

An excerpt from the final report from the evaluation  
of the "20,000 Police" initiative, Brå report 2014:17



## The Clearance rate in Sweden and in other countries



# The clearance rate in Sweden and other countries

An excerpt from the final report from the evaluation of the "20,000 Police" initiative, Brå report 2014:17

**The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (Brå) –  
centre for knowledge about crime and crime prevention  
measures**

The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (Brå) works to reduce crime and improve levels of safety in society by producing data and disseminating knowledge on crime and crime prevention work.

© Brottsförebyggande rådet 2015  
URN:NBN:SE:BRA-568

Production: The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (Brå), Box 1386, SE-111 93 Stockholm  
Tel+46 (0)8-527 58 400, e-mail: [info@bra.se](mailto:info@bra.se) Brå on the internet: [www.bra.se](http://www.bra.se)

The Swedish report can be ordered from Brå, [info@bra.se](mailto:info@bra.se)

# The clearance rate in Sweden and other countries

In this article we compare the number of reported offences per 1000 of population in Sweden, and the proportion of cleared offences, with the corresponding figures for five other European countries. The aim is to find explanations for why Sweden has a lower clearance rate than the other countries, despite the fact that victim surveys show that real crime levels are roughly the same. One factor of relevance to differences in the clearance rate is the issue of differences in the way the police register crimes. In Sweden, for example, the method used to count the number of reported offences is less restrictive than those employed in the other countries. Several of the countries also use a definition of cleared offences that differs from that employed in Sweden. In some countries, it is sufficient to have registered a suspect on reasonable grounds for the offence to be considered cleared. In Sweden, however, an individual must either have been prosecuted for the offence or issued with a summary sanction order or a waiver of prosecution. Finally, the chapter presents an alternative method of measuring police effectiveness in the countries studied, namely the number of conviction decisions per 1000 of population. Using this measure, Sweden is no worse than the other five countries; in fact, all of the countries lie at approximately the same level.

When police effectiveness is discussed in relation to the investigation and clearance of offences, comparisons are sometimes made with other countries. The picture that emerges from such comparisons is that the police in other countries clear a much higher proportion of offences than their Swedish counterparts. Viewed in this light, the Swedish police appear to be less effective than the police in other

countries. But is this a correct and fair conclusion? This is the question that is examined in this chapter. The objective here is in part to analyse whether the comparisons are fair, and in part to discuss whether we in Sweden ought to supplement or adapt the methods we use to measure the clearance rate in order to make them more comparable with those used in other countries.

The countries included in the comparison are Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Germany and England & Wales.

## Method

The basis used for comparing the different countries is their official crime statistics. In addition, we have obtained information about registration principles by means of questions posed via e-mail and telephone to one or more contacts in each country. These contacts were for the most part people working with the official crime statistics at the relevant statistical agency in each country, but they also concluded police staff and researchers.<sup>1</sup>

## The cleared offences measure in Sweden

When evaluating the quality and effectiveness of the police's investigative work, the measure that is usually employed is *the proportion of offences that are cleared*. In Sweden, the clearance rate is calculated by dividing the number of offences cleared in any given year by the number of registered crimes that have been reported to the police in the same year.

The number of registered crimes includes most of the offences that are reported to the police, with the exception of offences that only result in a summary police fine, such as speeding or littering.

Offence reports may be registered at the initiative of the police themselves, following a police intervention, or on the initiative of e.g. a crime victim, who may report an offence by visiting a police station, calling a police contact centre or via the police website. Some offences are reported to the police by other public sector agencies, such as the tax agency or the social services. For a case to fall into the category of cleared offences, the police and prosecutors must link a perpetrator to the offence by means of a prosecution, or by a prosecutor issuing a summary sanction order (which usually takes the form of a fine), or a waiver of prosecution.

## The clearance rate is lowest in Sweden...

Table 1 shows the proportion of offences officially described as cleared in Sweden and in the other five countries. If we disregard Denmark, Sweden has a significantly lower clearance rate than the other countries examined. The greatest difference is found in relation to Germany, where more than half of all registered offences are cleared, and Norway, where just under half of all registered offences

---

<sup>1</sup> A complete list of contacts can be found in the Appendix.

are cleared. In addition to the different countries' total clearance rates, the table also presents the clearance rates for the most common types of crime.<sup>2</sup> The calculations of which categories of offence to include were carried out manually in order to resemble the categories employed in Sweden as far as possible. This may mean that the figures presented here differ from those presented by the respective countries themselves.

**Table 1. Clearance rate for different types of offence (%) 2012.<sup>3</sup>**

	Sweden	Norway	Denmark	Netherlands	Germany	England & Wales
Official clearance rate	17	47	18	25 <sup>1</sup>	54	27 / 29 <sup>2</sup>
Theft offences	7	17	11	12	28	18
Offences against life and health	15	57	79	66	88	41
Fraud	9	35	65	* <sup>3</sup>	77	**
Criminal damage	4	20	14	12	25	16
Drug offences	56	87	95 <sup>4</sup>	91	94	94
Traffic offences	65	81	**	37	**	91

\*\* Not presented

<sup>1</sup> Preliminary figure; the final figure will be presented in 2016.

<sup>2</sup> The clearance rate lies at 27 percent if only "sanction detections" are included. It lies at 29 percent if "non-sanction detections" are also included. These concepts are explained in more detail in the section on England & Wales.

<sup>3</sup> According to calculations conducted by the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, the clearance rate for fraud lies at 24 percent in the Netherlands. However, the Dutch authorities do not believe that the category is accurate since fraud is found in several different categories of offences, and the Dutch police registration procedures do not include all of the offence categories that have been employed here by the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention.

<sup>4</sup> In Denmark, the "drug offences" category only includes the sale of drugs (Salg af narkotika mv.), which is not the case in the other countries. See Appendix.

The offences that different countries include in their calculations of total clearance rates are not entirely identical. One particularly important factor is the fact that many countries do not include traffic offences, which have a high clearance rate. As presented in Table 1 this is the case for Denmark and Germany. In England, fraud clearances were not included in the official clearance rate during the period examined.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> In addition, there is also an "other offences" category, which is not presented here because its contents differ too greatly between the different countries examined. A more detailed account of the contents of each offence category for the respective countries is presented in Appendix.

<sup>3</sup> For detailed source references, see Appendix.

<sup>4</sup> For more information, see the section on England & Wales.

### ... And the number of offences reported per 1000 of population is highest

Sweden also differs from the other countries in registering a much higher number of reported offences per 1000 of population. In Sweden, between two and three times as many offences are registered per 1000 of population than is the case in the other countries.

**Table 2. Total number of registered offences per 1000 of population in 2012.<sup>5</sup>**

Sweden	Norway	Denmark	Netherlands	Germany	England & Wales
147	55	96	68	73	64

Table 2 presents the numbers of registered offences published by the respective countries themselves. In the same way as in Table 1 there may therefore be some differences between the countries in the categories of offences that are included.

### Victim surveys indicate that real crime levels are approximately the same

The International Crime Victimization Survey (ICVS), which has been carried out at regular intervals, does not show any significant differences between the countries in levels of exposure to crime.<sup>6</sup> In the most recent survey from 2004/2005, an average of 16 percent of the adult population had been exposed to some sort of crime in the previous year (van Dijk et al. 2007). In Sweden and Norway, victimisation levels were close to the average, whereas they were slightly higher in Denmark, the Netherlands and the UK, and two percentage points below the average in Germany.<sup>7</sup> Thus the much higher number of reported offences found in Sweden cannot be explained by actual crime rates being much higher in Sweden than in the other countries. The differences noted must instead relate to the propensity to report and register offences, and to the ways in which offences are recorded and counted in official crime statistics.

The factors that may be of relevance for variations in the size of the clearance rate across the different countries examined are described below.

---

<sup>5</sup> For detailed source references and methods, see Appendix.

<sup>6</sup> The offences included in these studies are, in principle, offences against the person and theft offences against private individuals and households.

<sup>7</sup> More recent national victim surveys have been conducted in some of the countries, but these are not as comparable as the ICVS. In addition, crime trends are also very similar across the different countries examined.



## Differences may be due to several factors

In order to understand what the differences in reported and cleared offences are due to, many different factors must be taken into account.

The National Council has previously identified three main factors that may affect comparisons of crime statistics between different countries (Brå 2006:1):

- Statistical factors - the point at which the statistics are collected, counting procedures, how attempted offences are dealt with, the time frame to which the statistics refer and changes in statistical routines
- Legal factors - how offences are defined in legislation and factors affecting the legal process
- Actual conditions - the legality principle and reporting and recording propensities.

This report focuses on the statistical conditions. In particular, the following three factors are reviewed in more detail below:

- Differences in which offences are registered
- Differences in offence counting procedures
- Differences in the way cleared offences are defined

### **Differences in the ways in which offences are reported and registered**

One factor that may affect how many reported offences are registered is how easy it is to report an offence. If reporting an offence is time-consuming and difficult, the propensity to report may be lower. Having the option of making a report by telephone or via the internet probably increases the propensity to report crime by comparison with a situation where offences must be reported in person at a police station.

The number of reported offences that are registered is also affected by whether or not the police make some form of assessment when a report is made. In Sweden, the reported offence statistics include all incidents that the individuals reporting them perceive to be crimes; none are filtered out by the police. In other countries, the police generally make an assessment as to whether the incidents actually constitute criminal offences and exclude those that do not. This provides an opportunity for discretion that the police do not have in Sweden. In practice, this opportunity for discretion may lead to the filtering out of reported incidents that may actually constitute offences according to the prevailing legislation. If reports relating to offences that are difficult to clear are not always registered, this will increase the clearance rate.

There may also be differences in the legal requirements on police to register reports against the wishes of the injured party and in how the police relate to such requirements in practice.

The clearance rate may also be affected by differences in the procedures for registering offences committed abroad and offences

committed by individuals below the age of criminal responsibility. In some countries, reports relating to incidents of these kinds are not registered. In other countries they are registered, but are then counted as cleared. In Sweden such offences are registered in the statistics on reported offences, but are then not counted as having been cleared in the offence clearance statistics.

*Differences in types of offences included in criminal statistics*

Clearance rates may also be affected by the selection of offence categories that are included in a country's crime statistics. If one country includes a larger proportion of minor offences, such as more types of driving offences, the clearance rate may be higher in that country than in others.

## **Differences offence counting procedures**

Crime statistics are also affected by offence counting procedures. The way offences are counted is relevant in relation to the recording of reports involving *multiple offences* either in the form of a number of different incidents or a single incident involving a number of different perpetrators/victims. Such reports may result in either a single offence or several offences being registered. There are two typical cases, which involve counting procedures relating to serial offences and procedures that employ the principal offence method.

1. *Serial offences* might for example involve a woman reporting that she has been assaulted by her husband on a number of occasions. In this case there are a number of similar offences involving the same victim and the same perpetrator, but which have occurred on different occasions. A non-restrictive offence counting procedure would mean that each incident would be counted as a separate offence. Other offence counting procedures may be more restrictive. In the extreme case, only a single offence will be registered. The principal rule employed in Sweden is to count each specified incident as a separate offence.
2. *The principal offence method* may be used in cases where different types of offences have been committed on the same occasion. This might, for example, occur when the police respond to an incident of domestic assault, where the offender then violently resists arrest and also causes criminal damage to a police car. In such cases, each offence could be counted separately, or the rule might rather be only to register the most serious offence, i.e. the principal offence. In Sweden, each offence is counted in the statistics as a crime in its own right.

It is not possible to state the general effects that differences in offence counting procedures will have on the clearance rate. If serial offences that are easy to clear are only counted as a single offence, this will have a negative impact on the clearance rate. Counting several offences that are difficult to clear as a single offence would instead have a positive effect on the clearance rate.

## Differences in *what* are defined as cleared offences - and *when* offences are defined as having been cleared

Finally, there may also be differences between different countries in what is required for an offence to be counted as cleared. In some countries, including Sweden, an offence clearance is largely synonymous with a person being convicted of the offence.<sup>8</sup> In other countries, the requirements are less strict. It may be sufficient for the police to have identified an individual who is suspected of the offence on reasonable grounds, irrespective of whether there is sufficient evidence to prosecute or convict the individual in question.

The following sections describe the central features of the systems in place in relation to these factors in the different countries included in the comparison. This is followed by a more comprehensive analysis of the different countries, one factor at a time.

## Sweden

Number of registered offences per 1000 of population in 2012: 147  
Clearance rate in 2012: 17 percent

In Sweden, it is possible to report an offence by telephone, by visiting a police station or via the internet. There are two different telephone numbers for reporting offences by phone: one for emergencies and one for less urgent offence reports. The less urgent telephone calls go to the Sweden's Police Contact Centres (PCCs), and reports can also be made to these centres via the internet. More than half of all reports are currently made by telephone or via the internet to PCCs.

The principle applied in Sweden is that an incident reported to the police - or which the police or another related agency itself discovers - must be registered as a reported offence without any detailed investigation of whether the incident in fact constitutes an offence, or indeed whether it has even occurred.<sup>9</sup>

Reported offences are counted non-restrictively. In the case of serial offences, all offences are counted separately and the principal offence method is not employed. The statistics on reported offences also include both crimes that were committed outside Sweden and offences committed by children under the age of 15 (which is the age of criminal responsibility in Sweden). These offences are then counted among the non-cleared in offences the offence-clearance statistics. A cleared case in Sweden means that the police and prosecutors have tied a perpetrator to the offence by means of either a decision to prosecute or the issuance of a summary sanction order (fines or a

---

<sup>8</sup> In Sweden, the term "conviction" refers to cases where an offender has been found guilty in court or where a prosecutor has issued a summary sanction order or a waiver or prosecution. A clearance is registered where an individual has either been prosecuted or has been issued by the prosecutor with a summary sanction order or a waiver of prosecution.

<sup>9</sup> The recording of offences for the official statistics is carried out in the computer system RAR. In addition, operators at the County Communication Centre (CCC) also file an incident report when they receive a call regarding a serious crime, but this information is only used to lead operational work.

suspended sentence awarded by the prosecutor) or a waiver of prosecution.

## Norway

Number of registered offences per 1000 of population in 2012: 55  
Clearance rate in 2012: 47 percent

In Norway, an offence may be reported either by visiting a police station or via the internet. In 2012 approximately 10 percent of all offences were reported via the internet.<sup>10</sup> In the case of theft crimes, internet reports accounted for almost 30 percent of the total number of offence reports. There is no equivalent of Sweden's PCCs in Norway, so it is not possible to make a report by telephone.

Overall, this means that there are fewer ways of reporting offences than in Sweden. This is likely to lead to a lower proportion of less serious offences being reported than in Sweden. Only reports relating to incidents that the police assess to constitute criminal acts are registered. A study by Statistics Norway shows that in spite of this, approximately 3 percent of registered reports relate to incidents that do not constitute crimes.<sup>11</sup>

Informal interviews with employees from the Norwegian police also show that, in practice, reports are sometimes not registered if the police consider that they do not have the necessary resources to investigate the offence, or if they consider the offence to be impossible to clear. The person making the report may then be informed that there is no point in doing so, since it will not be possible to clear the offence. Such cases are described and criticised at regular intervals in the Norwegian press.<sup>12</sup> By contrast with the situation in Sweden, the Norwegian police are not required to register an assault report if they see violence in public places, unless those involved wish to file a complaint. Taken together, these differences would probably explain a large part of the difference between Norway and Sweden in the number of reported offences per 1000 of population.

### **Only reported offences that have resulted in a decision are included in the denominator**

One factor that affects the size of the clearance rate is whether this rate is based on all the reports registered over the course of a given year. When the clearance rate is calculated in Norway, the calculation only includes offences that have resulted in a decision during that year, in the form of either a decision to discontinue an investigation without a prosecution or a conviction decision that has gained legal force. The Norwegian statistics also present the total

---

<sup>10</sup> In Sweden, almost 60 percent of all offences are reported by telephone to PCCs or via the internet.

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.ssb.no/a/kortnavn/straffkjede/tab-2002-06-18-02.html> [2014-07-03]

<sup>12</sup> See the list of references for electronic sources with examples.

number of reported offences, regardless of whether or not these have resulted in a decision, and this figure is 9 percent higher than that for offences that have resulted in a decision. However, this is not the figure that is used as the basis for calculating the clearance rate.

Information on the number of reported offences that have resulted in a decision is also available in Sweden, but is not presented in the Swedish crime statistics.<sup>13</sup> The number of offences that have resulted in a decision is around 50,000 fewer than the number of reported offences. Otherwise, the offence counting procedures employed in Norway are generally the same as those used in Sweden: the principal offence method is not employed, and in the case of serial offences, each offence is counted separately.

### **Reported crime statistics include more types of offences that are easy to clear**

Statistics on reported offences include all criminal offences, i.e. both serious offences and misdemeanours. The statistics include both Penal Code and non-Penal Code offences. The proportion of non-Penal Code offences is greater in the Norwegian than in the Swedish crime statistics, however. These offences are for the most part of a kind where a perpetrator is identified at the same time as the crime itself is detected, such as minor traffic offences. These offences typically have a very high clearance rate, and this is another factor that may contribute to the clearance rate being higher in Norway than in Sweden.

### **Clearances defined in the same way as in Sweden**

The Norwegian definition of a cleared offence is broadly similar to that employed in Sweden. In contrast to Sweden, however, offences committed by persons under the age of criminal responsibility are counted as having been cleared.

Cleared offences are presented on the basis of five categories:

- Summary sanction order
- Prosecution
- Waiver of prosecution
- Cases dismissed because the suspect cannot be held criminally responsible (under the age of criminal responsibility or suffering from mental illness)
- Transferred to mediation board.

The distribution in terms of types of conviction decision appears to be approximately the same as in Sweden. Uncleared offences are presented on the basis of four categories:

- Dismissed due to lack of information about the perpetrator
- Dismissed due to lack of evidence
- Dismissed due to lack of processing capacity
- Other uncleared cases

---

<sup>13</sup> The inclusion of this information in the Swedish official statistics is under discussion.

We have identified the following factors that may contribute to the clearance rate being higher in Norway than in Sweden.

- It is not possible to report offences to the police by telephone, which is likely to contribute to the reporting of fewer minor offences, which are often difficult to clear.
- On the other hand, Norwegian statistics include a wider range of offence types where a suspect is typically identified at the same time as the crime is detected, such as minor traffic offences, than is the case in Sweden. These types of offences typically have a very high clearance rate.
- According to information obtained informally by the National Council, the police may sometimes choose not to register an offence report if an offence is judged to be impossible to clear or if there are insufficient resources to investigate the crime.
- Incidents of violence in public places, which the Swedish police are required to register as criminal offences, are in Norway usually regarded as minor disturbances and not crimes, and are therefore not registered.
- The proportion of drug-related offences in crime statistics is greater than in Sweden, and the clearance rate for these offences in Norway is almost 90 percent.
- Offences committed by individuals who are below the

## Denmark

Number of registered offences per 1000 of population in 2012: 95  
Clearance rate in 2012: 18 percent

In the same way as in Sweden, an offence can be reported either at a police station or to a police officer at the scene of the crime, by telephone or via the internet. It is also possible to make a written report. As in Sweden, a large proportion of penal code offences are reported by telephone – 60 percent in 2013.

As in all of the other countries except Sweden, at the time of the report, the police make an assessment of whether the reported incident in fact constitutes an offence. If it is not considered to constitute an offence, it may instead be registered as an "incident". Incidents are recorded in the police's own statistics, but are not included in the official crime statistics.

### **The Danish police register fewer reports of violence than in Sweden**

The police may also choose not to register a report in their case processing system if an offence is regarded as trivial. When the distributions of reported offences in Sweden and Denmark are compared, there are indications that the Danish police are more restrictive than their Swedish counterparts in their recording of reports relating to violence. In Denmark, roughly the same number of property offences

es is reported per 1000 of population as in Sweden.<sup>14</sup> However, the number of reported violent offences per 1000 of population is three times higher in Sweden than in Denmark.<sup>15</sup> The available data from victim surveys suggest that there are no major differences between the two countries in real crime rates. In Denmark, property offences account for 94 percent of the reported Penal Code offences, while violent offences account for only 4 percent.

The fact that reported property offences lie at approximately the same level in both countries indicates that the police do not exercise very much discretionary control in relation to the level of recording of this type of crime. Exposure to offences of this kind often results in insurance compensation, which in turn requires the filing of an offence report.<sup>16</sup> This makes it more difficult for the police to exercise discretion in relation to the recording of such offence reports. In the case of violent offences, there is probably a greater degree of variation in police practice as regards the recording or initiation of offence reports. In addition, the propensity to report relationship violence may vary between Sweden and Denmark.

When it comes to street violence, there are clear differences between Denmark and Sweden in both regulations and practice. In addition to the assault provision, the Danish penal code contains an additional provision on violence, Section 248, which applies to fights and which allows for a so-called remission of sanction to be granted in particularly extenuating circumstances. Violence which falls under this provision is not included in the statistics on offences reported to the police. However, fights and similar offences may also be registered as infringements of the public order ordinances (Ryttebro, Rönning and Tham, 2009).

In Sweden, however, there are very strict requirements on the police to register fights as assault offences. This is the result of a case in 2002, in which two police officers were convicted for failing to register an assault report in relation to a fight which the injured party did not want reported. The new practice that resulted from this case led to the number of reports of assault by an unknown perpetrator increasing by approximately 8,500 cases from 2001 to July 2007 (Brå 2009:1 p. 48).

### **Offence counting methods the same as in Sweden**

The offence counting procedures employed in the Danish crime statistics are the same as those used in Sweden.

This means that, in principle, serial crimes are counted as multiple offences and the principal offence method is not employed in the calculation of offence counts.

Crimes committed by children who are below the age of criminal responsibility are included in the crime statistics, as in Sweden, but

---

<sup>14</sup> 74 per 1000 of population in Denmark compared with 89 in Sweden.

<sup>15</sup> Three per 1000 in Denmark compared with nine per 1000 in Sweden.

<sup>16</sup> Insurance companies follow these routines in all of the countries studied.

in contrast to Sweden, these offences are then classified as having been cleared.

### Results measures based on reasonable suspicion

In Denmark, the concept of cleared offences is no longer used in discussions of the outcome of police investigations. Instead the terms *sigtelseprocent* and *afgørelseprocent* are employed. The *sigtelseprocent* measure relates the total number of offence reports to the number of reports to which a suspect has been tied on the grounds of a reasonable suspicion.<sup>17</sup> The *afgørelseprocent* measure relates the total number of reported offences to the number of reports that have resulted in a conviction or a fine issued by the police. The most widely used measure of police results is the proportion of reported offences to which a suspect has been tied on reasonable grounds.<sup>18</sup>

We have identified the following factors that may contribute to the clearance rate being higher in Denmark than in Sweden.

- Reports relating to incidents not viewed as offences are not included in the crime statistics.
- The police do not appear to register reports of assault to the same extent as in Sweden.
- The identification of a suspect on reasonable grounds is sufficient for an offence to be counted as cleared.
- Cases involving suspects who are below the age of criminal responsibility are also counted as cleared.

### The Netherlands<sup>19</sup>

Number of registered offences per 1000 of population in 2012: 68  
Clearance rate in 2012: 25 percent

In the Netherlands, fewer than half as many offences are registered per 1000 of population compared with Sweden. One possible reason could be that in the Netherlands, as in Germany and Norway, offences are for the most part reported at a police station or at the crime scene. It is also possible to report an offence by telephone or via the internet, but this happens far less often than in Sweden. Crimes that are reported via the internet or telephone are rarely investigated; the service is more seen as a way of registering relative-

---

<sup>17</sup> As far as the National Council for Crime Prevention has been able to ascertain, this relates to the identification of a suspect on reasonable grounds in the course of a police investigation. There is no requirement that the individual in question remains a suspect upon the completion of the investigation.

<sup>18</sup> Police statistics show the number of offences tied to a suspect on reasonable grounds in relation to the number of reported offences.

<sup>19</sup> The Dutch figure presented here is preliminary; the final figure will be reported in 2016.



ly minor offences in order for the injured party to be able to obtain compensation from his/her insurance company.<sup>20</sup>

The Dutch system for registering offences is also based on whether the police consider a reported incident actually to constitute an offence. In other cases the report should instead be registered as an “incident”. The obligation for police to register certain types of offences is not as strict as in Sweden. This system involves a filtration of incoming cases, which may be one of the explanations why fewer reported offences are registered.

A further explanation for the smaller number of offences registered in the Netherlands could be that the offence counting procedures employed are more restrictive than those used in Sweden. Serial offences are generally counted as a single offence and the principal offence method is applied. In cases where an offence has been committed by several perpetrators, only one offence is registered.

### **Reasonable suspicion is sufficient for clearance**

In the Netherlands it is sufficient that a suspected perpetrator has been identified on reasonable grounds<sup>21</sup> for an offence to be considered as cleared. Even if this situation changes at a later stage of the investigation, the offence remains cleared if a suspect has been registered on reasonable grounds at any time.

### **Statistics remain preliminary for three years**

The Netherlands has a system that differs from Sweden and the other countries examined regarding which offences the clearance figures refer to. Clearance rates for a given year only refer to those offences that were reported in that specific year. The first preliminary figures on clearance rates for the previous year are published as early as two months after the year-end. The figures are then updated regularly as investigations of the offences reported during the year in question are completed. Since the processing times for certain investigations may stretch over several years, the final figure for the number of cleared offences is not considered to be definitive until three years later.

For example, the figures from 2012 that are reported in this chapter will remain provisional until the spring of 2016. Experience indicates that the final clearance rates for 2012 will be a couple of percentage points higher than the preliminary figure that presented here. The disadvantage of such a system is that the general public and other public sector agencies do have no quickly and easily acces-

---

<sup>20</sup> To make a report online or by telephone, the police require, among other things, that

- the offence in question is theft or criminal damage – burglary cannot be reported online but may be reported by telephone
- there have been no personal injuries, either physical or psychological
- the perpetrator is unknown
- there is no evidence that needs to be secured (except of damage caused in the course of a burglary)

<sup>21</sup> Wetboek van Strafvordering, article 27 para 1.

sible statistics of the kind available in Sweden. At the same time, the procedure produces more correct figures, since the figures are not affected by changes from year to year in the inflow of cases.

### Debate on the clearance rate

The clearance rate is used as a measure of police effectiveness in the crime policy debate in the Netherlands. As in Sweden, the police have been criticised for not clearing a sufficiently large proportion of reported offences. A clearance rate of around one-quarter of offences is viewed as being far too low, particularly given that the clearance rate in neighbouring Germany, is twice as high, and that the Dutch police previously cleared significantly more crimes. The statistics on clearance rates in the Netherlands go back to 1948. The clearance rate at that time was 60 percent.

#### *Previous study questions the validity of international comparisons*

At the beginning of the 2000s, the research centre of the Dutch Department of Justice published a study in which Dutch crime statistics were compared with the statistics from a selection of other European countries,<sup>22</sup> including Sweden. Just as we have done in this study, the researchers identified a number of factors that are important to take into account when comparing different countries' statistics. The report primarily focused on factors related to what is registered at the time an offence report is recorded, the methods employed to produce offence counts and the way offence reports are distributed across different types of crime.

The researchers also came to the conclusion that the conviction statistics of the countries examined were easier to compare than the clearance rate, and thus constituted a more useful measure for the purpose of international comparisons<sup>23</sup> (Smit, van Tuldner, Meijer and De Groen 2003).

We have identified the following factors that may contribute to the clearance rate being higher in the Netherlands than in Sweden.

- The number of offences reported is lower, which may be due to the fact that offences are for the most part reported at the crime scene or at a police station. Reports by telephone and via the internet are less frequent than in Sweden.
- Reports of incidents that do constitute offences are not included in crime statistics.
- An offence is counted as cleared as soon as a suspect is tied to the offence on reasonable grounds.

---

<sup>22</sup> The countries compared were Sweden, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, France, England & Wales, Scotland and Portugal.

<sup>23</sup> The issue of the possibility of using conviction statistics for international comparisons is returned to later in this article, under the heading: Would convictions per 1000 of population be a more appropriate measure?

## Germany

Number of registered offences per 1000 of population in 2012: 73  
Clearance rate in 2012: 54 percent

Germany has no equivalent of Sweden's PCCs. If a serious offence has been committed, a telephone call can be made to the equivalent of the Swedish County Communication Centres, and the police will register an offence report at the crime scene. Other offences can either be reported in person at a police station or via the internet (for the past 2 years).

To be registered as a reported offence, incidents must be concrete and verifiable in terms of their content, location and time. If the police consider that a reported incident does not meet these requirements, it is not registered as an offence in the crime statistics. In addition, statistics on reported offences do not include open cases. This means that if an investigation is initiated, the offence is not registered in the statistics on reported offences until the police investigation has been completed. For example, if a report is received in September 2013, is then investigated and closed in February 2014, the offence is not presented in the crime statistics until 2014. The system is thus the same as that applied in Norway.

The procedure employed to produce offence counts is also more restrictive than in Sweden, and employs the principal offence method. Thus, if a perpetrator assaults two men on the same occasion, this is only counted as a single offence in Germany, while in Sweden it would be counted as two separate offences. If someone commits a burglary in an apartment on two occasions with an interval of one week between the two incidents, this is counted as only a single offence in Germany, but would be counted as two offences in Sweden. In contrast to Sweden, multiple offences against the same victim are registered as only a single offence.

### **The identification of a suspect on reasonable grounds is sufficient for the offence to be regarded as cleared**

The greatest difference between Germany and Sweden lies in the fact that the criteria employed in Germany for registering incidents as cleared offences are much less stringent than those employed in Sweden. In Germany, as in the Netherlands, it is sufficient that a suspect has been tied to the offence on the grounds of a reasonable suspicion.<sup>24</sup> This is also the case in relation to offences committed by children below the age of criminal responsibility; if the child suspect is linked to the offence on the grounds of a reasonable suspicion, the offence is registered as cleared.

An offence is thus considered to be cleared if a suspect has been identified, regardless of whether it will be possible to obtain a conviction – a large proportion of the cleared offences will not result in convictions as a result of the evidence being too weak. This produces

---

<sup>24</sup> In Sweden, the proportion of offences to which a suspect had been tied on reasonable grounds was 34 percent, which is considerably higher than the clearance rate.

a situation where the clearance rate for offences against life and health, for example, lies at 88 percent in Germany, by comparison with 15 percent in Sweden.

We have identified the following factors that may contribute to the clearance rate being higher in Germany than in Sweden.

- There is no equivalent to Sweden's PCCs, to which reports can be made by telephone, which probably contributes to fewer offences being reported.
- Reports of incidents that do not constitute offences are not included in crime statistics.
- The obligation for police to report assault offences is not as extensive as in Sweden.
- The procedure employed to produce offence counts is more restrictive.
- Identifying a suspect on reasonable grounds is sufficient for an offence to be counted as cleared.
- The same applies in cases where the suspect is below the age of criminal responsibility.

## England and Wales

Number of registered offences per 1000 of population in 2012: 64  
Clearance rate in 2012: 27/29 percent

As in Sweden, there are several different ways of reporting an offence in England & Wales. It can be done in person, by telephone or via the internet on the police website. The objective is to make it as easy as possible for victims to report exposure to crime.

### Several factors contribute to reducing the volume of reported offences

The intention in England & Wales is thus that it should be easy to *report* an offence. At the same time, there are several factors that contribute to a smaller number of offences being *registered* than is the case in Sweden. The offences that are registered are those that the police themselves define as crimes on the basis of a number of basic questions put to those reporting the incidents.<sup>25</sup> The remainder are excluded.<sup>26</sup> If subsequent investigative measures show that an incident that has been registered as an offence does not in fact constitute a crime, the police then remove the incident from the register.

---

<sup>25</sup> Crimes punishable only by fines are not included in crime statistics, as is the case in Sweden.

<sup>26</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/299317/count-general-april-2014.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/299317/count-general-april-2014.pdf) (Whether & When to Record (2 of 8)) [03/07/2014].

In addition to the crime register there is another public register of "incidents".<sup>27</sup> If the police consider that a reported incident does not meet the criteria to constitute an offence, it should instead be recorded in this incidents register. These incidents are not included when calculating the clearance rate.

In the majority of police districts, everything that is reported to the police in any other way than through personal contact is first registered as an incident. A subsequent decision is then made as to whether the incident should be classified and registered as an offence.<sup>28</sup> The registered incidents are of many different types, but most commonly involve some form of public order disturbance. "Antisocial behaviour" constitutes a special category of incidents. Typically these may involve groups of young people shouting or fighting on the street or harassing people, disturbances between neighbours and minor incidents of vandalism, such as tagging. The number of registered incidents of anti-social behaviour is roughly equal to the number of registered reported offences.

As with the crime statistics, incident statistics are public information. This means that both crime statistics and incident statistics are used as indicators of social problems in different areas.

#### *Many offences are incorrectly registered as incidents*

Those incidents that the police, following questions posed during the reporting process (or subsequently), define as offences are *registered* as offences. Some of the cases that would be registered as offences in Sweden are in England & Wales only registered as incidents, however, such as petty vandalism. The supervisory authority for the police (HMIC) has noted that the dividing line between what should be registered as offences and incidents respectively is not always clear to police officers.<sup>29</sup> In addition, HMIC noted that many reports concerning incidents that clearly constituted offences, such as assault, unlawful threats or other offences against the person, had not been registered as offences by the police. In its most recent report, HMIC addresses strong criticism toward the quality with which the police record reported incidents and offences in the districts examined (HMIC 2014). It estimates that as many as 20 percent of reported offences are not registered by the police as offences but as incidents. If this is the case, it would explain a large part of the difference in the number of reported offences per 1000 of population between Sweden and England & Wales. In the light of these shortcomings, the statistical agency for England & Wales decided in January 2014 to remove offences reported to the police from the official crime statistics. They specified a number of improvements in the way police process reports that would be required before the

---

<sup>27</sup> <http://www.hmic.gov.uk/programmes/crime-data-integrity/> [2014-07-03].

<sup>28</sup> In some police districts, events that appear to constitute criminal offences are not first registered as incidents, but are instead only entered into the crime register.

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.hmic.gov.uk/programmes/crime-data-integrity/> [2014-07-03]

statistics could once again be included in the official crime statistics (HMIC 2014).

Offences committed abroad are not usually registered. However, offences committed by minors (under 12) are registered in the same way as other offences – although in contrast to Sweden, these are then counted among the offences that have been cleared.<sup>30</sup>

In 2011, the police in England & Wales stopped registering reports of fraud and instead established a specialised fraud centre (Action Fraud), which is operated by a private actor. Since the end of March 2013, Action Fraud has received fraud reports from all 43 police districts. Police districts now investigate only the reports they receive from Action fraud. This means that there is a risk that different procedures have been employed for registering fraud offences. For this reason, the Home Office has decided to exclude fraud from the official clearance rates during the period in question (Home Office 2013).

#### *Agreement that the police should not generally handle offences committed in schools*

Since 2004, there has been an agreement that the police should not deal with and register offences committed by children when they are in school. It is the school's responsibility to deal with these offences, with the exception of particularly serious crimes. This contrasts with the situation in Sweden, where many schools have routines in place that involve reporting all offences that take place in school to the police.

#### *Offences counted more restrictively*

The offence counting procedure employed in relation to reported offences is more restrictive than in Sweden. Serial offences are counted as a single crime, and the principal offence rule is applied. Statistics are described as "victim-based" rather than offence-based (ONS 2014, p. 21). These differences lead to the registering of fewer reported offences than the offence counting system employed in Sweden.

#### **Same principle for defining cleared offences as in Sweden**

Those offences counted as *cleared* are mainly offences that led to some form of sanction (sanction detections). This is the measure of cleared offences that is easily accessible on the internet in Crime Comparator, where different police districts can compare themselves with one another.<sup>31</sup> Of reported crimes, 27 percent are cleared in this way (Home Office 2013).

In addition, there is also a category called non-sanction detections (similar to a waiver of prosecution in Sweden). Of all reported offences, 2 percent are cleared in this way, which gives a total clear-

---

<sup>30</sup> These are counted as "non-sanction detections".

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.hmic.gov.uk/crime-and-policing-comparator/> [2014-07-03].

ance rate of 29 percent. Crimes that lead to a non-sanction detection are included when the total clearance rate (detection rate) is reported in the official crime statistics published by the Home Office (Home Office 2013).

Prior to 2007, a large number of different types of cases could be registered as cleared in the form of non-sanction detections, including cases where complainants or witnesses refused to participate in police interviews or at trial, or cases where the police deemed it not to be in the public interest to prosecute the suspect. Since 2007, the criteria for registering this type of clearance have become more stringent. It may now only be used in relation to relatively serious offences<sup>32</sup>, when the suspect is deceased, or in cases where the prosecutor determines not to take further action despite the suspect's guilt having been established.<sup>33</sup>

#### *Differences in sanctioning systems may affect clearance rates*

The sanctioning system in England and Wales differs from its Swedish counterpart in a way that could possibly affect the clearance rate. Of the 27 percent of cases described above as having being cleared by means of the offence leading to a sanction, 16 percent relate to measures that correspond to the summary sanction order and to prosecution in Sweden (charge/summons) (Home Office 2013). A further 9 percent of the offences are cleared by some form of sanction that is issued by the *police*. These include cautions issued by the police for less serious offences in general or for cannabis offences in particular, and in part what are labelled Penalty Notices for Disorder, which are most commonly issued for the possession of cannabis. These sanctions involve the individual being registered with the police (although this registration is not public information). The reason for giving the police the authority to make decisions regarding these sanctions is that they are described as a way of reducing the level of paperwork for the police and prosecution services, and of giving the police more time to investigate more serious offences.<sup>34</sup> It is not unreasonable to assume that such simple procedures could increase the clearance rate by a couple of percentage points.<sup>35</sup>

In summary, the clearance rate in England & Wales is comprised of the following components:

---

<sup>32</sup> Referred to as 'indictable offences' (those offences which must be tried at Crown Court).

<sup>33</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/191822/detection-open-data-notes.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/191822/detection-open-data-notes.pdf) [2014-07-03].

<sup>34</sup> <https://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/oecd/pnd-guidance-oecd.pdf> [2014-07-04].

<sup>35</sup> This assumption was confirmed by prosecutors interviewed by the National Council for Crime Prevention. The risk that was described as being associated with such a system, however, was that it might produce a decrease in the level of legal certainty.

**Table 3. Grounds for clearance decisions in England & Wales. 2012.**

<b>Grounds for clearance</b>	<b>Clearances based on different grounds, % of reported offences</b>
<b>Sanctions:</b>	
Charge/summon	17
Warning by police	5
Offences asked to be taken into consideration by court	2
Penalty Notices for disorder	2
Cannabis Warnings	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>27<sup>1</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup>The clearance rate sums here to 27 rather than 28 as a result of rounding.

### **Consideration being given to introduce of a new clearance category**

Discussions are underway at the Ministry of Justice, about the introduction of a new clearance category as a means of responding to criticisms that a greater proportion of offences should be cleared. By publishing statistics similar to the former Swedish category “technical clearances”, it would become easier to explain why many reported offences do not result in sanction- and non-sanction detections. In particular, there is a desire to draw attention to those offences that only result in municipally organised mediation and in no other sanctions, since these offences are not included in the current clearance statistics. There is a desire to make such cases visible by means of the introduction of new categories in the offence clearance statistics.

In the same way as in Sweden, the reported offences and cleared offences recorded in the annual crime statistics are not entirely comprised of the same offences, but rather of those that have been reported and cleared respectively during a given year.



We have identified the following factors which may contribute to the registered clearance rate being higher in England & Wales than in Sweden.

- Reported incidents that do not constitute criminal offences are filtered out.
- Some acts that are counted as offences in Sweden are only counted as incidents in England & Wales and are thus not included in crime statistics, e.g. minor incidents of vandalism - which rarely result in a clearance.
- Everyday offences in school are not reported to the police (there are thus no uncleared offences in England & Wales committed in school by 15–17-year-olds, which is the case in Sweden).
- Offence counting procedures are more restrictive in England & Wales, which may affect the clearance rate.
- Five percentage points of the clearance rate in England & Wales are accounted for by offences that have not resulted in any action by the prosecutor, but which have been cleared by means of the suspect admitting guilt (usually to a minor offence) and being issued with a caution.

## Analytical Summary

The above review shows that there are substantial differences between different countries in both the way statistics on reported offences are produced and the way the clearance rate is calculated. The differences apply to both the way reported offences are recorded and registered, and the offence counting procedures that are employed. Countries also differ in fundamental ways regarding what is required for an offence to be counted as cleared. The central findings from the National Council's review of the different countries' routines and counting procedures are summarised below.

**Table 4. Overview of what is included in crime statistics and what is counted as a cleared crime.**

	Sweden	Norway	Denmark	Nederländerna	Tyskland	England
<b>What is included in the statistics on reported offences?</b>						
Incidents perceived to be crimes by the complainant but not by the police	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Crimes that are reported but that the police perceive to be very minor or impossible to clear <sup>1</sup>	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear
Offences committed abroad	Yes	Yes <sup>2</sup>	Yes	No	No	No
All individual offences in serial crimes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Offences that are part of multiple offences but not the principal offence	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Largely the same non-penal code offences as that are included in the Swedish crime statistics	Yes	No <sup>3</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>What are counted as cleared offences?</b>						
When an individual is suspected of the offence by the police on reasonable grounds	No	No	Yes <sup>4</sup>	Yes	Yes	No
Offences where the suspect is below the age of criminal responsibility <sup>5</sup>	No	Yes <sup>6</sup>	Yes	Yes <sup>7</sup>	Yes	Yes
Offences where a prosecutor has decided to issue a summary sanction order, waiver of prosecution, or to prosecute someone for the offence	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

<sup>1</sup>In the same way as in Sweden, insurance companies in other countries require a police report in order to pay compensation for stolen goods that were insured.

<sup>2</sup>Just over 3 percent of the reported offences registered in Norway in 2012 were offences committed outside Norway.

<sup>3</sup>Several types of traffic offences are included.

<sup>4</sup>As stated previously, the concept of cleared offences is not used in Denmark. However, the proportion of reports that have been tied to a suspect on reasonable grounds is normally used in Denmark to measure the results of the police's investigative work, i.e. in a way similar to that in which the clearance rate is employed in the other countries.

<sup>5</sup>It should be noted that the age of criminal responsibility is not the same in all countries.

<sup>6</sup>Offences committed by children under the age of 15 account for 1–2 percent of the total number of cleared offences.

<sup>7</sup>The same requirement of a reasonably grounded suspicion applies in cases where the suspect is under 12 as in cases where the offender has reached the age of criminal responsibility.

### **How important are these differences for the clearance rate?**

The central question is how much the different factors described above affect the clearance rate. At the general level, it can be noted

that the routines and counting procedures in place in Sweden consistently tend towards the production of a clearance rate that is lower than it would be if other options had been applied. There are two principal factors that contribute to the Swedish clearance rate being so much lower than that of the majority of the other countries examined: the way the reporting of offences is dealt with, and the way the clearance rate is calculated.

*Other countries make an initial assessment of whether the reported incident constitutes an offence*

In all of the other countries examined, the police should only register a reported incident in the crime statistics if it meets the criteria required to constitute an offence. A large number of reported incidents are filtered out in this way. The National Council's analysis also indicates that this process may in itself lead to police officers also filtering out incidents that do in fact constitute offences, such as minor offences that are difficult to clear, in order to reduce the workload. There are ongoing discussions in both Norway and England & Wales about whether police practices in this area are always correct.

In addition, the police's obligation to register offence reports in relation to minor assault offences, such as minor fights in public places, is more far-reaching in Sweden than in the other countries. All of these factors lead to the number of recorded offences being lower in the other countries than in Sweden. The incidents/offences that are excluded from the other countries' statistics are such that they are either impossible to clear, since they do not constitute offences, or are offences that, typically speaking, are very difficult to clear.

As regards the counting procedures employed in relation to the statistics on reported offences, the same routines are employed in Sweden, Norway and Denmark. The counting procedures employed in the other countries are more restrictive. These particular differences do not play such an important role in relation to the size of the clearance rate, however – and may lead to differences of at most a couple of percentage points.

*It is common for the clearance rate to be based on a reasonably grounded suspicion*

One factor that is of major significance for the size of the clearance rate is that of whether clearances are based on having a registered suspect or on convictions or decisions to prosecute. In Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands, a "clearance" means that someone has been suspected of the offence on reasonable grounds at some point during the police investigation. In Sweden and Norway<sup>36</sup>, a clearance requires that someone has been prosecuted or issued with a summary sanction order or a waiver of prosecution by the prose-

---

<sup>36</sup> The exact categories of reactions included in clearances in Norway are shown under the heading "Clearances defined in the same way as in Sweden" in the section on Norway.

cutor. In England & Wales, a clearance requires that someone has been issued with a sanction as a result of the offence. England & Wales differ from Sweden and Norway, however, since one of the more common sanctions included in the base for calculating offences clearances (the caution) is issued by the police and not by a prosecutor.

There are also differences that produce a negative effect on the Swedish clearance rate with regard to how offences/clearances are registered in relation to crimes committed abroad or by individuals below the age of criminal responsibility. However, these differences do not affect the clearance rate by more than one or two percent.

#### *Impossible to calculate the exact impact of the differences*

The National Council has attempted to calculate what size the clearance rate would be in the other countries if they applied exactly the same system of procedures as in Sweden, but the difficulties involved have proved too great. There are simply too many variable factors involved. Further, while some of the differences between the countries are due to differences in officially specified procedures, others are due to variations in the extent to which the police follow the rules in place for how reported offences should be registered. It is simply not possible to calculate the size of these irregularities.

### **Would convictions per 1000 of population be a more appropriate measure?**

The very broad estimates that the National Council has been able to calculate for a couple of the countries suggest that the differences in clearance rates between the countries are not particularly large when clearances are calculated in the same way. To take one example, a suspect was registered in relation to 34 percent of the offences reported in Sweden in 2012.

In order to arrive at a somewhat more reliable understanding of the size of the real differences in police effectiveness, the National Council has selected a new measure with which to compare the different countries. The measure would appear to produce a fairer comparison than those employed today. The measure in question is the number of convictions per 1000 of population. The National Council's assessment is that this provides a more meaningful measure for comparisons, since the number of people exposed to crime per 1000 of population is largely similar across the different countries.<sup>37</sup> The number of convictions per 1000 of population may be viewed as a measure of how well society, through the police and the rest of the justice system, succeeds in producing a criminal justice reaction to these offences.

The results of the comparison are presented in Table 5. The definition of convictions includes decisions by prosecutors or the courts that as far as possible correspond to summary sanction orders,

---

<sup>37</sup> This measure would be more difficult to apply when comparing countries where exposure to crime varies from country to country. In such cases it would be necessary to include controls for differences in crime levels.

waivers of prosecution and court convictions in Sweden. For England & Wales, two alternative figures have been calculated. The first includes sanctions issued by the police, whereas the second excludes these sanctions, since they are not based on decisions by a prosecutor or the courts.

Appendix 4 presents the decisions that are included for each country.

**Table 5. All convictions per 1000 of population 2012<sup>38</sup>.**

Country	Convictions per 1000 of pop.
Norway	16 <sup>1</sup>
England	14/20 <sup>2</sup>
Sweden	14
Denmark	14
Germany	12
Netherlands	10

<sup>1</sup>The Norwegian figure refers to 2011.

<sup>2</sup>Including relevant sanctions issued by the police.

As can be seen from the table, when the comparison is based on this measure, the differences between the various countries are very limited. Measured in this way, Swedish police and prosecutors are no less effective than those of the other countries examined.

### **Should Sweden adapt its statistics to facilitate comparisons with other countries?**

One question that might then be asked is that of whether Sweden ought to adapt or supplement her official crime statistics in order to facilitate comparisons with other countries. One difficulty associated with any such attempt is that while the other countries differ from Sweden in this regard, they also differ in relation to one another. A number of countries employ more restrictive offence counting procedures, for example, but the procedures employed in Norway and Denmark are the same way as those in Sweden. Similarly, the other countries examined differ from Sweden in the way that offences committed by persons below the age of criminal responsibility are not registered as uncleared in the offence clearance statistics. The way this problem is resolved varies somewhat between different countries. Further, as has been noted above, these particular differ-

<sup>38</sup> The number of convictions in the other countries examined has been adapted to correspond as closely as possible to the definition employed in Sweden in order to make the figures comparable. This means that the convictions figures presented here do not correspond to the convictions statistics that are published in the respective countries themselves, since some categories of convictions have been removed. For detailed source references and method, see Appendix.

ences do not have any major significance for the size of the clearance rate.

One relatively simple means of showing that the police's capacity to investigate offences can be measured in different ways would be for Sweden to supplement the existing clearance measure with the proportion of reported offences for which a suspect is registered on the basis of a reasonably grounded suspicion. This measure is not currently reported. As was noted earlier, 34 percent of the offences reported in Sweden in 2012 were linked to a registered suspect in this way.

# Appendix

## Source references and methods

### Source references table 1 and table 2

#### *Sweden*

##### *Source reported and cleared offenses:*

Kriminalstatistik 2012, Brå

[http://bra.se/download/18.6b82726313f7b234a51e31/1379673865503/2013\\_18\\_Kriminalstatistik\\_2012\\_webb.pdf](http://bra.se/download/18.6b82726313f7b234a51e31/1379673865503/2013_18_Kriminalstatistik_2012_webb.pdf) [2014-05-12]

##### *Source population:*

[http://www.scb.se/sv/\\_Hitta-statistik/Statistik-efter-amne/Befolkning/Befolkningsstatistik/25788/25795/Helarsstatistik---Riket/26046/](http://www.scb.se/sv/_Hitta-statistik/Statistik-efter-amne/Befolkning/Befolkningens-sammansattning/Befolkningsstatistik/25788/25795/Helarsstatistik---Riket/26046/) [2014-06-02]

#### *Norway*

##### *Source reported and cleared offenses:*

Etterforskede lovbrudd 2012, Statistisk sentralbyrå

<http://www.ssb.no/sosiale-forhold-og-kriminalitet/statistikker/lovbrudde/aar/2014-02-11?fane=tabell&sort=nummer&tabell=162559> [2014-05-12]

##### *Source population:*

<https://www.ssb.no/statistikkbanken> [2014-06-02]

#### *Denmark*

##### *Source reported and cleared offenses:*

Kriminalitet 2012, Danmarks statistik

<http://www.dst.dk/pukora/epub/upload/17950/krim.pdf> [2014-05-12]

##### *Source population:*

<http://www.statistikbanken.dk> Tabell FOLK 1 [2014-06-02]

#### *Netherlands*

##### *Source reported and cleared offenses:*

Opgehelderde misdrijven, Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek

<http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=D&DM=SLNL&PA=8250 NED&D1=3-4&D2=a&D3=0&D4=7&HD=140813-1116&HDR=G3,T&STB=G2,G1> [2014-05-12]

##### *Source population:*

<http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=D&DM=SLNL&PA=37296eng&D1=a&D2=62&HD=140813-1505&LA=EN&HDR=G1&STB=T> [2014-06-02]

#### *Germany*

##### *Source reported and cleared offenses:*

Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik 2012, Bundeskriminalamt

[http://www.bka.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Publikationen/PolizeilicheKriminalstatistik/2012/Standardtabellen/Faelle/tb01\\_\\_FaelleGrundtabelle\\_\\_pdf,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/tb01\\_\\_FaelleGrundtabelle\\_\\_pdf.pdf](http://www.bka.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Publikationen/PolizeilicheKriminalstatistik/2012/Standardtabellen/Faelle/tb01__FaelleGrundtabelle__pdf,templateId=raw,property=publicationFile.pdf/tb01__FaelleGrundtabelle__pdf.pdf) [2014-05-12]

##### *Source population:*

[https://www.destatis.de/DE/ZahlenFakten/GesellschaftStaat/Bevoelkerung/Bevoelkerungsstand/Tabellen/Zensus\\_Geschlecht\\_Staatsangehoerigkeit.html](https://www.destatis.de/DE/ZahlenFakten/GesellschaftStaat/Bevoelkerung/Bevoelkerungsstand/Tabellen/Zensus_Geschlecht_Staatsangehoerigkeit.html) [2014-06-02]

### England and Wales

Source reported and cleared offenses:

Crimes detected in England and Wales 2012/13, Home office

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/224037/hosb0213.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/224037/hosb0213.pdf) [2014-05-12]

Source population:

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/taxonomy/index.html?nscl=Population#tab-data-tables> [2014-07-02]

## Source references and calculation table 1 and table 5

An accounting of the different types of offences included in the categories shown in Table 1

	Sweden	Norway	Denmark	Netherlands	Germany	England and Wales
<b>Theft offences</b>	8 kap. Stöld m.m. (exkl rån)	Tyveri, inbrudd, naskeri	Indbrud i forretning, virksomhed mv., Indbrud i beboelser, Indbrud i ubeboede bebyggelser, Tyveri fra bil, båd mv. , Butikstyverier mv. , Andre tyverier, Tyveri/brugstyveri af køretøj , Tyveri/brugstyveri af andet	Diefstal, verduistering en inbraak	Diebstahl ohne erschwerende Umstände §§ 242, 247, 248a-c StGB, Diebstahl unter erschwerenden Umständen §§ 243-244a StGB	Theft offences
<b>Offences against life and health</b>	3 kap. Brott mot liv och hälsa	Forbrytelse mot liv, legeme og helbred	Voldsforbrydelser i alt	Mishandeling, Levensmiddrijf, Vrijheidsbeneming/gijzeling, Geweldsmisdrijf (overig)	Körpverletzung §§ 223-227, 229, 231 StGB, Mord § 211 StGB (exkl 040000; 219030; 219050)	Violence against the person
<b>Fraud</b>	Bedrägeri inkl. grovt. Bedrägligt beteende (1-3 §)	Bedrageri, utroskap	Bedrageri, Checkbedrageri	<i>Not presented</i>	Betrug §§ 263, 263a, 264, 264a, 265, 265a, 265b StGB	<i>Not presented</i>
<b>Criminal damage</b>	12 kap. Skadegörelsebrott	Skadeverk (forbrytelse og forseelse)	Hærværk	Vernieling en beschadiging (förutom dierenmishandeling)	Sachbeschädigung §§ 303-305a StGB	Criminal damage, arson
<b>Traffic offences</b>	Brott mot trafikbrottslagen	Forseelse mot veitrafikkloven	<i>Not presented</i>	Verkeersmisdrijven	<i>Not presented</i>	Dangerous driving



## An accounting of the different types of convictions included in the categories shown in Table 1

### *Sweden*

The categories used for calculating convictions per 1000 of population in Sweden are the following:

- Court sentencing<sup>39</sup>
- Summary sanction order
- Waiver of prosecution

*Source number of convictions:*

[http://bra.se/download/18.6b82726313f7b234a581e6b/1379677279048/2012\\_personer\\_lagf%C3%B6rda\\_f%C3%B6r\\_brott.pdf](http://bra.se/download/18.6b82726313f7b234a581e6b/1379677279048/2012_personer_lagf%C3%B6rda_f%C3%B6r_brott.pdf) [2014-06-02]

*Source population:*

[http://www.scb.se/sv/\\_Hitta-statistik/Statistik-efter-amne/](http://www.scb.se/sv/_Hitta-statistik/Statistik-efter-amne/)

Befolk-

ning/Befolkningenssammansattning/Befolkningsstatistik/25788/25795/He-larsstatistik--Riket/26046/ [2014-06-02]

### *Norway*

The categories used for calculating convictions per 1000 of population in Norway are the following:

- Court sentencing involving deprivation of liberty (betinget fengsel, betinget fengsel og bot, ubetinget fengsel, ubetinget og betinget fengsel)
- Summary sanction order (forelegg)
- Waiver of prosecution (betinget påtaleunntatelse)
- Community service (samfunnsstraff)
- Fines issued by a court (bot ved dom)
- Other<sup>40</sup>

Breach-of-regulations fines (forenklet forelegg) are not included in the National Council's calculation. Breach-of-regulations fines are issued by police and custom authorities and make up 75 percent of the total convictions in Norway. They are primarily issued for traffic offenses, e.g. speeding.

Unlike the other countries presented, the Norwegian figure refers to 2011. The corresponding figures for 2012 had not been published by the time this report was written.

*Source number of convictions:*

[http://www.ssb.no/a/kortnavn/a\\_krim\\_tab/tab/tab-2013-01-24-28.html](http://www.ssb.no/a/kortnavn/a_krim_tab/tab/tab-2013-01-24-28.html) [2014-06-02]

*Source population:*

<https://www.ssb.no/statistikkbanken> [2014-06-02]

---

<sup>39</sup> Imprisonment, institutional care of young persons, forensic psychiatric care, probation, conditional sentence, care of young persons, youth service, commission to care, fine, remission of sanction

<sup>40</sup> 22 forvaringsdommer, 22 dommer med tvungent psykisk helsevern, to dommer med tvungen omsorg og en dom med rettighetstap.

### *Denmark*

The categories used for calculating convictions per 1000 of population in Denmark are the following:

- Court sentencing involving deprivation of liberty (dom til frihedsstraf)
- Summary sanction order (bødevedtagelse)
- Waiver of prosecution (tiltalefrafald)
- Forensic psychiatric care (foranstaltning domme)
- Fines issued by a court (bødedom og udeblivelsesdom, indenretlig bøde og frakendelse, indenretlig vedt. af bøde og kørselsforbud, indenretlig vedtagelse af bøde/frakendelse af retten til at føre lille knallert)

Categories that are similar to Swedish breach-of-regulations fines are excluded from the Danish figure. The categories excluded account for 58 percent of all convictions in Denmark and consist of breach-of-regulations fines<sup>41</sup>

*Source number of convictions:*

<http://www.statistikbanken.dk> [2014-06-02]

*Source population:*

<http://www.statistikbanken.dk> [2014-06-02]

### *Nederländerna*

The categories used for calculating convictions per 1000 of population in the Netherlands are the following:

- Court sentencing involving deprivation of liberty (ontslag rechtsvervolging met maatregel, ontslag rechtsvervolging zonder maatr., schuldigverklaring zonder straf, schuldigverklaring met straf)
- Summary sanction order (transactie, onbekend<sup>42</sup>)
- Waiver of prosecution (beleidssepot, voeging ad informandum, voeging ter berechting)

*Source number of convictions:*

<http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=81532NED&D1=2-3,5-7,14-17&D2=0&D3=0&D4=1&HDR=T&STB=G1,G2,G3&VW=T> [2014-06-02]

*Source population:*

<http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=D&DM=SLNL&PA=37296eng&D1=a&D2=62&HD=140813-1505&LA=EN&HDR=G1&STB=T> [2014-06-02]

### *Germany*

The category used for calculating convictions per 1000 of population in Germany is *Abgeurteilte*. This category consists of suspects who have accepted a summary sanction order or those whose main

---

<sup>41</sup> 214 Bødeforlæg, 216 Udenretlig bøde og frakendelse, 218 Udenretlig vedt. Af bøde og kørselsforbud, 219 Bøde og øvrige frakendelser eller kørselsforbud, 221 Udenretlig vedtagelse af bøde/frakendelse af retten til at føre lille knallert.

<sup>42</sup> vooral strafbeschikking

hearing has resulted in the suspect either being convicted or acquitted. In order to make the German numbers comparable as possible with the Swedish, acquittals have been excluded.

*Source number of convictions:*

<https://www.destatis.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/Rechtspflege/StrafverfolgungVollzug/Strafverfolgung2100300127004.html> [2014-06-02]

*Source population:*

[https://www.destatis.de/DE/ZahlenFakten/GesellschaftStaat/Bevoelkerung/Bevoelkerungsstand/Tabellen/Zensus\\_Geschlecht\\_Staatsangehoerigkeit.html](https://www.destatis.de/DE/ZahlenFakten/GesellschaftStaat/Bevoelkerung/Bevoelkerungsstand/Tabellen/Zensus_Geschlecht_Staatsangehoerigkeit.html) [2014-06-02]

### *England and Wales*

For calculating convictions (number of detections) per 1000 of population in England and Wales two types of measures were used.

One measure consists of the convictions in total

- Charge/summons, cautions
- Penalty Notice for Disorder
- Taken into consideration
- Cannabis warning

The other measure is less extensive and consists of convictions by prosecution or court.

- Charge/summons
- Taken into consideration

*Source number of convictions:*

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/224037/hosb0213.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/224037/hosb0213.pdf) [2014-05-12]

*Source population:*

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/taxonomy/index.html?nscl=Population#tab-data-tables> [2014-07-02]