



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 14 September 2011

14042/11

**Interinstitutional File:
2011/0146 (COD)**

**GENVAL 89
JAI 615
DATAPROTECT 92
CODEC 1426
STATIS 64**

NOTE

from: Presidency
to Working Party on Statistics

No. prev. doc.: 11664/11 GENVAL 65 JAI 430 DATAPROTECT 64 CODEC 1045 STATIS 58
CM 3992/11

Subject: Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on
European statistics on safety from crime - Member State comments

Delegations find attached a summary of the results obtained on the basis of the questionnaire template (CM 3992/11) issued on 19 July 2011.

Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on European statistics on safety from crime

SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OBTAINED ON THE BASIS OF THE TEMPLATE ISSUED 19 JULY

LEGAL TEXT

<i>Article</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Problem</i>	<i>Details</i>	<i>Presidency comments</i>
<i>ART . 1 And recital (9)</i>	<i>Subject matter</i>	<i>objective of the Regulation</i>	<i>should be specified that the regulation will set out a framework <u>for a survey</u></i>	<i>reference to European statistics is needed as some information already exists at national level and a survey might be supplemented by information from other sources as some countries indicate such need</i>
<i>ART 2</i>	<i>Definitions</i>	<i>usual residence</i>	<i>(b) consistency with the definition used in statistics on demography</i>	<i>a definition that is proposed in a draft Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on European Statistics on Demography is still at the stage of discussion; proposed definition contains all crucial elements</i>
		<i>+ crimes</i>	<i>+ definitions of all crimes included in safety from crime statistics</i>	<i>a handbook specifying definitions is in preparation by the Eurostat Task Force</i>
		<i>wording</i>	<i>(c) "safety from crime" instead of "safety" (f) "metadata" instead of "metadata on quality"</i>	<i>change of phrases according to remark</i>

ART 3	Scope	sexual violence	par.2. formulated ambiguously	<i>the paragraph might be omitted as Annex I already makes it clear that it is voluntary for MS to include the module in their national questionnaires</i>
		violence between household members	par.3. request of Malta for exemption from collecting data on violence between household members	<i>to be discussed</i>
		physical violence	par. 3. possible request for derogation as regards physical violence; making this module optional because of its sensitivity	<i>this is a crucial part of a survey; making it optional would extensively reduce the value of the survey</i>
ART 4	Data characteristics and time reference	use of other administrative sources	par. 1 MS should be entitled to use all available national sources under the condition they have the same statistical quality as a household sample survey	<i>where appropriate data on safety from crime collected in household surveys might be supplemented with information from administrative sources</i>
		observation period	par.3. in Annex I there are two observation periods: mandatory - last 12 months and optional - 5 years	<i>only period of 12 months is mandatory for the survey; the optional period of 5 years is used in checking for the 'telescoping' effect - some MS prefer 2 or 3 years</i>
		type of interview mode	+ adding paragraph that regulates type of interview mode, in order to secure comparability between the MS	<i>MS propose also to use additional sources of data to reduce costs of the survey</i>

<i>Art 5</i>	<i>Sampling and sample size</i>	<i>design effect</i>	<i>par.2. determining a method for calculating the design effect</i>	<i>to be explained</i>
		<i>precision requirements</i>	<i>defining precision requirements regarding population estimates</i>	
<i>ART 6</i>	<i>Collection unit</i>	<i>number of people to be interviewed in a household</i>	<i>+ add provision that only one person per household shall be interviewed; define the number of interviews in the household</i>	<i>to be discussed</i>
		<i>age of surveying persons</i>	<i>par. 3. Why 16 and over?</i>	<i>it is compromise based on treshold existing in other households surveys</i>

ART 7	Transmission and handling of data	reformulating the article	<p><i>par. 1 proposal to change because not convincing about transmission of micro-data to Eurostat:</i></p> <p><i>‘When necessary for the production of European statistics, Member States shall transmit confidential micro-data to the Commission (Eurostat) in accordance with the provisions on the transmission of data subject to confidentiality set out in Regulation (EC) No 223/2009. Member States shall ensure that the transmitted data do not permit the direct identification of households or persons and that personal data are protected in compliance with principles laid down in Directive 95/46/EC’.</i></p>	<i>to be considered</i>
		deadline for transmission of micro- data	<p><i>par. 2 requesting for postponing the deadline to : 31 October 2014 /30 September 2014 / 31 August 2014</i></p>	<i>to be discussed ; needs corresponding change in Art. 9</i>
ART 8	Provision of data and metadata	change of words	<p><i>metadata on quality -> metadata exchanging micro-data - > transmission of micro-data (also recital (10))</i></p>	<i>change of phrases according to remark</i>

ART 9	Data dissemination and access to confidential data for scientific purposes	deadline for dissemination of statistics	par. 1. rescheduling the deadline of dissemination - 31 December 2014 – according to change agreed on Art. 7(2)	to be discussed; depending on agreement on Art.7
ART 10	Quality assessment	deadline of quality report (MS)	par. 3 extending the deadline from 1 to 2 months after the data transmission	to be discussed
		evaluation/quality report (Eurostat)	+ introducing a provision on drawing up by the Commission an evaluation/ quality report and the deadline for submitting it	to be considered
ART 11 And recital (4)	Financing	financial contribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • exactly 90% financial support is needed • not clear the financial support for countries having to adjust existing survey to the SASU 	some MS do not require any financial support, so giving exactly 90% as a condition will not be true with reference to them. On the other hand the total budget is limited to 12 mln euro and it will be not possible to exceed this amount. To be discussed (in the contest of Art. 11 point 3.)
ART 13	Entry into force and applicability	date of end	this Regulation shall cease to apply on 30 June 2015 – necessary?	to be explained
Recital (3)		supplementing the text	the full reference included in the Stockholm programme	supplementing the reference to Stockholm programme

ANNEX I				
POI NT	Name	Problem	Details	Presidency comments
1	<i>Experience of crime by types of crime</i>	<i>title</i>	<i>'crime victimisation' rather than 'experience'.</i>	<i>to be considered</i>
		<i>second homes</i>	<i>second homes should be considered</i>	<i>the issue was dropped as increasing unnecessarily the length of the questionnaire</i>
		<i>specifying the variables/indicators</i>	<i>the list of variables leave room for different interpretations – specification is needed;</i>	<i>specification will be made available in the manual being prepared by the Task Force</i>
		<i>robbery</i>	<i>too small numbers of victims to justify reporting</i>	<i>the figures may provide valuable information when aggregated to EU level</i>
1.4	<i>Non-conventional crimes:</i>	<i>(2)card/on-line banking abuse</i>	<i>bank fraud rather than bank abuse</i>	<i>accepting a change depending on MS opinions</i>
		<i>(3) bribery</i>	<i>doubtful to obtain reliable results, need further development, it is not right instrument to measure it</i>	<i>to be discussed</i>

2	Crime details	level of details	<i>too extensive level of details, it will result in the low reliability of data</i>	<i>it reflects political interest; even if some figures will not be reliable at national level they may provide reliable information when aggregated to EU level</i>
2.2		(3) <i>contact with victim support</i> (4), (8) <i>specifying the variables</i>	<i>delete variable – too small samples for obtaining reliable results</i> (4) <i>unclear question “what was the emotional impact”</i> (8) <i>“who was involved in a bribery”(giving or receiving?)</i>	<i>as above</i> <i>reference to manual being prepared by the Task Force would be made</i>

3	Respondent attitudes to law enforcement and security precautions	specifying the variables	unclear “whether the respondent was exposed to drugs problems”	as above
		problematic questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the list of security measures (burglar alarm, a special door or locks) is not complete, the question can cause suspicion of the respondent gun ownership-question can be treated as offended – delete opinion on court performance – premature considering that survey concerning the last 12 months; items on police and court performance should be deleted to shorten the questionnaire (there are other sources of such data) <p>this section does not form a core part of a survey on experience of crime- should be omitted</p>	<p>information on guns and safety precautions is important for comparing crime levels between countries;</p> <p>opinions on police/court performance is a standard feature and provides an indicator for policy measures</p>
4	Respondent’s feelings of safety and worries about crime	subjective perception measures	respondents feelings are not a core part of a survey – should be omitted	to be discussed
		wording	“worry to suffer a burglary” rather than “likelihood of burglary”	change of phrases according to remark

5	Socio-demographic background of respondent	scope	<i>too exhaustive, can be obtained from administrative sources</i>	<i>to be discussed; possibility to use administrative sources will be introduced, see comment to Art. 4</i>
		“country of birth of mother/father”	<i>worry about the ban in the national legal provisions concerning collecting data on ethnical origin</i>	<i>the question is related to migration and is considered to be an element of the standard socio-demographic variables for all household surveys</i>
		“past relationships”	<i>personal question and subjective, difficult to collect – should be excluded</i>	<i>it is a filter to the partner violence module; could be added as a category (no partner or previous partner) in the violence module</i>
6	Technical variables	wording	“respondent code” rather than “identification of respondent”	<i>change of phrases according to remark</i>

7	Violence crimes	non-sexual physical violence	<i>the whole module should be optional because the questions are very sensitive</i>	<i>it is one of the most important subjects of the survey; making this module optional would largely reduce the value of the survey</i>
		order of questions on non-partner sexual violence	<i>changing the sequence of the questions: question on attempted sexual violence before more serious crime – sexual violence</i>	<i>to be discussed</i>
		wording	<i>(1), (2) - omit “ever” in the first questions, use “threw sth that could hurt” instead of “thrown sth”, use “pushed or shoved “ instead of “pushed”</i>	<i>change of phrases according to remark</i>
ANNEX II				
EXCLUSION FROM THE SURVEY	small territories	including islands of Gozo and Comino in Annex 2	including Gibraltartar in the Annex	<i>seems acceptable</i>