance in tackling crime. This can clearly only be effective if the data are accurate.

5. There is therefore a clear link between accurate crime data and police effectiveness. This is why Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), which has a statutory duty to inspect and report on the efficiency and effectiveness of police forces in England and Wales, monitors and inspects the recording practices used to produce crime and incident data.
6. Last year, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) published a report on the divergence of the Crime Survey of England and Wales (CSEW) and police recorded crime. Both sources show that crime has been reducing for some time, but police-recorded crime is dropping at a faster rate. ONS argues that this is due to recording practices.
7. Closer to home, every single Police and Crime Commissioner's Policing and Crime Plan prioritises the reduction of crime. This means that it is ever more important that the data to support success of these plans is trustworthy. While many also talk about crime detections, the more recent focus on outcomes is intended, among other things, to move away from viewing the value of detecting a robbery as the same as detecting a shoplifting.
8. There is huge local and national interest in crime levels and, hence, crime recording. In her letter to Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Constabulary (HMCIC), Tom Winsor, agreeing the planned inspections for the year, the Home Secretary made only one specific comment: "*...it is vital that the public have access to transparent and trustworthy statistics on recorded crime*", and requested that HMIC publish a report on the issue by the end of March 2013.
9. Given the concerns around the accuracy of police-recorded crime figures, HMIC has committed to inspect crime data integrity during 2013/14 and onwards. HMCIC has recently confirmed this commitment to the Home Affairs Select Committee and the Police Federation. Preventing crime and protecting the vulnerable are core roles for the police service, so it is important that HMIC examines the quality of crime recording and the service victims receive.
10. It is also important that HMIC explores written and unwritten rules and that it explains to the public what it finds. The key test for their inspection is "*to what extent can police recorded crime information be trusted?*"
11. The desired outcome of the inspection is that the police service's recording of crime data improves, leading to an increased public trust in police-recorded crime information.

Programme Objectives

12. The specific objectives of the inspection involve establishing:
 - how confident in the accuracy of national police-recorded crime data the public can be;
 - how effectively police leaders oversee and govern the integrity of crime data integrity in each force;
 - how effectively victims are considered when crime-recording decisions are taken in each force;

- whether the outcomes generated from crimes (for instance, cautions, restorative justice, cannabis warnings) suit the needs of victims, offenders, the criminal justice system and the wider public interest in each force; and,
 - whether decisions in each force to declassify a recorded crime as not a crime (commonly called a 'no-crime' or 'no-criming') adhere to the National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS).
13. This inspection will include the 43 geographical forces in England and Wales (and British Transport Police by arrangement) and will be limited in scope to:
- understanding forces' arrangements to achieve the above objectives;
 - a review of crime and incident data to assess crime recording, outcomes and no-crime decision making; and,
 - victim contact to assess the quality of the service delivered, from the viewpoint of the victims.

Methodology

14. HMIC has worked with stakeholders to design a methodology. These include the business area lead, Chief Constable Jeff Farrar; the Office for National Statistics; the Police Federation; the Home Office; and this Committee. It has also consulted with a working group of practitioners including performance managers and force crime registrars from several forces.
15. The inspection will not only test compliance, but will also explore the culture of crime recording, and the service the police provide to the victim. HMIC will place at the heart of their inspection, the victims and the impact of crime recording on the community. It will do this by sampling follow-up calls to victims to determine the impact the decision to record or not record a crime has had. It will also look at crimes which, when repeated, cause significant harm to the community, such as criminal damage or other crimes related to anti-social behaviour. Finally, HMIC will look at the appropriateness of outcomes including cautions and community resolutions from the viewpoint of a victim.
16. HMIC's methodology also includes a representative survey of the public to gauge their level of trust in police crime data and which aspects of crime recording really matter to them. It is in the process of consulting with ONS on this aspect of the inspection. More information about the methodology is in Annex 1.

Piloting the inspection methodology

17. HMIC carried out a pilot inspection to test the methodology in Avon and Somerset Constabulary in early September 2013 (the audit work took place between 2 and 4 September 2013, and the fieldwork between 9 and 11 September 2013). It proposes to conduct a further pilot of the audit element in Merseyside Police toward the end of September 2013 (the dates for this are to be decided). It therefore does not have full details of the learning gained from the pilots at the time of writing this paper. An oral update of the pilot in Avon and Somerset will be provided at the meeting on 19 September 2013.

Olivia Pinkney

Methodology

1. HMIC will conduct the inspection in two phases. In the first phase, it plans to estimate how accurately all crimes are recorded across England and Wales. In order to provide context for the results, and counter any misinterpretation, it also plans to investigate how accurately the service records crimes in respect of particular victim-based crime types, based on a total sample of approximately 9,000 records.
2. A methodology has been devised to obtain a robust estimate of crime recording at a national level, contextualised with crime recording for high volume crime types (eg burglary) also at a national level. It has not been designed to comment or compare the accuracy of individual forces.
3. In the second phase, It will look at how individual forces record crime. The aim at force level is to provide a sufficient weight of evidence to convince force management and the public about the quality of crime recording in their force. This approach provides a range of information on the effectiveness of crime recording in each force, but stops short of providing quotable, statistically robust estimates of the accuracy of overall crime recording. HMIC will not, therefore, be able to say that (for example) 97% of overall crime reported to a particular force is recorded accurately. This approach would, however, allow them to comment at a force level on what the information suggests. For example: *'We examined 200 incidents and identified that 100 of them required a crime to be recorded. Of those 100, 97 were actually recorded. This result, together with our view of the leadership, training, supervision and victim-focus within the force, suggest that crime is recorded with integrity and the resulting crime information can be trusted to a great extent.'*
4. Where their analysis identifies areas of risk in a force, requiring a further audit of a specific crime type or types, HMIC will review a statistically significant sample of incidents to allow them to make comment on the percentage of the relevant crime type(s) accurately recorded.

Phase 1 – Audit of incidents and crimes, commencing in October 2013 and concluding in February 2014 (reporting in March/April 2014).

Audit Methodology

5. HMIC has developed a method for auditing the accuracy of crime recording, based on reviewing force incident records, whereby an assessment can be made of whether a call for service correctly resulted in a crime being recorded, and whether that crime was classified correctly. This is the same approach it took in our recent inspection of Kent Police's crime recording, which provided data on the proportion of crimes that were recorded correctly.

Producing a National Estimate for the Accuracy of Crime Recording: Sampling

6. The inspection will aim to sample enough records from a 12 month period to provide an estimate of the accuracy of crime recording across England and Wales, with a confidence interval of approximately $\pm 2\%$ at the 95% confidence level. The confidence interval, in this case $\pm 2\%$, provides an estimated range of values that the population being examined is likely to fall within. For example, if the audit found that 90% of crimes in the sample were recorded correctly, then we could be confident that between 88% and 92% of all crimes in the period we examined were recorded correctly.
7. HMIC has adopted the 95% confidence level as this is the generally accepted level of certainty used in statistical tests. Any sample might produce estimates that differ from the figures that would have been obtained if the whole population had been examined. At the 95% confidence level, it is expected that the confidence interval would contain the true value 95 times out of every 100 identical surveys conducted under the same conditions.
8. To calculate the required sample size that would yield a particular confidence interval, HMIC needs to make assumptions about the expected results of the audit. Ordinarily, it would be safest to expect that 50% of crimes will be correctly recorded. However, using evidence from previous crime recording audits, it has been able to make some assumptions about the likely range of results that it will get. This means that HMIC has been able to reduce the required sample sizes. (Generally we have assumed a “worst case” result of 75% accuracy; if the results found are worse than this, then although the confidence intervals around the results will be higher, it will still be possible to draw conclusions about how well crime is recorded).
9. To produce an estimate of the accuracy of crime recording nationally, HMIC must include information from all 43 forces. In order to gather a representative sample it has been “stratified”, that is to say the number of records it reviews from each force will be proportional to the crimes that each force contributes to the national total.
10. However, without any supporting context of the levels of accuracy of some specific crime types, publishing the results of a national audit of all recorded crime might undermine, rather than enhance, trust in crime statistics. For instance, if the overall national recording accuracy rate was about 85% then some might wrongly assume that, likewise, 85% of robbery crimes were accurately recorded. To ensure that HMIC is able to properly contextualise the results of the overall national estimate and counter false extrapolations and wrong conclusions, it will also produce estimates of the accuracy of the recording of some specific crime types as well. To do this, it proposes to carry out further sampling for those crime types to sufficiently boost the number reviewed. This will allow them to comment on the national picture in terms of those crime types and make the distinction between, say, the recording of robbery crimes and the recording of all-crime (which would include a high number of less serious offences).
11. HMIC’s provisional list of specific crime types to look at is:
 - violence with injury;
 - sexual offences;
 - robbery;
 - burglary;
 - vehicle crime;
 - crimes related to anti-social behaviour (including criminal damage).
12. Producing this additional contextual information will add to the number of records to be reviewed. Using statistical techniques to weight the samples drawn, HMIC can therefore take a larger sample of records overall, but expect to be able to additionally estimate the

accuracy of the recording of crime types such as violence with injury, robbery, burglary and vehicle crime to $\pm 5\%$ or better (depending on how well our assumptions hold).

13. HMIC will take a minimum sample of 50 random records from each force and around 1,000 from the largest force, the Metropolitan Police Service (which accounts for about 20% of all crime recorded in England and Wales). The sample will be drawn from incident and crime records for the most recent 12 months from the point at which it starts the inspection, likely to be the 12 months to the end July 2013. It will only take a sample for the most recent year; it will not sample from earlier time periods, and therefore will not be able to comment in the final report on whether the accuracy of crime recording has improved or deteriorated over time.
14. HMIC will exclude from their sample those incidents which are very unlikely to contain reports of crime, and it will use an approach to checking the accuracy of each record similar to that used in the Kent inspection; starting with listening to the initial call for service and working through to the crime recording decision.
15. The **provisional** analysis below shows the approximate sample sizes it will need to take from each force. HMIC will further refine these sizes with assumptions behind these calculations, in consultation with ONS and practitioners from forces, and in light of piloting our methodology.

Force	Sample size	Force	Sample size
Avon and Somerset	247	Merseyside	226
Bedfordshire	91	Metropolitan Police	1,920
Cambridgeshire	117	Norfolk	92
Cheshire	139	Northamptonshire	118
City of London	76	Northumbria	170
Cleveland	98	North Wales	92
Cumbria	76	North Yorkshire	88
Derbyshire	132	Nottinghamshire	170
Devon and Cornwall	214	South Wales	211
Dorset	103	South Yorkshire	233
Durham	76	Staffordshire	152
Dyfed-Powys	76	Suffolk	98
Essex	253	Surrey	135
Gloucestershire	76	Sussex	227
Greater Manchester	452	Thames Valley	335
Gwent	88	Warwickshire	76
Hampshire	271	West Mercia	153
Hertfordshire	135	West Midlands	426
Humberside	161	West Yorkshire	409
Kent	242	Wiltshire	88
Lancashire	238		
Leicestershire	148		
Lincolnshire	91	England and Wales	9,017

Phase 2 – inspection fieldwork, and risk based audit, commencing April 2014, concluding August, 2014 (reporting in October, 2014).

16. At the conclusion of phase 1, HMIC will visit each force to:

- carry out a common programme of inspection work to enable them to understand the effectiveness and efficiency of the arrangements the force has in place for ensuring the quality of crime recording; and
 - carry out targeted work (including additional audits of records where necessary) specific to each force to probe potential areas of strength or weakness. It intends to produce a report for each force on our findings.
17. HMIC recognises that forces' IT systems vary, and forces collect incident data differently and to different levels of detail. It also recognises that crimes can enter the system by a variety of means. One of the aims of piloting is to work out how these differences are best accommodated.
 18. The methodology for phase 2 ensures that this inspection will not simply be a compliance test, but will also include an exploration of culture in respect of crime recording, and the service provided to the victim. Further detail on this approach appears below.

A 'risk-based' approach at force level to supplement the national representative sample

19. HMIC's approach involves analysing data to identify those forces with unusual patterns in their data (compared with elsewhere) that might indicate a weakness (risk) or strength in crime recording, and therefore an area from which it could learn the most. Doing everything everywhere is neither cost effective nor swift, and there is much to be gained from taking a pragmatic, considered approach that looks in the areas where it is most likely to glean valuable information.
20. In particular, HMIC will focus attention on the attrition rate between recording an incident and classifying it as a crime. To explain this method, it will use a hypothetical example of burglary recording.
21. A trial exercise in one force revealed that 68% of domestic burglary incidents reported by victims were eventually recorded as a burglary offence. To identify whether this would merit further inspection, it would compare this statistic with other forces. If the equivalent figure from other forces was significantly different (say 80%), it would want to investigate this force's recording of burglary in more depth.
22. The next steps would be, for example:
 - to test whether burglaries were being 'downgraded' to, say, criminal damage – which it could examine using an analytical tool it has already developed which provides the ratios between the volumes for different types of recorded crime; and
 - to review the information it had from our phase 1 audit in the force, looking at the (relatively small) number of burglaries that were covered by our national sample.
23. Before starting work in the force HMIC would also set this analysis in context, by using the information already collected about organisational arrangements for managing crime recording, and apparent strengths and weaknesses. This might reveal, for instance, that there was an ambitious target for reducing burglaries in the force, that those responsible for the target were also responsible for the classification of this crime, that there was little in the way of independent checking from the crime registrar and that there was weak governance and monitoring of the process of crime recording.

HMIC might then choose to explore burglary recording in more depth during their inspection of the force and, if necessary, audit more burglary records.

24. In HMIC's final report, evidence that burglary was under recorded in the force (or at least at a very high risk of being under recorded) would therefore be along the following lines:
- i. The 'attrition rate' was significantly higher than elsewhere.
 - ii. Some of the burglaries were being 'downgraded' to other crimes.
 - iii. The audit of records showed evidence of incorrect decisions such as inappropriately not recording, or downgrading, a crime. This might or might not be a statistically robust figure – but either way it would be just one part of the evidence.
 - iv. Incentives in the force discourage officers and staff from accurately recording crimes.
 - v. There are insufficient controls within the force to identify this.

This will involve carrying out a remote overview of comparative data and practices in each force. Some of the data are available, but HMIC will need to request further data from forces.

25. Our overview will be based on a number of factors:

- HMIC's audit knowledge and experience of forces, including the results of previous audits, whether recommendations have been implemented. This is currently being gathered through the desktop review.
- Analysis of existing performance data to assess trends or significant differences between similar forces.
- A review of targets, their ambition and the risk of perverse incentives
- A review of force management arrangements such as identifying: if staff are properly trained and supervised; if arrangements are comprehensive; if conflicts of interest are avoided; if information is used by the force to monitor quality; if governance arrangements exist and are working; and if the costs and staffing involved in the checking of crime recording have been calculated.

CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Improving the measurement of fraud and cyber-crime

Purpose

1. To provide the Committee with a summary of work undertaken so far in exploring potential improvements to the measurement of fraud and cyber-crime and to seek the Committees advice on proposals for future work.

Action

2. The Committee are asked to note the:
 - improvements to the coverage of fraud offences within the police recorded crime collection that were introduced in the last quarterly ONS release; and,
 - rough estimates of the level of fraud and cyber-crime not currently covered in the crime estimates from the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW).
3. The Committee are also asked to give consideration to the questions highlighted in the paper (listed below):
 - **Does the Committee agree that because of the conceptual challenges around attempted fraud and cyber-crime, these offences require a different approach to counting them within the CSEW than used for traditional crimes?**
 - **Is the Committee content with the proposed programme of work to develop and test questions to be added to the main CSEW crime count on fraud and cyber-crime over the next 12 months with final proposals to be presented in autumn 2014 (for implementation in April 2015)?**

Background

4. The National Statistician's review of Crime Statistics for England and Wales noted that there were significant gaps in the crime statistics related to fraud and cyber-crime (i.e. crime enabled by the internet and new technology). Some of the key issues surrounding the coverage of fraud and cyber crime in crime statistics were discussed by a group of Committee members at the CSAC workshop in November 2012, and by the full committee at their meeting in May 2013.
5. The 2006 Fraud Review, commissioned by the Government, recognised that attempts to tackle fraud were being undermined by the lack of a joined-up approach to reporting, recording and analysing it. This has led to changes in the operational arrangements for the public reporting of fraud to the police and of the recording and investigation of offences by them. To reflect these changes, the ONS quarterly crime statistics now include offences recorded by Action Fraud, a public facing national reporting centre that records incidents of

fraud directly from the public and organisations. **In turn, this has led to an increase in the volume of fraud offences recorded by the police and improved the coverage of fraud in the crime statistics** (see Annex 1 for more details). However, the police recorded crime series will not include frauds not reported to or detected by them.

6. The CSEW provides estimates of the volume of criminal incidents experienced by the household population. Since the survey started these have been derived from a core module of victimisation questions which covers a range of offences experienced by the household (e.g. burglary) or by the individual respondent (e.g. robbery). The offences covered by this core module have remained unchanged since the survey started in the early 1980s. The offence of fraud (whether committed in a traditional or newer ways, such as over the internet) is not part of this core module. Other offences which are committed via cyberspace (such as harassment) are also not covered by the existing questions.
7. The CSEW has previously included supplementary modules of questions on victimisation across a range of fraud and cyber-crime, including plastic card and bank/building society fraud. The survey has also asked about experience of:
 - identity fraud
 - computer virus and hacking
 - mass marketing fraud
 - 'romance' fraud
8. These questions have generally simply asked whether or not the respondent has been a victim of such crimes and have been useful in providing a measure of the prevalence of victimisation. Unlike the core modules, these supplementary questions have generally not attempted to provide an estimate of the volume of incidents (i.e. the number of times victims have been victimised) and are therefore not currently included in the main count of crime produced by the CSEW.
9. These supplementary questions have also helped to highlight a number of conceptual challenges around the measurement of fraud and cyber-crime as set out in a previous paper to the Committee ([paper CSAC \(13\)9](#) for the May meeting). These challenges set fraud and cyber-crime apart from more conventional ways of committing crime (e.g. the balance between attempted and successful crimes, and ambiguity over who the victim is and where an offence took place). A further challenge in measuring these crimes arises as advances in technology offer offenders new targets and opportunities to develop new modus operandi. It is difficult to predict whether a crime problem will be 'enduring' (thus making it an important crime to measure), or whether preventative policies or further technological advancement will make it only a short-term problem.
10. The omission from the survey's main crime count of fraud and cyber-enabled crime has been a subject of criticism from some quarters. It has been argued (for example, by Professor Marian Fitzgerald) that more traditional crime has been displaced into these newer crime types. Thus, there has been a debate about the extent to which the fall in traditional volume crimes measured by the survey reflects a genuine fall in levels of crime or whether criminality has simply migrated to new types of crime not measured by the survey.
11. Following the May meeting of the Committee ONS were asked to conduct further analysis of the supplementary questions to provide a rough estimate of the likely scale of fraud and cyber crime not currently measured by the CSEW (see paras 12 to 15 below). A summary of findings from this analysis is given in this paper, followed by proposals for further work to explore how we might make improvements in the measurement of fraud and cyber-crime in the National Statistics published by ONS.

CSEW estimates of fraud and cyber-crime

12. Initial analysis indicated that we would be able to produce rough estimates for some types of fraud and cyber-crime covered by the CSEW, but not all. For some types of crime (e.g. mass marketing fraud or computer viruses and hacking) although substantial numbers of survey respondents reported having experienced attempts to commit these types of offence, only a very small number actually fell victim of these crimes.
13. Including such attempted fraud and cyber-crime offences in overall estimates of crime would present some challenges. For example, it would not seem sensible to include all attempted frauds that result from phishing emails, as due to the sheer volume of emails sent out, any resulting estimate of the number of attempted offences is likely to be so large that it would swamp other crime types covered by the survey and render time-series useless. Furthermore, many respondents are unlikely to be able to give a reliable indication of the number of times they received such emails in the previous 12 months. It is also the case that such attempted frauds are qualitatively different from attempts to commit more conventional crime like burglary or vehicle theft where the impact on the victim can still be considerable. With these considerations in mind, such forms of fraud and cyber-crime, where the vast majority of offences are unsuccessful attempts, were not included in rough estimates presented in this paper.
14. The issues around attempted fraud offences are recognised in the Home Office Counting Rules for police recorded crime, which sets out scenarios to help guide the police in making decisions about when a crime of fraud should be recorded. One of the key principles applied in judging whether an attempted fraud should be recorded is whether the target was an 'intended victim'. Although this means that some attempts will not result in a crime being recorded (e.g. mass marketing fraud), the victim-focused National Crime Recording Standard means that other attempted frauds will result in a crime recorded for each individual victim. For example, a single act of uploading a computer virus or sending a malicious e-mail may impact on thousands of people and could (in theory) result in thousands of crimes being recorded in the unlikely event that the subject were to report this to the police.

Does the Committee agree that because of the conceptual challenges around attempted fraud and cyber-crime, these offences require a different approach to counting them than used for traditional crimes?

15. For the reasons outlined above estimates produced at this stage have been restricted to types of fraud and cyber-crime where there are a sufficient number of victims of crimes involving actual loss; plastic card fraud and bank and building society fraud. Data from the 2012/13 CSEW has show that together, these two types of fraud could contribute between **3.6 and 3.8 million incidents** of crime to the total number of CSEW crimes. These estimates of fraud and cyber crime volume are based on the assumption that no victim experienced more than three such offences in the 12 month prior to the survey interview. Were these estimates to be added to the CSEW main crime count for 2012/13 this would be inflated from 8.6 million offences to somewhere between 12.2 and 12.4 million. CSEW crime peaked in 1995 with estimates of 19.1 million offences – excluding fraud and cyber-crime).

Conceptual challenges and practical considerations

16. These estimates are helpful in providing an approximate indication of the scale of these types of fraud and cyber-crime offences. However, these are based on some simple assumptions given the current absence of data on the number of times respondents fell

victim within the crime reference period. There are still a range of conceptual challenges to address before we could consider more reliably measuring this type of crime.

17. Conceptual challenges associated with obtaining more robust measures of plastic card and bank and building society fraud include:
- Counting incidents – plastic card or bank account fraud often involve separate ‘events’ (e.g. card purchases at different retailers, on different days) and a clear set of rules for counting incidents would need to be established. These need to be conceptually sound but also practical in terms of respondents being able to recall and group, or separate, such events into individual incidents.
 - Identifying where the crime took place - while it is often possible to identify where the victim or victims reside, it is often not possible to identify where the offence originated. So, for example while the main CSEW crime count collects information about robberies experienced while abroad it excludes such incidents from the main crime count for England and Wales. Such an approach will probably not be possible with regard to cyber-related crimes.

Proposals for further work

18. Further work is proposed to design and test new questions for the inclusion in the CSEW. In addition to considering the conceptual challenges, the programme of work would also need to explore some of the practical implications of adding questions to the survey. Such testing would need to address a range of issues including:
- Respondents’ ability to correctly categorise and accurately recall information about their victimisation for these types of crime.
 - Adding new questions to the victimisation module of the survey without impacting on the long time series for existing victimisation data from this module.
 - Impact of additional questions on the length of the survey and time it takes for respondents to complete.
19. It is proposed that development and testing of new questions would take place over the next year, with final proposals to be presented to the Committee in autumn 2014 with a view to adding finalised questions to the CSEW from April 2015. ONS would seek input from Professor Mike Levi to provide expert advice and peer review during this development process.

Is the Committee content with the proposed programme of work to explore the feasibility of adding questions on fraud and cyber-crime the CSEW crime count?

**John Flatley and Mark Bangs
Crime Statistics and Analysis Team
Office for National Statistics
11 September 2013**

Changes to the presentation of fraud in police recorded crime

The Fraud Act 2006 and the Attorney General's Fraud Review resulted in the creation of a National Fraud Authority (NFA). The NFA acts as an umbrella government organisation to co-ordinate and oversee the fight against fraud. One of their key objectives is to better support the reporting of fraudulent crimes and their subsequent investigation. The review also resulted in the City of London Police becoming the National Lead Force for fraud and being given the responsibility for setting up a centre of excellence for fraud investigation across the UK.

In 2009/10 the NFA opened Action Fraud, a national fraud reporting centre that records incidents of fraud directly from the public and organisations by phone or internet in addition to incidents reported directly to individual police forces. Additionally, in 2009/10 the NFA and the police jointly established the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau (NFIB), which is a government-funded initiative run by the City of London Police.

To reflect these changes, the ONS quarterly crime statistics now include offences recorded by Action Fraud, a public facing national reporting centre that records incidents of fraud directly from the public and organisations. Since 1 April 2013, Action Fraud has taken responsibility for the central police recording of fraud offences. While Action Fraud has now taken responsibility for the central recording of fraud in all police forces areas, this transfer was rolled out at different times for different forces. For example, by the end of December 2012, 25 police force areas had transferred responsibility with the remaining transferring by the end of March 2013.

In the latest published statistics (for the year ending March 2013) a total of 229,018 fraud offences were recorded by the police. **This represents a volume increase of 27% compared with the previous year and an increase of 58% compared with 2007/08. However, in the context of the move to centralised recording of fraud making comparisons over time are problematic.** There are a number of factors that may have contributed to this increase including:

- the centralisation of recording fraud and a possible improvement in recording practices resulting from having a specialist team dealing with fraud;
- an increased proportion of victims reporting fraud following publicity around the launch of Action Fraud; and,
- a possible increase in the volume of fraud.

It is not possible to separate out or quantify the scale of each possible effect. A clearer picture will emerge over the next 1 to 2 years once the new recording arrangements have matured.

CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**Renewing the appointments of the Chair and Non-executive Members of the Committee****Purpose**

1. This paper sets out the process for the renewal of the appointments of the Chair and the other non-executive members of the Committee.

Action

2. Members are invited to note the paper.

Discussion

3. The Committee was established in late 2011. The Chair was appointed by the National Statistician for three years. Non-executive members were appointed by the National Statistician, in consultation with the Chair, for either two or three years. As the second anniversary of the Committee approaches, it is necessary to decide how a renewal of appointment process might operate.
4. For the Chair, the Role Specification (October 2011) made available to potential candidates stated under 'Terms and Conditions':

Period of appointment – the appointment will initially be made for 3 years with the possibility of renewal for a further similar period.

For non-executive members, there was a similar statement in their Role Specification (October 2011):-

Period of appointment – the appointment will be initially be made for 2 or 3 years that will vary to facilitate continuity. The possibility of renewal for a further similar period will be available.

Letters of appointment to non-executive members also stated “Your appointment will be for an initial term of two (or three) years” (my emphasis).

Moreover, the candidate pack for the recent recruitment exercise earlier this year which resulted in the appointment of Junaid Gharda as a non-executive member stated:-

Period of appointment

The appointment will be made for 2 years. The possibility of renewal for a further similar period will be available.

5. It is clear therefore that whilst there is no guarantee that an appointment will be renewed, that possibility should be a matter for consideration. It is the nature of that consideration that is discussed below separately for the role of Chair and non-executive member.

Chair

6. It is intended that four months before the period of the Chair's appointment expires, he/she will be approached by the Secretariat to ascertain whether he/she wishes to continue in the role. If the Chair indicates that he/she wishes to renew his/her appointment then the National Statistician will offer him/her a further period of three years. If the Chair does not wish to renew his/her appointment then the post will be advertised.

Non-executive member

7. It is intended that four months before the period of a non-executive member's appointment expires, he/she will be approached by the Secretariat to ascertain whether he/she wishes to continue in the role. If the non-executive member indicates that he/she wishes to renew his/her appointment then the National Statistician should consider, in consultation with the Chair, whether to offer him/her a further period of two years in the role. That consideration may include a discussion between the National Statistician, the Chair and the non-executive member. If the non-executive member does not wish to renew his/her appointment then the post will be advertised.

**CSAC Secretariat
National Statistician's Office
September 2013**

CRIME STATISTICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Report of National Crime Registrar

CSAC(13)20

Purpose/Issue

1. This paper is the regular report to the Committee from the National Crime Registrar. In accordance with the Committee's terms of reference, these reports are intended to either outline any proposed changes to the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) in detail or, where there is no need to do so, to advise accordingly.

Action

2. The Committee is invited to note the contents of this paper

Background

3. As set out in the Committee's terms of reference, the National Crime Registrar (NCR) has delegated authority to determine as an ex officio member whether proposed changes to the HOCR or the National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS) require referral to it for consideration prior to implementation.

Crime Recording Strategic Steering Group

4. As advised in previous reports the National Crime Recording Strategic Steering group (NCRSSG) has now been re-constituted. The group met in its new form for the first time on the 2nd July 2013. The SSG agreed its terms of reference and they are attached at annex 1 for information.
5. In addition to items that form part of the substantive agenda for this meeting of the committee the SSG also concluded the following decisions for changes to the HOCR with effect from 1st April 2014 and which have been assessed as being not of statistical significance. They are as follows:-

Theft from a vehicle

- i. To revise the current PRC classification Theft from a Vehicle (45) to become Theft from a **Motor** Vehicle. This will be achieved by the removal of the offence of "*theft from a conveyance other than a motor vehicle*" from classification 45 and placing it into Other Theft (49). This is to bring Theft **of** a Motor Vehicle and Theft **from** a Motor Vehicle into alignment and to provide clarity in the resulting statistics and to correct an issue which is frequently misunderstood. Currently Theft **from** a Vehicle includes thefts **from** (but not **of**) conveyances such as boats, bicycles and horse drawn carts. In 2012/13 285,051 thefts from vehicles

were recorded but only some 1800 (or 0.6%) relate to other conveyances, the remainder being thefts from motor vehicles.

Threats to Kill

- i. To revise the counting basis for offences of Threats to Kill (3B) to bring it correctly in line with the law. Since at least 2003 the HOCR basis for recording has been “one crime per intended victim”. For example, where A threatens B that he will kill both C and D then 2 crimes should be recorded (with C and D as victims) even if both C and D were unaware of that threat. This position was based on previous legal advice. However I reviewed this advice and having sought clarification from legal advisors it is apparent that the recording basis should be “one crime for each person to whom threats are made”. Thus in the example above where A threatens B he will kill C and D then 1 crime should be recorded with B as victim.
- ii. Whilst this will see some fall in the overall numbers of crimes recorded in this classification the change is necessary to correctly reflect the law. It has not been possible to make a robust assessment of the statistical impact as to do so would require a bureaucratic request to all forces to manually examine records. However an indicative assessment suggests that at most this would result in a 5% reduction in volumes of threats to kill. In 2012/13 7,359 such crimes were recorded and a reduction of around 350 could be expected to result from this revision.

Stalking

- i. To establish a new classification within HOCR for crimes of Stalking. This will see the current classification of Harassment (8L) split with the recently enacted specific stalking offences disaggregated into the new classification.
- ii. Stalking is a particularly appalling crime which can have a life changing impact on its victims even if they are not actually subject to direct violence or other types of criminality. In recognition of this and to allow it to be more effectively tackled, Parliament created a new specific offence. There is a pressing need to have good data on this offence to allow policy decisions to be made and reviewed and in recognition this change has been specifically requested by the Police through the National Policing Lead for Stalking and is robustly supported by the other stakeholders including Home Office policy and the national stalking working group.
- iii. The new classification will see an offence of stalking being recorded in preference to some other types of crime in certain circumstances. For example, currently victims of stalking may, as part of the overall stalking activity, have their car damaged by the offender. Current rules would just see the criminal damage recorded which masks the true extent of stalking. The new provisions will see the stalking recorded rather than the damage. Both the national stalking working group and the NCRSSG are producing detailed guidance to the police on the point at which stalking should be the recorded offence and this guidance will be implemented in time for April 2014 and kept under review.
- iv. The change has no impact on the overall numbers of crimes recorded and ensures the statistics do not undermine the severity of stalking. As stalking is a new offence introduced only in 2012/13 it should be possible to assess the impact and make the necessary adjustment to create a back series through the

Home Office Data Hub. Subsequent discussions will need to consider the future presentation of the offence in crime statistics publications although these should not hold up a decision to create the classification.

Steve Bond
National Crime Registrar
4 September 2013

National Crime Recording Strategic Steering Group (NCRSSG)

Terms of Reference July 2013

Purpose

The purpose of the National Crime Recording Strategic Steering Group (NCRSSG) is to consider and determine the strategic development of the National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS) and the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) in particular any proposals to change the core principles of NCRS. It also serves to provide national leadership in driving forward improvements in data quality and transparency whilst giving due consideration to bureaucracy and burden. The group will also consider matters to be discussed by the Crime Statistics Advisory Committee (CSAC).

Crime is recorded by the police and others to assist:

1. Both central and local government and Police and Crime Commissioners to establish whether their policies are effective in driving down crime and to gain understanding of the relative performance of policing and criminal justice providers in England and Wales.
2. The public in making informed decisions about the risk of crime to themselves as individuals and to allow judgments on how effective Government and police have been in tackling crime; and
3. In providing police and partners with data which informs the targeted use of resources and allows the relative effectiveness of different methodologies to be established.

Membership

The NCRSSG meetings will be chaired by the Home Office Programme Director for Crime Statistics and will have a core membership of a suitable representative from:

- Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) National Police Lead - Crime Statistics
- Office for National Statistics
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC)
- National Fraud Authority
- National Crime Recording Working Groups (Chair of each Group)
- National Crime Registrar, Home Office
- Crime and Policing Group, Home Office – Police Transparency Unit
- Crime and Policing Group, Home Office – Crime Statistic Policy
- Crime and Policing Group, Home Office – other policy leads as required
- College of Policing
- Crown Prosecution Service
- Subject Matter Experts – 2 Crime Registrars to act as advisors and experts

It is anticipated that representatives will always be of an appropriate level to allow for strategic decision making. The NCRSSG may also invite appropriate individuals to attend and provide advice to the Group.

Role and Remit

The NCRSSG will be responsible for:

- Overseeing the development and implementation of the strategic work programme;
- Making recommendations on policy considerations to revisions to NCRS or HOOCR and where relevant feeding those recommendations to the CSAC
- Tasking relevant NCR Working Groups to carry out identified work on its behalf;
- Consulting with appropriate policy leads in the Home Office, ACPO, College of Policing, FCRs and other stakeholders on proposed strategic changes to the NCRS and the HOOCR;
- Using relevant evidence and advice gathered from stakeholders to inform decisions regarding changes to the NCRS and HOOCR to ensure consistency, quality and integrity of crime data which in turn should increase public confidence in the crime statistics;
- Reviewing and endorsing proposed amendments to the NCRS and the Counting Rules to ensure they are fit for purpose.
- The HOOCR technical working group will retain delegated responsibility to agree administrative changes to the HOOCR that are routine in nature and do not require upwards referral.

Governance Arrangements

The NCRSSG will provide advice and report to Ministers in accordance with the working practices outlined below.

Working Practice

- The NCRSSG will usually meet three times a year (around 4 weeks prior to each scheduled meeting of the Crime Statistics Advisory Committee) although the Chair may set up an additional meeting if they deem it appropriate. The NCRSSG ACPO representative will act as Deputy Chair.
- The NCRSSG will act as the primary strategic decision-maker on NCRS- and HOOCR-related issues. Recommendations regarding substantive changes, for example, changes that are likely to have a significant effect on recorded crime levels or that may affect public confidence or trust will be referred to Home Office Ministers via CSAC for further consideration.

- The NCRSSG will direct and agree the activities of the NCR sub-groups, for example, they may ask a Working Group to carry out development work on its behalf. Changes required to the HOCR resulting from strategic decisions of the NCRSSG are the remit of the HOCR Technical Working Group (TWG). The TWG is empowered to determine those changes without further referral to the NCRSSG unless the TWG considers that in making such changes further strategic issues may arise. The TWG is also empowered to make decisions on matters of interpretation or clarification of the HOCR and the TWG is only required to refer to the NCRSSG any matters where such interpretation may, in their opinion, create a significant change in recording levels and practice.

Relationship with the Crime Statistics Advisory Committee (CSAC)

The National Crime Registrar (NCR) in their role as ex officio member of CSAC will include a summary of NCRSSG decisions in the routine report to each CSAC meeting. Where the NCRSSG consider that any decision they make requires specific advice from CSAC before referral to Ministers for clearance the NCR will submit that matter to CSAC as a specific paper for consideration.

Secretariat Arrangements

- The Home Office will provide Secretariat support to the NCRSSG.
- The agenda and related papers will be distributed electronically to members at least nine working days before a Steering Group meeting.
- The draft minutes will be distributed to members within ten working days and following agreement will be made available on the POLKA secure website.