

**Memorandum 2006-1**

# **Expenditure on Crime in the Netherlands**



**Memorandum 2006-1**

# **Expenditure on Crime in the Netherlands**

**Debora Moolenaar**

This is an English reprint of chapter 7 from Eggen, A.Th.J., W. van der Heide (2005) (eds), *Criminaliteit en Rechtshandhaving 2004: ontwikkelingen en samenhangen*, Den Haag, WODC/CBS, Onderzoek en Beleid 237.

**February 2006**



Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek-  
en Documentatiecentrum  
(Research and Documentation Centre  
of the Dutch Ministry of Justice)

Copies of this publication can be ordered from:

Bibliotheek WODC  
kamer KO 14  
Postbus 20301  
2400 EH Den Haag  
The Netherlands

Fax: +31 70 370 45 07  
E-mail: [a.eind@minjus.nl](mailto:a.eind@minjus.nl)

Memorandums are free of charge and available  
while stocks last.

Further information on WODC-publications can  
be found on [www.wodc.nl](http://www.wodc.nl)

# Content

<b>Summary</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1 Key questions	9
1.2 Methodological problems	9
1.3 Limitations	10
1.4 Outline	10
<b>2 Government expenditure in response to crime</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Victim care	13
2.2 Investigation and prevention	15
2.3 Prosecution	18
2.4 Criminal procedure	19
2.6 Suspect Support	23
2.7 Summary	24
<b>3 Expenditure for the prevention of crime</b>	<b>27</b>
3.1 Prevention measures taken by private individuals	27
3.2 Prevention measures taken by companies and institutions	27
3.3 Other prevention measures	28
3.4 Summary	28
<b>4 Expenditure as a result of crime</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1 Damaged sustained by companies and institutions	29
4.2 Damage sustained by households	29
4.3 Damage sustained by the government	31
4.4 Other damage	32
4.5 Summary	33
<b>5 Overview and international comparison</b>	<b>35</b>
5.1 Overview	35
5.2 International comparison	36
5.3 Conclusion	38
<b>References</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>41</b>



# Summary

In order to increase safety and maintain the rule of law the government needs to respond to crime. This carries a cost. The government's response to crime is accompanied by a corresponding response from the corporate sector and private individuals. Citizens and businesses that (expect to) sustain damage, are taking initiatives to limit this damage. This too carries a cost.

In this report, we will attempt to gain more of an insight into the costs incurred. There are three key questions:

- How much does the government spend on combating crime and on enforcing criminal law, and how has this developed in the period 1995-2004?
- How much are citizens and the corporate sector spending on prevention in 2004?
- How high is the financial damage caused by crime in 2004?

Government expenditure for combating crime and law enforcement has increased from 2.5 billion euro in 1995 to 4.2 billion euro in 2004. This is an increase of 70%. Per capita this amounts to € 260, which is approximately € 100 euro more than in 1995. Most money is spent on investigation and prevention, the least on victim care. Execution also claims a large part of the budget. In 2004, expenditure per recorded crime amounts to almost 3,200 euro as opposed to more than 2,000 euro in 1995. This is an increase of 57%.

The Ministry of the Interior is responsible for approximately 30% of all expenditure. The Ministry of Justice is accountable for approximately 60% of expenditure on combating crime and law enforcement. The greatest part of this total goes to the Correctional Institutions Service. Other major sources of expenditure for the Ministry of Justice are the Public Prosecution Service, the Council for the Judiciary, subsidized legal aid and the Probation and After-Care Service. The remaining 10% of expenditure is attributed to other ministries, municipalities and provinces.

Prevention measures taken by households, companies and institutions are found to be 3.3 billion euro on an annual basis. This is over 200 euro per capita. This figure does not include government expenditure on prevention. In total the damage sustained as a result of crime amounts to 12.6 billion euro on an annual basis. This is approximately 775 euro per capita.

The total cost of crime in the Netherlands is 20 billion euro on an annual basis. This is more than € 1,200 per capita. In this respect the Dutch expenditure on the combating of crime and law enforcement does not differ very much from other countries.





# 1 Introduction

It is estimated that in the Netherlands in 2004 about 5 million crimes were committed against private individuals and about 4 million crimes were committed against the corporate sector. In the same year the police recorded 1.3 million crimes and solved about 360.000 crimes. About 270.000 cases were reviewed by the Public Prosecutor of which 133.000 came to court. This resulted in 36.000 prison sentences, 51.000 community services and 103.000 fines or financial settlements.

This response is needed in order to increase safety and maintain the rule of law. However, it does carry a cost. The government's response to crime is accompanied by a corresponding response from the corporate sector and private individuals. Citizens and businesses that (expect to) sustain damage, are taking initiatives to limit this damage. This too carries a cost.

## 1.1 Key questions

In this report, we will attempt to gain more of an insight into the costs incurred. There are three key questions:

- How much does the government spend on combating crime and on enforcing criminal law, and how has this developed in the period 1995-2004?
- How much are citizens and the corporate sector spending on prevention in 2004?
- How high is the financial damage caused by crime in 2004?

## 1.2 Methodological problems

When answering the above questions, a number of methodological problems arise. For example:

- How can broad items of expenditure be specifically attributed to the combating of crime and criminal law enforcement?
- How can immaterial damage be expressed in financial terms?
- Which approach should be taken to the limited availability of figures?
- How can data for different years be compared?

Many organisations in the field of justice do not focus exclusively on combating crime, but also have other tasks, such as safeguarding safety and security, maintaining public order, dealing with offences, civil justice, administrative justice, etc. This distinction is not always made in the budgets allocated to these organisations. For this reason, these components must somehow be filtered out. Where this applies, efforts have been made to calculate allocation to criminal cases on the basis of other data (workload measurements, cost prices, etc.).

Much of the damage sustained as a result of crime is difficult to express in financial terms. This applies, for example, to emotional damage, but also to sickness absence. Nevertheless, an effort has been made to arrive at an estimate by combining data from different sources.

Data on government expenditure are available for a large number of years. However, the same does not apply for expenditure on prevention measures and damage. For many components, an indicative amount is available, but only on an incidental basis. Due to the lack of data, the most recent data available is used for each component in order to achieve an up-to-date overview of the costs applicable.

Most expenditure has not remained constant over the years. In order to find out whether this is the result of a change in volume or solely due to price adjustments, corrections must be made for inflation. The most customary deflator is the consumer price index. However, this does have some disadvantages (see Eurostat, 2001) and, what is more, the prices for government services generally develop follow a different path than the general consumer price index. Therefore, in this section, government expenditure will be corrected using the deflator for collective government expenditure from the national accounts. In the absence of a more specific price index figure, non-government expenditure will be corrected on the basis of the general consumer price index. All tables, figures and amounts in the text are expressed in price level 2004. Therefore, where expenditure has increased or decreased, this will be the consequence of changes in volume, not price adjustments. The tables in the appendix also include the uncorrected amounts.

### **1.3 Limitations**

This report will not discuss the benefits gained from criminal-law enforcement. Besides the problems mentioned above there are also problems in terms of the measurability of the effects on law enforcement and their translation into euros. This report also excludes the costs in the area of general security, the costs of minor offences that are usually dealt with in subdistrict courts and the costs of traffic offences that are dealt with administratively.

This report only focuses on expenditures on combating crime and law enforcement. It does not go into detail on the subject of the Dutch criminal justice system. Those who are interested may consult the report by Tak (2003, in English).<sup>1</sup> Extensive figures on combating crime and law enforcement can be found in Eggen & Van der Heide (2005, in Dutch).<sup>2</sup> Limited figures in English can be found on the website of Statistics Netherlands.<sup>3</sup>

### **1.4 Outline**

The current report on expenditure is an adaptation of chapter 7 of Eggen & Van der Heide (2005). In section 2 expenditure incurred when combating crime and enforcing criminal law will be broken down, wherever possible, into the various components of the criminal-law chain, such as victims, prevention, investigation, prosecution, trial, execution and support for suspects. In section 3, the costs

---

<sup>1</sup> The report can be downloaded from the English version of the WODC website: [www.ministerievanjustitie.nl:8080/b\\_organ/wodc/publications/wodc\\_205\\_website.pdf](http://www.ministerievanjustitie.nl:8080/b_organ/wodc/publications/wodc_205_website.pdf) (mind the interspacing).

<sup>2</sup> The report can be downloaded from the Dutch version of the WODC website: [http://www.wodc.nl/images/ob237\\_volledige\\_tekst\\_tcm11-100490.pdf](http://www.wodc.nl/images/ob237_volledige_tekst_tcm11-100490.pdf) (mind the interspacing).

<sup>3</sup> See [statline.cbs.nl](http://statline.cbs.nl), choose the British flag and then “select”, “population and society”, “justice and security”. The Dutch version of this website contains more extensive figures.

incurred for prevention measures will be broken down into citizens and the corporate sector. Section 4 will focus on the financial damage sustained as a result of crime by households, the corporate sector and government. Subsection 5 gives a brief overview and makes a comparison with other countries.



## 2 Government expenditure in response to crime

Expenditure on the combating of crime and the enforcement of criminal law in response to crime is incurred by various government agencies involved in some form or another in victim care, prevention, investigation, prosecution, criminal proceedings, execution and suspect support. In the Netherlands, this is responsibility of the Ministry of Justice, The Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries and the Ministry of Defence, and associated organisations. Municipalities and provinces also play a role in the combating of crime.

Wherever possible, government expenditure is derived from the (explanatory notes to the) Final Act amending the Budget, the Government's Autumn Financial Report, the Government's Spring Financial Report or the budget of the ministries involved, possibly supplemented with data from annual reports from related bodies. Despite the inflation correction applied, major jumps are sometimes evident. This is often due to amended definitions or changes in the budget system. In 2002, for example, major changes were made to the structure of the government budget. Although the amounts for 2001 and 2000 were adjusted with retrospective effect, a comparison with earlier years is not always possible.<sup>4</sup>

### 2.1 Victim care

The Netherlands has various organisations specialising in the provision of victim care, such as the Dutch Victim Support organisation and the Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund. In addition, the Central Fine Collection Agency is responsible for the collection of the compensation awarded to victims of crime.

The Victim Support organisation was formed in 2002, through a merger of a number of regional victim foundations. The object is to help victims to cope with offences from a legal, practical and emotional point of view. This might include the completion of claim forms, volunteers who accompany victims to court, mediation and help them cope with a crime from an emotional point of view. The Dutch Victim Support organisation is largely financed by the Ministry of Justice. The expenditure incurred for victim support by the Ministry of Justice increased by 57% in the period 1995-2004, although a large number of fluctuations are evident. In addition, an important part of the income obtained by the Dutch Victim Support organisation originates from the Dutch Victim Support Fund. This fund attracts money from the corporate sector and households for the Dutch Victim Support organisation. This expenditure is not stated here, since this takes the form of Voluntary contributions; however, it is discussed in section 3.3. Note that some of this money also goes to people who

---

<sup>4</sup> Nor is it easy to compare the figures in this section with a previous version of this paper (see Schreuders et al., 1999). This is due to the improved availability of sources, a breakdown into more categories, different categorisation, etc.

are not victims of a crime, but of an accident (without a guilty party) or a disaster. As such, the amount indicated in Table 2.1 is an overestimate.

The object of the Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund is to alleviate the suffering of victims of violent crime committed in the Netherlands by means of a cash payment. Victims must have sustained serious physical or mental injury and not be responsible for the incident in question. This payment constitutes a contribution towards personal injury that cannot be compensated in any other manner. The budget for compensation payments is in principle unlimited. In the period 1995-2004, the total amount paid increased by 78% to 10.1 million euro. This increase was due to the increased number of applications, amongst other things. As a result of increased workload, administrative expenditure has also more than doubled. However, it must be noted that administrative expenditure has decreased over the last 2 years.

With the introduction of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act and Guideline (1995), the position of the victim has improved considerably. These regulations are intended to improve the treatment of and information provision to victims throughout the judicial chain, to ensure that the damage sustained is recovered from the perpetrator, and provides for possible conflict mediation between the perpetrator and the victim. The Police and the Public Prosecution Service are primarily responsible for the enforcement of these regulations. If the court has awarded compensation to a victim (civil claim!), the Central Fine Collection Agency will collect this compensation from the perpetrator and transfer it to the victim. The Central Fine Collection Agency has various means of coercion at its disposal, such as a bailiff's procedure and, as a last resort, demand for default detention. Expenditure for the collection of these compensation measures has increased dramatically in the last ten years. This has not been due to an increase in cost price, but to the great increase in the number of compensation measures since the introduction of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. In fact, the number of compensation measures increased seven-fold in the period 1996 to 2004. Incidentally, the figures in Table 7.1 are limited to the collection expenditure and do not include actual compensation, since this originates from the perpetrator and, as such, does not fall under government expenditure.

In 2004, a total of 32 million euro was spent on victim care (see table 2.1). This is an increase of approximately 122% in comparison with 1995. Per capita we are spending two euros on victim care in 2004. This is an increase of approximately 111% in comparison with 1995. Expenditure per victim has increased by a similar factor. Thus, from a financial point of view, increasingly more attention is being given to victims.

**Table 2.1 Expenditure on victim care, 1995-2004**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Victim Support</i>										
contribution Ministry of Justice	7.1	5.6	6.2	7.2	7.1	8.3	9.1	9.9	8.5	11.1
contribution other government bodies*		0.9	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.6	3.1	3.4	4.2	4.1
<i>Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund</i>										
staff & material goods**	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	2.1	2.5	3.0	5.4	4.6	3.8
payments	5.7	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.1	5.3	6.4	7.0	9.3	10.1
<i>Ministry of Justice</i>										
collection of civil claims in criminal cases**	n/a	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.9	1.1	0.9	1.0	3.0
<b>Total victim care</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>14.7</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>22.8</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>32.1</b>

*euro, price level 2004*

*Expenditure on victim care per...*

Capita	0.94	0.84	0.87	0.94	0.97	1.11	1.42	1.65	1.70	1.97
Victim	4.43	4.45	4.19	4.38	4.55	5.30	7.00	7.45	8.16	9.52

\* Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sports, Ministry of Transport, Public works and Water Management, municipalities, provinces.

\*\* This concerns expenditure for the processing of applications, not the payment itself.

\*\*\* This concerns collection expenditure, not the compensation itself. In 2004, the Central Fine Collection Agency switched to a new method for costing. The difference lies chiefly in the costs added on. These costs are now spread out more equally over all of the products than previously. As a result, the 2004 figures are not comparable with figures for previous years.

See table A.3 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: budget/Final Act amending the Budget, Ministry of Justice, annual reports for the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund, annual reports for the Victim Support organisation, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

## 2.2 Investigation and prevention

A wide variety of government bodies specialise in activities in the field of investigation and prevention. However, both activities are often part of a more comprehensive budget item and, in terms of time or expenditure, are difficult to distinguish from the other activities for the budget item in question.

Since the Budget for 2002, prevention has been a separate policy article in the budget for the Ministry of Justice. Before this, prevention expenditure was spread over a number of policy articles. In the budgets for other ministries, prevention has not been indicated as a separate budget item. Nor is it known how much time or money the Police are spending on prevention. As a result, the first line of table 2.2 presents a somewhat distorted picture. This only states the amounts that could explicitly be attributed to prevention activities. In 2004, the Ministry of Justice spent 23 million euro on prevention activities. This is almost six times as much as in 1995. In part, this increase is an artefact. With the introduction of the new budget system, a number of general items have been categorised under the prevention item. However, the largest part of this increase, estimated at 13 million euro, represents an actual increase. Particularly in the framework of urban policy, the increased focus on youth crime (Ministry of Justice, 2003), the policy document on crime control (MvJ/BZK, 2001) and the Safety Programme

(Parliamentary documents II, 2002/2003), more money has been made available for prevention projects.

An important player in the field of investigation is the Police. Investigation may occur within the context of an investigative procedure. But also when the police detect an offence during their patrol activities, this is regarded as investigation. For this reason, it is difficult to distinguish between safety, prevention and investigation activities. Literature on this subject also offers little support. On the basis of time logs from 1987, Goudriaan et al. (1989) estimate that the Police spend approximately one-third of their time on the registration and investigation of crime. On the basis of various sources, Maas (2002) concludes that the Police spend approximately 5% to 7.5% of their time on investigation activities. Data on Police staff (Ministry of the Interior, 2004) show that approximately 16% of Police staff are criminal investigators. However, it should be noted that investigation activities may also be performed by staff outside criminal investigation departments.

Thus, there is little common ground between the various sources. This may be a result of differences in definition. The above publications do not always make it possible to determine whether the management of an investigation team, for example, also falls under investigation activities, whether and how overhead costs are attributed to investigation activities, and whether the National Police Service and supra-regional investigation teams are also included, etc. Based on the fact that 16% of Police staff are criminal investigators and that ordinary police officers also perform investigation activities, the estimate arrived at by Goudriaan et al. would appear to be the most accurate, despite being based on fairly old information. For this reason, one third of the Police budget will be attributed to investigation activities. These costs are shown in table 2.2.

The same problem applies for expenditure incurred by the Ministry of Defence. It proved impossible to filter out non-crime components from the police and security activities performed by the Royal Military Police and the Coastguard. This means that, in table 2.2, the amounts in question overestimate actual expenditure to some extent. Specific expenditure incurred by the Ministry of Justice or other ministries in relation to anti-terrorism activities are not included here, given the high-security nature of this expenditure.

If we consider the overall field of investigation, the largest item of expenditure is formed by expenditure for the Police, including the National Police Service (funded by the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Justice). It is estimated that this expenditure amounts to more than 1.3 billion euro in 2004 and increased in the period from 1995 to 2004 by approximately 21%. The special investigation services take second place. In the period from 1995 to 2004, joint expenditure more than doubled to 172 million euro. The Tax Inquiries and Investigation Service is responsible for the biggest chunk of this amount. Expenditure for Police and security tasks performed by the Royal Military Police has increased by 67%, while expenditure for the Coastguard has increased by 145%. The Coastguard in particular plays an important role in the investigation of financial offences in the shipping and fishing sectors.

In addition to the organisations focusing directly on investigation (such as the Police, the special investigation services and the Royal Military Police), there are also a number of organisations that are indirectly involved in investigation. The Netherlands Forensic Institute makes an important contribution to investigation activities. In 2004, the Netherlands Forensic Institute's expenditure was almost 43



million euro. This is a two-fold increase in comparison with 1995. If a suspect is taken into Remand custody, a probation officer will visit the suspect to inform him of the assistance that the Probation and After-Care Service can offer (pre-trial assistance). It is estimated that this involved an amount of 3 million euro in 2004. This amount has remained reasonably constant over the last ten years. If a suspect is taken into remand custody, he will also be entitled to a solicitor. For this form of initial assistance by a solicitor, the suspect can appeal to the defence rota scheme, regardless of his income. This is funded from the resources for subsidized legal aid. In 2004 this involved an amount of 22 million euro, which is more than double the amount for 1995.

**Table 2.2 Expenditure on investigation and prevention, 1995-2004**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Prevention</i>										
crime prevention	4	6	6	5	4	31	33	21	22	23
<i>Police</i>										
contribution Ministry of the Interior*	851	891	922	975	1,039	1,163	1,243	1,260	1,320	1,353
contribution Ministry of Justice	269	271	291	241	230	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
special police tasks, policy making**	78	76	81	87	95	93	105	112	59	26
<i>Special investigation services</i>										
Tax Inquiries and Investigation Service	72	76	81	87	94	103	103	105	122	124
Social Inquiries and Investigation Service	7	4	5	5	4	8	11	10	20	20
General Inspectorate	n/a	n/a	1	3	4	7	6	5	5	8
Housing and Environment Inquiries and Investigation Service	4	4	4	4	4	5	6	7	6	5
other special investigation officers and projects***	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	16	20	98	79	16
<i>Other investigation</i>										
Police and security tasks Royal Military Police	64	72	79	80	84	87	94	104	109	106
Coastguard	3	4	4	5	6	6	6	5	6	8
Netherlands Forensic Institute****	21	25	25	19	22	24	27	31	36	43
<i>Remand custody</i>										
pre-trial assistance (Probation and After-Care Service)	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
subsidized legal aid	10	12	11	12	12	14	17	16	20	22
<hr/>										
Total investigation and prevention	1,385	1,442	1,515	1,526	1,601	1,561	1,675	1,777	1,807	1,756

*euro, price level 2004*

<i>Expenditure on investigation and prevention per...</i>										
capita	90	93	97	97	101	98	104	110	111	108
recorded crime	1,129	1,213	1,236	1,247	1,247	1,195	1,234	1,249	1,306	1,326

\* As of 2000, incl. National Police Service

\*\* Including the Unusual Transactions Unit (up to and including 1999), airport security (later the aviation department of the National Police Service).

\*\*\* Including Unusual Transactions Unit, Central Information System for Telecommunication Investigation and National Police Service; in 2002 and 2003, incl. project on combating drug smuggling at Amsterdam Airport.

\*\*\*\* Up to and including 1997, incl. the central criminal intelligence division.

See table A.4 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: Final Act amending the Budget/budget of the Ministries of the Interior, Justice, Social Affairs and Employment, Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, Finance and Defence, annual reports tax authorities, VROM inspectorate, Social Information and Investigation Service and General Inspection Service, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

Overall, expenditure for investigation and prevention has increased by 27% since 1995, to an amount of almost 1.8 billion euro in 2004. Per capita, this works out at more than €100 per person. This is an increase of 20% in comparison with 1995. The expenditure per recorded crime is more than 1,300 euro.

### **2.3 Prosecution**

The prosecution of suspects is the exclusive task of the Public Prosecution Service. In the current budget, the Public Prosecution Service is included as one policy article without distinguishing between minor offences, criminal offences, legal costs, (sub)district courts, courts of appeal and national services. For this reason, expenditure on the Public Prosecution Service is broken down into the categories indicated above, on the basis of the workload measurements for the period 1994-1998 and the budgets up to and including 2001. Subdistrict court cases are not taken into consideration, as these deal with minor offences.

The total expenditure for the Public Prosecution Service for district court cases, excluding legal costs, doubled to almost 290 million euro in the period 1995-2004. This increase in expenditure is partly the result of the Safety Programme (parliamentary documents II, 2002/2003). It has been agreed to gradually allow the influx of district court cases at the Public Prosecution Service to increase by 40,000 extra cases in the period 2003-2006. What is more, the Safety Programme includes numerous other measures in which the active involvement of the Public Prosecution Service is expected. The Public Prosecution Services's expenditure on district courts cases and court of appeal cases has doubled in the period 1995-2004. Expenditure for the national services has increased by more than 80%.

Legal costs have also increased sharply (by approximately 110%). Legal costs constitute of expenditure in relation to correspondence and communication with the suspect and the criminal proceedings. The increase is the result of the expansion of the telecommunications market, the increase in the number of very large cases, the increasing need for interpreters and translators, and technological developments in telecommunication. Since the attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001, costs for tapping, name and address checks, etc. have risen considerably. Suspects often have a number of mobile phones, as a result of which criminal investigations are accompanied by high costs. For this reason, the total budget for legal costs (including civil cases, administrative cases and subdistrict court cases) was increased structurally by 18.4 million euro in 2002.

Indirectly, other organisations are also involved in the prosecution of suspects. For example, the Probation and After-Care Service and the Child Protection Board advise on the judicial process to be followed for adults and minors respectively, central to which is reintegration into society. Expenditure for basic and follow-up investigations by the Child Protection Board amounts to 40 million euro in 2004. This is an increase of 130% in comparison with 1995. It is estimated that expenditure by the Probation and After-Care Service for various reports amounts to 36 million euro in 2004. This is almost 3 times as much as in 1995.

**Table 2.3 Expenditure on prosecution, 1995-2004**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>Mln euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Public Prosecution Service, staff and material goods</i>										
national services	10	10	11	12	10	13	15	15	16	17
court of appeal cases*	25	30	34	32	35	39	44	44	46	52
district court cases**	107	109	122	135	146	164	185	185	195	217
<i>Public Prosecution Service, legal costs</i>										
court of appeal cases	4	5	5	4	5	5	7	8	9	9
district court cases	19	17	17	18	19	22	29	36	37	40
<i>Child Protection Board</i>										
basic and follow-up investigation	17	20	22	26	32	34	38	42	40	40
<i>Probation and After-Care Service</i>										
reports	13	15	14	15	23	29	28	36	37	36
<b>Total prosecution</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>411</b>
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Expenditure on prosecution per...</i>										
capita	13	13	14	15	17	19	22	23	23	25
district court case	758	821	899	997	1,149	1,310	1,464	1,455	1,406	1,501

\* Incl. minor offences heard in appeal.

\*\* As of 1998, including central criminal intelligence division.

See Table A.5 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: Final Act amending the Budget/budget Ministry of Justice, annual reports Public Prosecution Service, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

Table 2.3 shows that the total expenditure on the prosecution of crimes is more than 400 million euro in 2004. This is more than twice as high as in 1995. Expenditure per capita on the prosecution of crimes also doubled in this period. In 2004, expenditure per capita was €25. Expenditure per district court case increased from 760 euro per case in 1995 to 1,500 euro per case in 2004.

## 2.4 Criminal procedure

Expenditure on criminal procedures can be broken down into three categories, i.e. criminal proceedings before the Supreme Court of the Netherlands, criminal proceedings before the courts of appeal and criminal proceedings before district courts. The last two categories fall under the responsibility of the Council for the Judiciary. Other expenditures, such as expenditure on Probation activities or legal aid during court proceedings are not included here, since these cannot always be attributed to specific court proceedings. These items will be raised in section 2.6. Again the costs of proceedings before the subdistrict court are not considered here.

Like the budget for the Public Prosecution Service, the budgets for the Supreme Court and the Council for the Judiciary cannot be broken down according to the various components. No distinction is made between offence or crime, or between civil cases, administrative cases or criminal cases. Legal costs are not always indicated separately. Nor is a distinction made, in the budget for the

Council for the Judiciary, between (sub)district courts, courts of appeal and national services. If this distinction is to be made, other sources must be used.

For the district courts and courts of appeal, workload measurements were used for the period 1994-1998 and cost prices indicated in the budget for 2005 for the period 2001-2004. The years lying between these periods have been interpolated. It was proved to be impossible to apply the workload measurements for later years, or the cost prices for earlier periods, since a different counting method was introduced in 2001. Up to and including 2000, the number of cases was counted, while, as of 2001, the number of judgments is counted. Since one case may result in a number of judgments (a conviction and a confiscation measure, for example), it is difficult to compare the period before 2001 with the period after this date. As a result of the new system introduced, the data in Table 2.4 show a slightly distorted picture of actual developments.

Regarding the Supreme Court, little is known about the workload applicable for the various types of cases. For this reason, the cost price applicable for the courts of appeal, as indicated in the 2005 budget for the Council for the Judiciary, have been used as an indication of the workload applicable for the various cases brought before the Supreme Court.

Expenditure on criminal procedures increased by more than 200% in the period 1995-2004 (see Table 2.4). In terms of a percentage, the smallest increase was experienced by the Supreme Court. In 2004, the Supreme Court spent an estimated 11 million euro on criminal procedures. This constitutes a two-fold increase in comparison with 1995, while both the number of criminal procedures and the workload percentage fell slightly. Expenditure on criminal procedures before the courts of appeal were three times as high in 2004 as they were in 1995, i.e. 41 million euro. The district courts also experienced a three-fold increase of expenditure on criminal procedures in the period 1995-2004. For the district courts, the observed were used may be distorted by the introduction of a new counting method. However, in the period 1994-1998 and 2004, the increase in workload for criminal procedures constituted an actual increase. The adoption of a new counting method would not seem to have had any effect on the budget of the courts of appeal.

Expenditure for the national services almost quadrupled in the period 1995-2004. In addition, there is a separate budget for projects, special programmes and the office of the Council for the Judiciary. On the basis of the ratio between civil cases, administrative cases, criminal cases and minor offences, these items have been partially attributed to criminal cases. This attribution is included in table 2.4.

In 2004, total expenditure on criminal procedure was 213 million euro. This translates into €13 per capita. This is three times as much as in 1995. Per district court case concluded by a judge, expenditure is almost 1,600 euro. This is an increase of 46% in comparison with 1995, when expenditure per district court case was just 650 euro.

**Table 7.4 Expenditure on criminal procedure, 1995-2004**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Courts: staff and material goods*</i>										
supreme court, criminal cases**	6	6	6	7	8	8	7	11	11	11
court of appeal, criminal cases**	14	14	16	17	19	23	27	29	33	41
district court, criminal cases	42	43	53	60	75	95	119	118	114	128
national services	4	4	5	6	5	8	9	13	13	15
projects, programme budgets, council office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	8	11	15
<i>Courts: legal costs</i>										
supreme court, criminal cases	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
court of appeal, criminal cases	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.6
district court, criminal cases	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.4	1.0	1.2	1.6	1.8
<b>Total criminal procedure</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>213</b>
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Expenditure on criminal proceedings per...</i>										
capita	4	4	5	6	7	8	10	11	11	13
district court case concluded by a judge	648	649	759	860	973	1,217	1,469	1,538	1,366	1,596
<i>Workload criminal proceedings as a percentage of total workload***</i>										
supreme court**	59%	57%	52%	56%	59%	64%	56%	59%	55%	56%
court of appeal**	39%	38%	40%	40%	38%	37%	36%	36%	40%	45%
district court	13%	13%	14%	15%	18%	21%	23%	23%	23%	24%

\* Including housing costs and corrected for transfers to the Public Prosecution Service.

\*\* Incl. minor offences heard in appeal, excluding the administrative enforcement of traffic regulations.

\*\*\* This concerns the weighted workload.

See table A.6 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: budget/Final Act amending the Budget, Ministry of Justice, annual reports Supreme Court, annual reports Council for the Judiciary, workload measurements 1994-1998, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

## 2.5 Execution

Responsibility for the execution of the various measures and sentences lies with a large number of implementing organisations, as is evident from table 2.5. The Correctional Institutions Service is responsible for the execution of custodial sentences. With a figure of 970 million euro in 2004, the prison system (excluding the detention of aliens and deportation centres) is the biggest item of expenditure. This expenditure increased by 95% in the period 1995-2004. The psychiatric prison hospitals hold second place. In the period 1995-2004, expenditure on psychiatric prison hospitals more than doubled to 200 million euro in 2004. Youth prisons hold third place with more than 130 million euro in 2004. However, this sector did experience the greatest growth in the period 1995-2004; expenditure on youth prisons in 2004 is two-and-a-half times as high as in 1995. In addition, almost 70 million euro was spent on detention centres in 2004 (mainly intended for the detention of drugs smugglers) and 10 million euro

police cells (intended for remand custody). Expenditure on extramural provisions (electronic monitoring/detention, penitentiary programmes) has also increased dramatically.

The Central Fine Collection Agency is responsible for the execution of fines, financial settlements and confiscation measures, and for the administration of community service orders and custodial sentences not yet served. Due to the large extent to which the above activities have been automated, expenditure is relatively low. The growth in expenditure is the consequence of an increased workload on the one hand and of the increasingly challenging collection procedure on the other hand, whereby it has proved necessary to call upon the services of a bailiff more frequently than previously. Incidentally, the expenditure of 8 million euro in 2004 is counterbalanced by income estimated at 34 million euro from fines, financial settlements and confiscation measures in criminal cases.

In addition to the Correctional Institutions Service and Central Fine Collection Agency, a number of other institutions are also active in the field of execution. For example, Halt Nederland is responsible for the execution of community service orders for first-time juvenile offenders. These juveniles are referred to Halt Nederland by the police and do not come in contact with the Public Prosecutor. In 2004, an amount of 10 million euro was spent on this. This is an increase of 41% in comparison with 1995. This corresponds with the increase in the number of referrals in this period. The execution of all other community service orders for minors falls under the responsibility of the Child Protection Board and the Youth Care Agency. This item of expenditure tripled to some 23 million euro in the period 1995-2004. This is chiefly the result of the considerable increase in the number of community services orders offered by the Public Prosecutions Department. The execution of community service orders for adults falls under the responsibility of the Probation and After-Care Service. Expenditure on this item increased by 36% to 37 million euro in the period 1995-2004. Finally, increasingly more was spent in relation to unlawful detention. This concerns suspects who have been detained unlawfully, for example when a pre-trial detention is not followed by an irrevocable custodial sentence. In the period 1995-2004, this item of expenditure tripled to 7 million euro in 2004.

Given the above, the total expenditure for execution is 1.6 billion euro. This is an increase of 128% in comparison with 1995. In 2004, this is € 96 per capita, an increase of 117% in comparison with 1995. Up to and including 2001, expenditure per penalty increased. In 2002 a temporary fall in expenditure was observed. However, in 2004, expenditure rose again to almost € 5,400 per penalty.

**Table 7.5 Expenditure on execution, 1995-2004**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Correctional Institutions Agency</i>										
Prisons	499	550	587	635	763	760	786	833	894	970
youth prisons	52	60	68	82	98	101	114	130	123	128
psychiatric prison hospitals	92	101	108	133	150	167	176	203	197	201
police cells	0	0	8	4	2	1	6	8	10	10
detention centres	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	60	68
electronic monitoring/detention	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	4
penitentiary programmes	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	5	5	6	6	12
other*	0	0	54	85	126	101	142	92	39	91
<i>Central Fine Collection Agency**</i>										
finances	0.9	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.4	2.0	2.0	1.7	1.8	2.4
financial settlements	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.6	1.3
administration of prison sentences	n/a	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.8
administration of community services	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.0	1.0
confiscation measures	n/a	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	1.1
<i>Other services</i>										
community services, minors, first-time offenders	7	8	9	9	12	11	12	10	10	10
community services, minors	7	8	9	11	14	14	16	18	19	23
community services, adults	27	31	31	32	34	33	32	29	27	37
compensation unlawful detention	2	2	4	5	6	6	6	7	7	7
other***	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7	8	5	4	4
<b>Total execution</b>	<b>687</b>	<b>764</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>998</b>	<b>1,212</b>	<b>1,209</b>	<b>1,306</b>	<b>1,345</b>	<b>1,402</b>	<b>1,572</b>

*euro, price level 2004*

*Expenditure on execution per...*

capita	44	49	56	64	77	76	81	83	86	97
penalty***	3,239	3,432	3,875	4,345	4,902	5,007	5,339	5,190	4,753	5,386

\* projects and items which cannot be attributed, etc.

\*\* In 2004, the Central Fine Collection Agency switched to a new method for costing. The difference lies chiefly in the costs added on. These costs are now spread out more equally over all of the products than previously. As a result, the 2004 figures are not comparable with figures for previous years.

\*\*\* Amongst others, the Council for Criminal Justice and Youth Protection, policy-making.

\*\*\*\* The sum of all custodial sentences, fines, community service orders, measures, financial settlements and Halt referrals. Combinations count twice.

See table A.7 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: budget/Final Act amending the Budget Ministry of Justice, annual reports Central Fine Collection Agency, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

## 2.6 Suspect Support

Throughout the judicial procedure, suspects can receive various types of support, provided for example by the Probation and After-Care Service or by means of subsidized legal aid. The Probation and After-Care Service strives to reduce the chance that a suspect will re-offend and enable the suspect to reintegrate into society. Besides this, it also monitors compliance with certain sentences or

measures. For adults, expenditure for the Probation and After-Care Service increased by some 28% in the period 1995-2004 (see table 2.6), but expenditure has been falling since 2001. For minors, expenditure for the Youth Probation and After-Care Service has increased by 83%. For adults, more than 60 million euro was spent on the Probation and After-Care service in 2004, while some 30 million euro was spent on minors.

If the Public Prosecution Service decides to prosecute a suspect, the latter may apply for subsidized legal aid. The contribution that a suspect receives will depend on the seriousness of the crime he is suspected of and on his income. Incidentally, this support may also be provided after a suspect has been convicted, for example if he wishes to submit a complaint about the prison he is staying in, etc. In 2004, almost 123 million euro was spent on subsidized legal aid in criminal procedures (excluding the defence rota schemes for individuals on remand custody). This is well over double the amount spent in 1995.

A total of more than 215 million euro was spent in 2004 on the provision of support to suspects during the judicial process. This is € 13 per capita, an increase of 68% in comparison with 1995. And it is an amount of € 785 per district court case. This is an increase of 66% in comparison with 1995. What is striking is that the average expenditure for 2004 is the lowest in the last four years.

**Table 7.6 Expenditure on support for suspects, 1995-2004**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Probation and After-Care Service</i>										
adults (excl. pre-trial assistance, reports and community services)	48	36	54	68	56	59	77	72	74	61
minors	17	18	21	17	25	25	28	27	30	31
<i>Subsidized legal aid</i>										
criminal cases	57	58	64	66	67	82	101	99	124	123
<b>Total suspect support</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>215</b>
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Expenditure on suspect support per...</i>										
Capita	8	7	9	10	9	10	13	12	14	13
district court case	473	450	555	625	632	713	872	789	839	785

See table A.8 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: budget/Final Act amending the Budget Ministry of Justice, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

## 2.7 Summary

The previous sections gave an indication of the estimated government expenditure on combating crime and law enforcement per area of policy. Table 2.7 summarises the above and estimates the total expenditure. This overview is far from complete. Overestimates and underestimates apply to different components. Civil cases, administrative cases and minor offences (subdistrict-court cases) have deliberately been disregarded. However, as a consequence, choices have sometimes been made when attributing cost items to different parts of the criminal law chain.



With this in mind, we can conclude that government expenditure for combating crime and law enforcement has increased from 2.5 billion euro in 1995 to 4.2 billion euro in 2004. This is an increase of 70%. Per capita this amounts to € 260, which is approximately € 100 euro more than in 1995. Figure 2.1 shows how expenditure per capita is divided over the various policy areas. Most money is spent on investigation and prevention, the least on victim care. Execution also claims a large part of the budget. In 2004, expenditure per recorded crime amounts to almost 3,200 euro as opposed to more than 2,000 euro in 1995. This is an increase of 57%.


**Table 2.7 Total government expenditure on combating crime and law enforcement, 1995-2004**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>By policy area</i>										
victim care	14	13	14	15	15	18	23	27	28	32
investigation and prevention	1,385	1,442	1,515	1,526	1,601	1,561	1,675	1,777	1,807	1,756
Prosecution	196	206	226	242	270	306	345	366	380	411
criminal procedures	66	68	81	90	108	135	165	180	184	213
Execution	687	764	880	998	1,212	1,209	1,306	1,345	1,402	1,572
suspect support	122	113	139	152	148	166	206	198	227	215
<hr/>										
Total law enforcement	2,471	2,606	2,855	3,023	3,355	3,394	3,720	3,893	4,027	4,199
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Expenditure on law enforcement per...</i>										
capita	160	168	183	192	212	213	232	241	248	258
victim	756	890	879	901	994	1,019	1,144	1,089	1,191	1,246
recorded crime	2,014	2,191	2,328	2,470	2,612	2,600	2,740	2,736	2,910	3,170

See table A.9 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: see tables 2.1 to 2.6.


**Figure 2.1 Government expenditure on combating crime and law enforcement per capita, 1995-2004**



See tables A.9 in the appendix for corresponding figures.  
Source: see tables 2.1 to 2.6.

Figure 2.2 indicates how expenditure is incurred amongst the various organisations. The Ministry of the Interior is responsible for approximately 30% of all expenditure. The Ministry of Justice is accountable for approximately 60% of expenditure on combating crime and law enforcement. The greatest part of this total goes to the Correctional Institutions Service. Other major sources of expenditure for the Ministry of Justice are the Public Prosecution Service, the Council for the Judiciary, subsidized legal aid and the Probation and After-Care Service. The remaining 10% of expenditure is attributed to other ministries, municipalities and provinces.

**Figure 2.2 Government expenditure for combating crime and for criminal-law enforcement, by public body, 2004**



See table A.9 in the appendix for corresponding figures.  
Source: see tables 2.1 to 2.6.

## **3 Expenditure for the prevention of crime**

This chapter looks at expenditure incurred by households and the corporate sector in order to prevent crime. Government expenditure for prevention has already been discussed in the previous chapter and will not be referred to again here.

### **3.1 Prevention measures taken by private individuals**

Many people are taking measures to prevent crime. These measures are mainly designed to prevent burglary and theft. No figures are available on the costs accompanying these measures. Therefore, an attempt has been made to estimate these costs. This includes purchase costs, installation costs and the annual cost of prevention measures, such as locks, shutters, outside lighting, alarm systems, guard dogs, bicycle locks and leaving lights on when away from home. The number of prevention measures taken has been derived from data of Statistics Netherlands and from the Police Monitor on Population. The costs per prevention measure are based on retail prices and labour costs. By combining these sources expenditure on prevention measures is estimated to be approximately 1.2 billion euro per annum. This is approximately € 75 per head of population. This is probably a lower limit, as the calculation is based on a limited number of prevention measures.

### **3.2 Prevention measures taken by companies and institutions**

Companies are also taking increasingly more prevention measures. Data on the turnover of the security industry (see table 3.1) show that the turnover for corporate security has doubled in the last 8 years. Corporate security is responsible for 72% of the total turnover for this sector and for 94% of all activities related to crime. Per capita, private security activities regarding crime prevention cost € 61. In addition, companies and institutions are also spending money on other preventive measures, such as extra locks and alarm systems. The Trade and Industry Crime Monitor estimates these measures at approximately 650 million euro.

**Table 3.1 Turnover of the security industry, 1995-2002**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>								
<i>Security activities regarding crime prevention*</i>								
personal protection	4	4	4	10	0	2	5	7
company security	458	501	499	557	631	636	740	931
order services	5	6	6	5	9	26	32	40
Security for car parks	4	5	5	5	6	5	7	9
<hr/>								
Total	471	515	514	577	645	668	784	986

*euro, price level 2004*

Costs per capita	30	33	33	37	41	42	49	61
------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

\* These data refer to organisations with five or more staff. Activities that are not directly related to crime have not been included.

See table A.10 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: Statistics Netherlands, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

### 3.3 Other prevention measures

A number of prevention measures are being taken by both households and the corporate sector. For example, households and companies together donated 2.4 million euro to the Dutch victim support organisation. Another prevention measure is insurance, covering damage resulting from theft, burglary or arson, for example. In international literature (see Brand & Price, 2000 and Mayhew, 2003), the cost of this insurance is also included as a prevention expenditure. The costs for this type of insurance have been defined as the premiums paid minus the amounts paid out under insurance policies. In the Netherlands insurance of moveables not only covers theft but also damage by fire. Therefore, the costs must be corrected for amounts paid out due to fire damage. The Police Monitor on Population shows how much insurance policies pay out in the event of damage caused by vandalism or theft. The ratio between this payment and the total amount paid out forms the percentage of the payment that can be attributed to the prevention of crime. The total costs calculated for theft and fire insurance, multiplied by this percentage, give us a figure that can be regarded as the amount spent prevention measures against crime. On an annual basis, this amounts to approximately 485 million euro.

### 3.4 Summary

If all expenditure is added up, the prevention measures taken by households, companies and institutions are found to be 3.3 billion euro on an annual basis. This is over 200 euro per capita. This figure does not include government expenditure on prevention. Chapter 2 has already shown that this figure is approximately 23 million euro.

## 4 Expenditure as a result of crime

This chapter will look at the damage sustained by households, the corporate sector and the government. The various estimates are based on a large number of sources. See table A.15 in the appendix for a total overview.

### 4.1 Damaged sustained by companies and institutions

The Trade and Industry Crime Monitor show that companies and institutions sustain an estimated 1.7 billion euro of damage each year as a result of crime. This concerns direct damage to and/or the theft of goods and vehicles, burglary and violence. Direct damage involves costs incurred for replacement, repair, etc. Indirect damage, by contrast, pertains (for example) to delays in the delivery of products and services. Indirect damage amounts to approximately 120 million euro per year.

Another form of indirect damage to the corporate sector is the loss of production as a result of sick leave taken by employees who have become the victims of crime. Because this figure is not recorded anywhere, an attempt has been made to estimate this figure. Data from Statistics Netherlands and the Police Monitor on Population show whether victims have sought medical help. Visits to the doctor will generally occur on working days. According to Statistics Netherlands, the average length of hospital stay is six days. Therefore, multiplication of this figure by the average labour costs gives an estimate of approximately 780 million euro for production loss in relation to employees. This is probably a lower limit: victims who have not sustained any (serious) injuries, but who have, nevertheless, been absent from work for one or several days have not been included.

An important loss item for the corporate sector is fraud. For example, according to the Dutch Association of Insurers, insurance fraud, with travel insurance in particular, amounted to approximately 500 million euro in 2004. According to Health Care Insurers Netherlands approximately 4.1 million euro of this amount is proven fraud with health care insurance. According to the Energy Theft Platform, energy worth approximately 200 million euro is stolen each year. The biggest offenders are the illegal cannabis farms. Hoffmann (2005) estimates that six billion euro disappears from companies each year as a result of fraud.

### 4.2 Damage sustained by households

Victim questionnaires have questioned victims on the damage sustained by victims as a result of a number of common offences. Table 4.1 provides an overview. The data up to and including 1999 are difficult to compare with later data, as they originate from different sources.<sup>5</sup> Theft and vandalism are the biggest loss items. However, the damage being sustained would appear to be shifting from burglary to other forms of theft, particularly theft from cars. In the case of vandalism, cars are again the main target. It is estimated that approximately 45% of damage is covered by insurance. One loss item for citizens that has not been included in table 4.1, is bank card fraud. According to an

---

<sup>5</sup> The data up to and including 1999 originate from the Periodical Survey on Living Conditions, while data as of 2000 originate from the Police Monitor on Population.

estimate by the Consumers' Association, the damage caused by bank card fraud was approximately 1.1 million euro in 2003.

**Table 4.1 Material damage as a result of common crime, 1995-2002**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>								
Violent crime	60	39	58	76	119	7		5
Theft	957	709	811	637	744	819		1,032
<i>of which</i>								
burglary	483	287	244	165	249	286		213
bicycle theft	103	102	117	119	125	211		183
car theft	105	73	125	93	90	62		89
theft from cars	125	114	170	120	146	156		263
other theft	141	292	156	140	133	105		283
Vandalism	305	270	520	420	504	648		918
<i>of which</i>								
damage to cars	247	211	325	276	300	555		662
other vandalism	57	59	195	143	203	92		256
Hit-and-run accident	129	125	115	85	115	91		133
Other crimes						145		44
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,450</b>	<b>1,143</b>	<b>1,504</b>	<b>1,218</b>	<b>1,481</b>	<b>1,709</b>		<b>2,132</b>
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>								
Costs per capita	93	73	95	77	93	106		130
Reimbursed by insurance company		45%		45%		48%		46%

See table A.11 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: up to and including 1999 Statistics Netherlands, as of 2000 Police Monitor on Population, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

Victims may also sustain personal injury. Little is known about this. From the Injury Information System, we do know that an average of 37,000 people report to first-aid departments of hospitals after having become a victim of a crime. In order to estimate the costs applicable for personal injury, various data sources have been combined. Vektis, the information centre for the health insurance sector, provides an overview of total expenditure in the Netherlands on hospital admissions, specialist care, doctor's assistance, etc. Dividing this by data from Statistics Netherlands on the number of hospital admissions and doctor's visits, gives the average expenditure per admission or visit. On the basis of data from Statistics Netherlands and the Police Monitor on Population, we know how many victims have sought medical assistance. The combination of these data results in an estimated 150 million euro of personal injury on an annual basis. This is probably also an underestimate. Meerding (2005) recently calculated that child abuse alone costs society 965 million euro each year. This includes total expenditure in response to child abuse. Since these costs already are a part of the expenditure calculated in chapter 2, the calculation must be corrected for this. The net damage child abuse then comes down to 435 million euro.

Another source that can be used to determine the material and immaterial damage sustained by victims are the payments made by the Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund. Table 4.2 provides an overview. In 2004, more than 10 million euro was paid out to victims. This is an increase of almost 80% in comparison with 1995. Approximately 65% of payments are made for immaterial damage and 35% for material damage. It should be noted that only damage not already compensated by other individuals or organisations is compensated by the Violent crime Injuries Compensation Fund. This amounts to almost € 0.60 per head of population and € 3 per victim. The budget for compensation payments is in principle unlimited.

**Table 4.2 Payments by the Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund, 1995-2004**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Payments</i>										
material damages	1.8	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.4	2.0	2.5	3.2	3.5
immaterial damages	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.9	4.4	4.5	6.1	6.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>10.1</b>
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Amount paid per..</i>										
capita	0.37	0.31	0.30	0.32	0.32	0.33	0.40	0.43	0.58	0.62
Victim*	1.73	1.64	1.46	1.49	1.52	1.60	1.98	1.95	2.76	2.99

\* This concerns all victims of crime, not just victims that have submitted applications.

See table A.12 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: annual reports Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

### 4.3 Damage sustained by the government

The government also sustains considerable damage as a result of crime. Table 4.3 provides an interview of the criminal damage that has been detected by the Tax Inquiries and Investigation Service. This concerns tax fraud and financial fraud. Financial fraud concerns bankruptcy fraud, corruption in the corporate sector, bogus organisations and health care fraud, for example. In 2003, around 700 million euro was traced and prosecuted. The tax damage is usually greater. However, more minor forms of fraud are settled according to administrative law, by means of an additional claim. If the additional claim is paid, criminal prosecution will not follow.

Besides tax and economic fraud, fraud with social insurance schemes is also possible. Major cases are handled by the Social Inquiries and Investigation Service. In 2004, the Social Inquiries and Investigation Service detected approximately 45 million euro in unpaid social insurance contributions and tax. A large part of the fraud detected is identity card fraud. The social damage applicable for this type of fraud is estimated at 40 million euro. Average-severity and minor fraud cases are again settled by the implementing bodies. Minor cases are usually settled according to administrative law, by means of an additional claim, while criminal action is taken against average-severity fraud (see the budgets of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment). It is estimated that the latter category involves an amount of approximately 100 million euro on an annual basis. This fraud usually concerns social security benefits, occupational

disability insurance, child benefit, pensions, unemployment insurance and sickness benefit. The two other special investigation services, the General Inspectorate and the Housing and Environment Inquiries and Investigation Service both detect approximately 1 to 2 million euro worth of fraud.

**Table 4.3 Fraud detected by special investigation services, 1995-2004**

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>Mln euro, price level 2004</i>										
<i>Tax Inquiries and Investigation Service*</i>										
detected criminal damages**	545	169	159	290	291	358	443	290	702	
detected tax damages**	654	194	178	291	304	341				
<i>General Inspectorate</i>										
detected unlawfully obtained advantage							2			
<i>Social Inquiries and Investigation Service</i>										
social security contributions lost									17	18
tax lost									44	27
social damages***										40
<i>Housing and Environment Inquiries and Investigation Service</i>										
housing benefit fraud									1	1

\* As of 2000, including the Economic Investigation Service.

\*\* Criminal damage is the detected damage as laid down in the official police reports for all investigations conducted on tax fraud and customs fraud. Tax damage is the detected damage as laid down in tax reports to the tax authorities. In 2003 the figure includes 1 investigation with 325 mln euro worth of fraud.

\*\*\* Social damage refers to the assumed yield arising from identity fraud detected. On the basis of data from the Ministry of Justice, the potential damage amount for a false or forged identity document can be estimated at € 36,300.

See table A.13 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: budget Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, annual reports tax authorities, the Tax Inquiries and Information Service, General Inspectorate, Social Inquiries and Investigation Service, Housing and Environment Inquiries and Investigation Service.

#### 4.4 Other damage

Money obtained through criminal means must often be laundered in some form. This may be done by paying in cash for large transactions, while arranging for the legal sale of the goods obtained later on. In order to gain some insight into the extent of the illegal circuit, the Disclosure of Unusual Transactions Act was introduced in 1994. All transactions involving large values must be disclosed. Following this disclosure, an investigation is performed in order to establish the extent to which the transaction is suspect. Table 4.4 provides an overview of suspicious unusual transactions. In 2004, this concerned an amount of more than 3.2 billion euro, or almost €200 per head of population. The major difference with the previous year can particularly be attributed to several very large suspicious transactions. An in-depth investigation into the extent, characteristics and spending of the proceeds of crime has been performed by Meloen et al. (2003).



**Table 4.4 Suspicious unusual transactions, 1999-2004**

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>						
Total amount	440	555	1,171	886	1,570	3,238
<i>Notified by</i>						
money transfers organisations	8	13	36	54	100	114
dealers in high-value goods				13	21	60
independent professionals					36	109
customs and tax authorities				221	82	47
traditional notifiers				598	1,331	2,909
<i>of which</i>						
money exchange offices				70		
banks				483		
casino's				11		
credit card companies				33		
life insurers, stock brokers, insurance brokers				0		
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>						
Costs per capita		35	73	55	97	199

See table A.14 in the appendix for corresponding figures.

Source: annual reports Unusual Transactions Unit, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

Once fraud or a property crime has been reported, the Public Prosecution Service can decide to institute proceedings. Besides a sentence, the Public Prosecution Service can also demand confiscation of the amount obtained through criminal means. In order to ensure that the confiscation order is actually paid, the Public Prosecution Service can seize bank accounts or valuable property. According to the Criminal Assets Confiscation Unit of the Public Prosecution Service, the district court has imposed confiscation measures for an amount of approximately 58 million euro in 2003.

#### 4.5 Summary

In order to obtain an impression of the total damage sustained, we can add up the above-mentioned loss items. We will disregard confiscation orders and unusual transactions, as these probably overlap in places with the loss items discussed before. Nor have the payments made by the Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund been included, since these have already been accounted in the government expenditure in chapter 2. Therefore, in total, the damage sustained as a result of crime amounts to 12.6 billion euro on an annual basis. This is approximately 775 euro per capita.



# 5 Overview and international comparison

## 5.1 Overview

Table 5.1 summarises all crime-related expenditure. This picture is by no means complete. Due to definition problems, measurement problems, conceptual problems, and the limited and fragmented availability of figures in this respect, the estimate is necessarily quite rough. In all probability it is an underestimate, since many forms of damage and prevention have remained unaddressed.

With this qualification, we can conclude that the total cost of crime on an annual basis is a minimum of 20 billion euro (see table 5.1). This is more than € 1,200 per capita. The total costs can be broken down into 21% for government expenditure, 16% for preventive measures by households and companies, and 63% for damage for companies, households and the government. The breakdown above is depicted in figure 5.1.

**Table 5.1 Total overview of the cost of crime**

costs on an annual basis	
<i>mln euro, prices 2004</i>	
<i>Government expenditure</i>	
victim care	32
investigation and prevention	1,756
prosecution	411
criminal proceedings	213
Execution	1,572
suspect support	215
<i>Prevention measures</i>	
Corporate sector	1,637
private individuals	1,198
General	487
<i>Damages</i>	
Corporate sector	9,001
households	2,718
government	886
<hr/>	
Total cost of crime	20,126
<i>euro, prices 2004</i>	
Total cost of crime per...	
Capita	1,237
Victim	5,974
recorded crime	15,194

See tables A..9 and A.15 in the appendix for corresponding figures.


Source: see tables A.3 to A.6 and table A.15 in the appendix.

This report has not looked at the benefits resulting from the enforcement of criminal law. To be able to draw any conclusions in this respect, the effects of

judicial policy must be identified. This is not always possible to measure unequivocally. Firstly, it is difficult to distinguish the effect of judicial policy from the effect of other social developments. For example, is crime decreasing because there are more police on the street, or because of increased attention for old-fashioned values? Secondly, the irrevocable question arises as to what does and does not constitute an effect? For example, falling crime rates may lead to less pressure on the judicial chain, but also to an increased sense of safety amongst citizens and fewer claims with insurance companies. Should all these effects be included and how should they be added up? If the effects can be measured, a cost-effectiveness study could be conducted. However, in order to arrive at a cost-benefit analysis, the effects applicable must also be expressed in financial terms. This is even more complicated. How can you give a financial value to an increased sense of safety? Recently, a first step was taken in this difficult matter, with the development of a cost-benefit model for judicial interventions (Versantvoort et al., 2005).

Still, it is possible to properly measure a limited number of benefits of judicial policy in the field of criminal-law enforcement at this time. For example, income from penalties and financial settlements as a result of crime is estimated at 34 million euro, and more than 8 million euro was collected as a result of confiscation measures in 2004 (source: Central Fine Collection Agency, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre).

**Figure 5.1 The cost of crime by type**



See tables A.9 and A.15 in the appendix for corresponding figures.  
Source: see tables A.3 to A.6 and table A.15 in the appendix.

## 5.2 International comparison

In other countries, efforts are also being made to quantify the cost of crime. Cohen (2000 and 2005) discusses the methodological problems in depth, but does not provide an overview of the total cost of crime. Publications that have made this attempt, are Brantingham & Easton (1998) for Canada in 1993, Schreuders et al. (1999) for the Netherlands in 1998, Anderson (1999) for the

United States in 1998, Brand & Price (2000) for England and Wales in the period 1999-2000, Dubourg et al.(2005) solely in relation to offences against individuals and households in England and Wales in the period 2003-2004, and Mayhew (2003) for Australia in 2001. These researchers also encounter the problem of limited data, the need to combine a number of sources, the difficulty in distinguishing between criminal offences and other components, and the need to make assumptions, all of the above particularly in relation to prevention measures and damage.

It is interesting to compare the Dutch situation with the situation in the United States, Canada, Australia and England and Wales. To be able to do this, the outcomes of these studies were first translated into prices for 2004 by means of an inflation correction applicable for the country in question. Next, the amounts were translated into euros, on the basis of the purchasing power parity.<sup>6</sup> Both Brand & Price (2000) and Mayhew (2003) make a distinction between expenditure for the prevention of crime, as the result of crime and in response to crime. Since this categorisation deviates slightly from the analysis in the previous chapters, the Dutch data in this box have been adjusted to reflect the international categorisation. Anderson (1999) and Brantingham & Easton (1998) do not make this distinction, but, based on the data in their publications, an attempt has been made to categorise the amounts in these categories. The study conducted by Schreuders et al. (1999) has not been included in the comparison, because the present report is an update thereof. Nor has the study by Dubourg e.a. (2005) been included, since despite being an update of Brand & Price (2000), it only pertains to offences against individuals and households and not against the corporate sector.

Table 5.2 shows the comparison. The figures pertaining to the judicial response are the easiest to estimate since they are often stated in Government budgets. In the Netherlands, 4 billion euro is spent on this in comparison with 18 billion euro in England and Wales, 5 billion euro in Australia, 316 billion euro in the United States and 9 billion euro in Canada. Per capita, this is €254, €346, €231, €1.167 and €314 respectively. The cost of prevention measures and damage are rough estimates in all cases. In total, the estimated cost of crime in the Netherlands is €1,236 per capita as opposed to €1,731 per capita in England and Wales, €1,146 in Australia, €7,002 in the United States, and €1,331 in Canada. Approximately the same costs apply capita for four of the five countries studied. However, the cost of crime in the United States in particular stands out. This is all the more striking given the fact that the ratio of registered crime to inhabitants is at about 0.09 for all of these countries in the years studied.

Some caution is recommended when comparing the different countries. Not all countries use the same components, whether through a lack of data, or as a result of institutional differences. For example, the entire police budget is included in the American and Canadian calculations, as no proper breakdown could be achieved into investigation and non-investigation activities. Moreover, medical expenses in the United States are relatively high, which can force up the total cost of crime. In the Dutch situation, the payments made by the Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund are a good indication of the immaterial damage sustained by victims of violent crime in particular, since the payment budget for the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund is, in principle, unlimited. In England and Wales and in Australia, this budget is limited and, as such, not a good indicator. In the American study, the purchase of a legal weapon is

---

<sup>6</sup> The purchasing power parity (PPP) is the exchange rate corrected for differences in price levels.

considered a prevention measure, while this is illegal in the Netherlands and England and Wales.

**Table 5.2 International comparison**

	Canada	United States	England and Wales	Australia	The Netherlands
	1993	1998	1999/2000	2001	2004
<i>mln euro, prices 2004</i>					
<i>Expenditure in response to crime</i>					
Judicial response (incl. police, excl. prevention and victim care)	8,996	315,692	18,300	4,514	4,144
victim care (excl. compensation)			62	621	24
<i>Expenditure in anticipation of crime</i>					
general prevention measures		168,266			
household prevention measures			1,145	1,291	1,198
corporate prevention measures	5,679		6,585	2,214	1,660
administration costs insurance policies		106	1,030	353	485
<i>Expenditure as a result of crime</i>					
material damages		621,288	13,094	5,205	4,019
Fraud		110,653	16,250	4,147	7,100
physical and emotional damages	11,267	485,762	27,924	2,341	445
medical costs	12,241	148,546	2,051	176	151
lost income		44,263	5,206	1,537	902
Total	38,183	1,894,576	91,647	22,399	20,126
<i>euro, prices 2004</i>					
Expenditure per capita	1,331	7,002	1,731	1,146	1,237
expenditure per recorded crime	13,957	77,211	18,005	12,307	15,194

Source: Brantingham & Easton (1998), Anderson (1999), Brand & Price (2000), Mayhew (2003), OECD, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

### 5.3 Conclusion

The total cost of crime in the Netherlands is 20 billion euro on an annual basis. This is more than € 1,200 per capita. Private and corporate expenditure on crime prevention in 2004 is estimated at approximately 3.3 billion euro. Damage as a consequence of crime in 2004 is estimated at approximately 13 billion euro. Government expenditure in response to crime is approximately 4.2 billion euro on an annual basis. In the period 1995-2004, this expenditure rose by 70%. The Dutch per capita expenditure on the combating of crime and law enforcement does not differ very much from other countries.

# References

- Anderson, D.A. (1999), "The aggregate burden of crime", *Journal of Law and Economics*, vol. 42, nr. 2, pp. 611-641.
- Brand, S., R. Price (2000), *The economic and social costs of crime*, London, Home Office, Research Study 217.
- Brantingham, P., S.T. Easton (1998), *The costs of crime; Who pays and how much? 1998 update*, Vancouver, Fraser Institute Critical Issues Bulletin.
- Cohen, M. (2000), "Measuring the costs and benefits of crime and justice", in: *Measurement and analysis of crime and justice*, Criminal Justice 2000, volume 4, Office of Justice Programs, US Department of Justice, Washington DC, pp. 263-315.
- Cohen, M. (2005), *The costs of crime and justice*, London, Routledge.
- Dubourg, R., J. Hamed, J. Thorns (2005), *The economic and social costs of crime against individuals and households 2003/04*, London, Home Office, Online Report 30/05.
- Eggen, A.Th.J., W. van der Heide (2005) (eds), *Criminaliteit en Rechtshandhaving 2004: ontwikkelingen en samenhangen*, Den Haag, WODC/CBS, Onderzoek en Beleid 237.
- Eurostat (2001), *Handbook on price and volume measures in national accounts*, Luxemburg, European Commission.
- Goudriaan, R., F. van Tulder, J. Blank, A. van der Torre, B. Kuhry (1989), *Doelmatig Dienstverleners*, Rijswijk, Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, Sociale en Culturele Studie 11.
- Hoffmann, G. (2005), "Als er genoeg bewijs is, springen we naar binnen", *De Actuaris*, jrg. 12, no. 5.
- Maas, C. (2002), "Justitie en strafrechtpleging", in: *Sociaal en Cultureel Rapport 2002*, Den Haag, Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Mayhew, P. (2003), *Counting the costs of crime in Australia*, Canberra, Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Meerding, W.J. (2005), "De maatschappelijke kosten van kindermishandeling", in: *Kindermishandeling: de politiek een zorg*, H. Baartman, R. Bullens, J. Willems (red), Amsterdam, SWP.
- Meloen, J., R. Landman, H. de Miranda, J. van Eekelen, S. van Soest (2003), *Buit en besteding: een empirisch onderzoek naar de omvang, de kenmerken en de besteding van misdadageld*, Den Haag, Elsevier Overheid, Studiereeks Recherche deel 12.
- Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (2004), *Kerngegevens Nederlandse Politie 2003*, Den Haag.
- Ministry of Justice (2003), *Jeugd Terecht: actieprogramma aanpak jeugdcriminaliteit 2003 → 2006*, Den Haag
- Ministry of Justice/Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (2001), *Criminaliteitsbeheersing: investeren in een zichtbare overheid*, Den Haag.
- Parliamentary documents II (2002/2003), *Naar een veiliger samenleving*, Den Haag, 28 684, nr. 1.
- Schreuders, M.M., F.W.M. Huls, W.M. Garnier, K.E. Swierstra (1999), *Criminaliteit en rechtshandhaving 1999*, Den Haag, WODC, Onderzoek en beleid 180.
- Smulders, P.G.W., D.J. Klein Hesselink, G.E. Evers (1999), *Geweld, intimidatie en discriminatie op het werk in de Europese Unie : een analyse van het databestand van de 'European Work Environment Survey' uit 1996 van de 'European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions'*, Den Haag, Ministerie van SZW/TNO-arbeid.

Tak, P.J.P. (2003), *The Dutch criminal justice system: organization and operation*, Den Haag, WODC Onderzoek en Beleid 205.

Versantvoort, M.C., A.C.M. Verster, J. Jannink, L.G.J.M. van den Broek, F. van Zutphen. P.A. Donker van Heel, *Kosten en baten justitiële interventies: ontwikkeling van een analyse- en rekenmodel*, Rotterdam, Ecorys.



# Appendix

Table A.1	Population and inflation, 1980-2004	42
Table A.2	Key figures on the Dutch criminal justice system, 1996-2004	42
Table A.3	Expenditure on victim care, 1994-2004	43
Table A.4	Expenditure on investigation and prevention, 1994-2004	44
Table A.5	Expenditure on prosecution, 1994-2004	46
Table A.6	Expenditure on criminal procedure, 1994-2004	47
Table A.7	Expenditure on execution, 1994-2004	48
Table A.8	Expenditure on support for suspects, 1994-2004	50
Table A.9	Total government expenditure on combating crime and law enforcement, 1994-2004	51
Table A.10	Turnover of the security industry, 1995-2002	53
Table A.11	Material damage as a result of common crime, 1992-2002	54
Table A.12	Payments by the Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund, 1994-2004	55
Table A.13	Fraud detected by special investigation services, 1983-2004	56
Table A.14	Suspicious unusual transactions, 1999-2004	57
Table A.15	Overview social costs	58

**Table A.1 Population and inflation, 1980-2004**

	Population (average)	Consumer price index (all households)	Deflator collective government expenditure (national accounts)
1980	14,149,800	55	
1981	14,247,208	59	
1982	14,312,690	62	
1983	14,367,070	64	
1984	14,424,211	67	
1985	14,491,632	68	
1986	14,572,278	68	
1987	14,665,037	67	68
1988	14,760,094	68	67
1989	14,848,907	69	68
1990	14,951,510	71	69
1991	15,069,798	73	72
1992	15,184,166	75	74
1993	15,290,368	77	76
1994	15,382,838	79	77
1995	15,459,006	81	80
1996	15,530,498	82	80
1997	15,610,650	84	82
1998	15,707,209	86	83
1999	15,812,088	88	85
2000	15,925,513	90	88
2001	16,046,180	94	92
2002	16,148,929	97	96
2003	16,225,302	99	98
2004	16,275,193	100	100

Source: Statistics Netherlands, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.2 Key figures on the Dutch criminal justice system, 1996-2004**

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
victims	2,928,136	3,248,320	3,355,640	3,374,916	3,331,741	3,251,513	3,575,375	3,382,376	3,369,141
recorded crime	1,189,217	1,225,964	1,223,500	1,284,328	1,305,635	1,357,617	1,422,863	1,383,875	1,324,600
suspects	254,379	266,292	266,853	267,247	268,173	276,615	321,737	346,847	355,700
Public Prosecution									
Service: number of cases	250,726	250,865	242,482	234,679	233,324	236,029	251,291	270,322	273,974
District Court: number of cases	104,617	106,372	105,031	111,309	111,033	112,037	116,810	134,631	133,218
prison sentences	25,604	25,112	26,002	28,497	28,577	31,331	35,432	38,790	35,403
Community services	20,561	23,095	23,687	27,162	26,831	32,501	39,522	46,137	50,611
financial settlements	57,399	56,765	56,711	63,265	59,307	58,308	58,873	66,872	63,241
fines	46,676	48,361	46,384	47,111	48,108	45,396	43,896	52,065	51,004

Source: Statistics Netherlands, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.3 Expenditure on victim care, 1994-2004**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>											
<i>Victim Support</i>											
contribution Ministry of Justice	5.6	5.7	4.5	5.1	5.9	6.1	7.3	8.4	9.5	8.3	11.1
contribution other government bodies*			0.7	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.6	2.9	3.2	4.1	4.1
<i>Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund</i>											
staff & material goods**	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.8	2.2	2.8	5.2	4.5	3.8
payments	2.9	4.5	3.8	3.9	4.1	4.3	4.7	5.9	6.7	9.2	10.1
<i>Ministry of Justice</i>											
collection of civil claims in criminal cases**	n/a	n/a	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.0	3.0
<hr/>											
Total victim care	9.9	11.5	10.5	11.1	12.1	13.0	15.6	21.0	25.5	27.1	32.1
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Victim Support</i>											
contribution Ministry of Justice	7.3	7.1	5.6	6.2	7.2	7.1	8.3	9.1	9.9	8.5	11.1
contribution other government bodies*			0.9	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.6	3.1	3.4	4.2	4.1
<i>Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund</i>											
staff & material goods**	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	2.1	2.5	3.0	5.4	4.6	3.8
payments	3.7	5.7	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.1	5.3	6.4	7.0	9.3	10.1
<i>Ministry of Justice</i>											
collection of civil claims in criminal cases**	n/a	n/a	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.9	1.1	0.9	1.0	3.0
<hr/>											
Total victim care	12.7	14.5	13.0	13.6	14.7	15.4	17.6	22.8	26.6	27.6	32.1
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Expenditure on victim care per...</i>											
Capita	0.83	0.94	0.84	0.87	0.94	0.97	1.11	1.42	1.65	1.70	1.97
Victim	3.91	4.43	4.45	4.19	4.38	4.55	5.30	7.00	7.45	8.16	9.52

\* Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sports, Ministry of Transport, Public works and Water Management, municipalities, provinces.

\*\* This concerns expenditure for the processing of applications, not the payment itself.

\*\*\* This concerns collection expenditure, not the compensation itself. In 2004, the Central Fine Collection Agency switched to a new method for costing. The difference lies chiefly in the costs added on. These costs are now spread out more equally over all of the products than previously. As a result, the 2004 figures are not comparable with figures for previous years.

Source: budget/Final Act amending the Budget, Ministry of Justice, annual reports for the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund, annual reports for the Victim Support organisation, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.4 Expenditure on investigation and prevention, 1994-2004**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
	<i>mln euro, nominal</i>										
<i>Prevention</i>											
crime prevention	4.9	3.0	4.6	4.8	3.8	3.7	27.1	30.9	20.5	21.6	23.3
<i>Police</i>											
contribution Ministry of the Interior*	666.7	678.8	714.5	752.9	804.3	881.1	1,029.3	1,148.7	1,204.9	1,295.5	1,352.5
contribution Ministry of Justice special police tasks, policy making**	210.5	214.5	217.4	237.4	199.0	195.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
contribution Ministry of Justice special police tasks, policy making**	67.8	62.0	61.1	66.5	71.7	80.9	81.9	97.3	106.8	57.4	25.6
<i>Special investigation services</i>											
Tax Inquiries and Investigation Service	53.2	57.1	61.1	66.5	72.1	80.0	91.5	95.0	100.0	119.6	123.8
Social Inquiries and Investigation Service	5.7	5.7	3.1	4.1	4.5	3.5	7.4	9.8	9.7	19.5	20.0
General Inspectorate Housing and Environment Inquiries and Investigation Service	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.7	2.5	3.1	6.2	5.5	5.0	4.7	7.6
other special investigation officers and projects***	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.7	4.7	5.8	6.9	6.1	5.1
other special investigation officers and projects***	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	13.9	18.8	93.4	77.8	16.0
<i>Other investigation</i>											
Police and security tasks Royal Military Police	48.4	50.9	57.4	64.4	66.4	71.6	77.0	87.1	99.6	106.8	106.5
Coastguard	2.5	2.5	3.1	3.7	4.3	4.8	5.4	5.4	4.9	6.0	7.7
Netherlands Forensic Institute****	14.9	16.6	19.9	20.6	15.3	18.5	21.6	24.6	29.9	35.3	43.1
<i>Remand custody</i>											
pre-trial assistance (Probation and After-Care Service)	1.6	2.1	2.0	2.5	2.1	2.5	2.6	2.3	3.0	3.3	3.2
subsidized legal aid	8.0	8.0	9.3	9.3	9.7	9.8	12.5	16.1	15.6	19.6	21.6
<b>Total investigation and prevention</b>	<b>1,087.3</b>	<b>1,104.4</b>	<b>1,156.8</b>	<b>1,236.8</b>	<b>1,259.3</b>	<b>1,358.2</b>	<b>1,381.0</b>	<b>1,547.3</b>	<b>1,700.2</b>	<b>1,773.2</b>	<b>1,756.0</b>

To be continued on the next page.

**Table A.4 (continued)**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Prevention</i>											
crime prevention	6.4	3.8	5.7	5.8	4.7	4.4	30.6	33.4	21.4	22.0	23.3
<i>Police</i>											
contribution Ministry of the Interior*	862.2	851.5	890.9	922.2	974.8	1,038.8	1,163.2	1,243.3	1,259.5	1,320.2	1,352.5
contribution Ministry of Justice	272.2	269.1	271.0	290.9	241.2	230.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
special police tasks, policy making**	87.6	77.7	76.2	81.4	86.8	95.3	92.5	105.3	111.7	58.5	25.6
<i>Special investigation services</i>											
Tax Inquiries and Investigation Service	68.8	71.6	76.2	81.5	87.4	94.3	103.4	102.8	104.5	121.9	123.8
Social Inquiries and Investigation Service	7.3	7.1	3.9	5.0	5.5	4.1	8.3	10.6	10.1	19.9	20.0
General Inspectorate	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.9	3.0	3.6	7.0	6.0	5.2	4.8	7.6
Housing and Environment Inquiries and Investigation Service	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.3	5.3	6.3	7.2	6.2	5.1
other special investigation officers and projects***	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	15.7	20.3	97.6	79.3	16.0
<i>Other investigation</i>											
Police and security tasks Royal Military Police	62.6	63.9	71.6	78.9	80.4	84.4	87.0	94.3	104.1	108.8	106.5
Coastguard	3.2	3.1	3.9	4.5	5.2	5.7	6.1	5.9	5.2	6.1	7.7
Netherlands Forensic Institute****	19.3	20.9	24.8	25.2	18.6	21.8	24.4	26.6	31.3	35.9	43.1
<i>Remand custody</i>											
pre-trial assistance (Probation and After-Care Service)	2.1	2.6	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.9	2.9	2.5	3.2	3.3	3.2
subsidized legal aid	10.3	10.1	11.6	11.4	11.8	11.6	14.1	17.4	16.3	19.9	21.6
<b>Total investigation and prevention</b>	<b>1,406.1</b>	<b>1,385.4</b>	<b>1,442.4</b>	<b>1,515.1</b>	<b>1,526.2</b>	<b>1,601.2</b>	<b>1,560.6</b>	<b>1,674.6</b>	<b>1,777.2</b>	<b>1,806.9</b>	<b>1,756.0</b>

*euro, price level 2004*

*Expenditure on investigation and prevention per...*

capita	91	90	93	97	97	101	98	104	110	111	108
recorded crime	1,070	1,129	1,213	1,236	1,247	1,247	1,195	1,234	1,249	1,306	1,326

\* As of 2000, incl. National Police Service

\*\* Including the Unusual Transactions Unit (up to and including 1999), airport security (later the aviation department of the National Police Service).

\*\*\* Including Unusual Transactions Unit, Central Information System for Telecommunication Investigation and National Police Service; in 2002 and 2003, incl. project on combating drug smuggling at Amsterdam Airport.

\*\*\*\* Up to and including 1997, incl. the central criminal intelligence division.

Source: Final Act amending the Budget/budget of the Ministries of the Interior, Justice, Social Affairs and Employment, Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, Finance and Defence, annual reports tax authorities, VROM inspectorate, Social Information and Investigation Service and General Inspection Service, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.5 Expenditure on prosecution, 1994-2004**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>											
<i>Public Prosecution Service, staff and material goods</i>											
national services	9.1	7.6	8.1	9.2	10.0	8.5	11.6	13.6	14.1	15.2	17.3
court of appeal cases*	20.0	20.1	24.2	27.7	26.4	29.5	34.5	40.6	42.0	45.3	51.6
district court cases**	105.6	85.3	87.7	99.5	111.3	124.1	145.2	171.0	176.9	191.1	217.4
<i>Public Prosecution Service, legal costs</i>											
court of appeal cases	2.9	3.5	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.9	4.6	6.3	8.1	8.7	9.4
district court cases	15.3	15.1	13.4	13.9	14.7	16.3	19.2	26.4	34.1	36.7	39.6
<i>Child Protection Board</i>											
basic and follow-up investigation	13.0	13.7	15.9	18.3	21.3	27.3	29.7	35.1	40.5	39.3	39.7
<i>Probation and After-Care Service</i>											
reports	8.3	10.6	11.9	11.6	12.3	19.2	25.7	26.2	34.0	36.5	36.1
<hr/>											
Total prosecution	174.2	155.9	165.0	184.1	199.5	228.7	270.5	319.2	349.7	372.9	411.1
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Public Prosecution Service, staff and material goods</i>											
national services	11.7	9.6	10.1	11.3	12.1	10.0	13.1	14.7	14.7	15.5	17.3
court of appeal cases*	25.9	25.2	30.2	34.0	32.0	34.7	39.0	43.9	43.9	46.2	51.6
district court cases**	136.5	107.0	109.4	121.9	134.9	146.3	164.1	185.1	184.9	194.7	217.4
<i>Public Prosecution Service, legal costs</i>											
court of appeal cases	3.8	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.2	4.6	5.2	6.8	8.5	8.9	9.4
district court cases	19.8	18.9	16.7	17.0	17.8	19.2	21.7	28.6	35.6	37.4	39.6
<i>Child Protection Board</i>											
basic and follow-up investigation	16.8	17.2	19.9	22.4	25.9	32.2	33.6	37.9	42.3	40.1	39.7
<i>Probation and After-Care Service</i>											
reports	10.7	13.3	14.9	14.2	15.0	22.7	29.0	28.4	35.6	37.2	36.1
<hr/>											
Total prosecution	225.3	195.5	205.7	225.5	241.8	269.6	305.7	345.5	365.5	380.0	411.1
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Expenditure on prosecution per...</i>											
capita	15	13	13	14	15	17	19	22	23	23	25
district court case	824	758	821	899	997	1,149	1,310	1,464	1,455	1,406	1,501

\* Incl. minor offences heard in appeal.

\*\* As of 1998, including central criminal intelligence division.

Source: Final Act amending the Budget/budget Ministry of Justice, annual reports Public Prosecution Service, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.6 Expenditure on criminal procedure, 1994-2004**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>											
<i>Courts: staff and material goods*</i>											
supreme court, criminal cases**	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.9	5.6	6.5	7.1	6.8	10.2	10.5	11.2
court of appeal, criminal cases**	10.5	11.0	10.9	12.7	13.9	16.4	20.3	25.2	27.6	32.8	41.1
district court, criminal cases	27.6	33.2	34.7	43.3	49.4	63.4	83.8	110.1	112.4	112.2	127.8
national services	2.8	3.2	3.3	4.1	4.6	4.4	6.7	8.7	12.6	12.3	15.0
projects, programme budgets, council office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.5	10.4	15.0
<i>Courts: legal costs</i>											
supreme court, criminal cases	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
court of appeal, criminal cases	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.6
district court, criminal cases	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.5	1.8
<b>Total criminal procedure</b>	<b>46.0</b>	<b>52.9</b>	<b>54.4</b>	<b>65.9</b>	<b>74.5</b>	<b>91.9</b>	<b>119.6</b>	<b>152.1</b>	<b>171.9</b>	<b>180.4</b>	<b>212.7</b>
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Courts: staff and material goods*</i>											
supreme court, criminal cases**	5.8	5.7	5.9	6.0	6.8	7.6	8.0	7.3	10.7	10.7	11.2
court of appeal, criminal cases**	13.6	13.8	13.6	15.6	16.8	19.4	23.0	27.3	28.8	33.4	41.1
district court, criminal cases	35.7	41.6	43.3	53.1	59.9	74.7	94.7	119.2	117.5	114.3	127.8
national services	3.6	4.0	4.1	5.0	5.5	5.2	7.6	9.4	13.2	12.6	15.0
projects, programme budgets, council office	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.8	10.6	15.0
<i>Courts: legal costs</i>											
supreme court, criminal cases	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
court of appeal, criminal cases	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.6
district court, criminal cases	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.9	1.1	1.4	1.0	1.2	1.6	1.8
<b>Total criminal procedure</b>	<b>59.5</b>	<b>66.3</b>	<b>67.9</b>	<b>80.7</b>	<b>90.3</b>	<b>108.3</b>	<b>135.2</b>	<b>164.6</b>	<b>179.7</b>	<b>183.8</b>	<b>212.7</b>
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Expenditure on criminal proceedings per...</i>											
Capita	4	4	4	5	6	7	8	10	11	11	13
district court case concluded by a judge	616	648	649	759	860	973	1,217	1,469	1,538	1,366	1,596
<i>Workload criminal proceedings as a percentage of total workload***</i>											
supreme court**	61%	59%	57%	52%	56%	59%	64%	56%	59%	55%	56%
court of appeal**	40%	39%	38%	40%	40%	38%	37%	36%	36%	40%	45%
district court	12%	13%	13%	14%	15%	18%	21%	23%	23%	23%	24%

\* Including housing costs and corrected for transfers to the Public Prosecution Service.

\*\* Incl. minor offences heard in appeal, excluding the administrative enforcement of traffic regulations.

\*\*\* This concerns the weighted workload.

Source: budget/Final Act amending the Budget, Ministry of Justice, annual reports Supreme Court, annual reports Council for the Judiciary, workload measurements 1994-1998, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.7 Expenditure on execution, 1994-2004**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>											
<i>Correctional Institutions Agency</i>											
Prisons	351.9	397.5	441.4	478.8	523.8	647.3	672.1	726.1	796.9	877.6	970.0
youth prisons	33.9	41.7	48.1	55.2	67.8	83.4	89.2	105.5	124.1	120.8	128.0
psychiatric prison hospitals	64.8	73.2	81.3	88.2	109.6	127.5	147.4	162.6	194.6	193.7	201.2
police cells	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	3.2	1.6	1.3	5.3	7.2	10.1	9.5
detention centres	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	59.1	68.1
electronic monitoring/detention	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	0.0	0.3	4.4
penitentiary programmes	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	3.0	4.2	4.3	5.6	5.8	11.8
other*	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.0	70.0	107.0	89.0	131.0	88.2	38.2	90.6
<i>Central Fine Collection Agency**</i>											
finances	0.2	0.7	1.5	1.7	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.8	2.4
financial settlements	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.6	1.3
administration of prison sentences	nvt	nvt	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.8
administration of community services	nvt	nvt	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.0	1.0
confiscation measures	nvt	nvt	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	1.1
<i>Other services</i>											
community services, minors, first-time offenders	5.0	5.9	6.4	7.6	7.6	10.4	9.6	11.3	9.9	10.2	10.4
community services, minors	5.5	5.8	6.7	7.7	9.0	11.5	12.5	14.8	17.1	18.2	22.9
community services, adults	19.4	21.5	25.2	25.6	26.0	28.5	29.2	29.5	28.1	26.6	36.8
compensation unlawful detention	1.6	1.8	2.0	3.1	4.2	4.9	5.4	5.9	6.3	6.8	7.3
other***	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	6.5	7.6	5.2	4.0	3.7
<b>Total execution</b>	<b>482.4</b>	<b>548.0</b>	<b>612.7</b>	<b>718.7</b>	<b>823.5</b>	<b>1,028.1</b>	<b>1,069.4</b>	<b>1,206.9</b>	<b>1,286.7</b>	<b>1,375.8</b>	<b>1,572.1</b>

To be continued on the next page.



**Table A.7 (continued)**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Correctional Institutions Agency</i>											
Prisons	455.1	498.7	550.4	586.5	634.9	763.1	759.6	785.8	833.0	894.3	970.0
youth prisons	43.9	52.2	60.0	67.6	82.2	98.4	100.8	114.2	129.7	123.1	128.0
psychiatric prison hospitals	83.8	91.9	101.4	108.0	132.9	150.4	166.5	176.0	203.4	197.4	201.2
police cells	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	3.9	1.9	1.5	5.7	7.5	10.2	9.5
detention centres	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	60.2	68.1
electronic monitoring/detention	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	0.0	0.3	4.4
penitentiary programmes	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	3.6	4.8	4.7	5.9	5.9	11.8
other*	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.9	84.8	126.2	100.6	141.7	92.2	38.9	90.6
<i>Central Fine Collection Agency**</i>											
finances	0.2	0.9	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.4	2.0	2.0	1.7	1.8	2.4
financial settlements	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.6	1.3
administration of prison sentences	nvt	nvt	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.8
administration of community services	nvt	nvt	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.0	1.0
confiscation measures	nvt	nvt	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	1.1
<i>Other services</i>											
community services, minors, first-time offenders	6.5	7.4	8.0	9.3	9.3	12.3	10.9	12.2	10.4	10.4	10.4
community services, minors	7.1	7.2	8.4	9.4	10.9	13.6	14.2	16.0	17.8	18.5	22.9
community services, adults	25.1	26.9	31.4	31.4	31.6	33.6	33.0	31.9	29.3	27.1	36.8
compensation unlawful detention	2.1	2.2	2.4	3.8	5.1	5.8	6.1	6.3	6.6	6.9	7.3
other***	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	nvt	7.4	8.3	5.4	4.0	3.7

Total execution	623.9	687.4	764.0	880.4	998.0	1,212.1	1,208.6	1,306.2	1,345.1	1,402.0	1,572.1
-----------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

*euro, price level 2004*

*Expenditure on execution per...*

capita	41	44	49	56	64	77	76	81	83	86	97
penalty***	3,142	3,239	3,432	3,875	4,345	4,902	5,007	5,339	5,190	4,753	5,386

\* projects and items which cannot be attributed, etc.

\*\* In 2004, the Central Fine Collection Agency switched to a new method for costing. The difference lies chiefly in the costs added on. These costs are now spread out more equally over all of the products than previously. As a result, the 2004 figures are not comparable with figures for previous years.

\*\*\* Amongst others, the Council for Criminal Justice and Youth Protection, policy-making.

\*\*\*\* The sum of all custodial sentences, fines, community service orders, measures, financial settlements and Halt referrals. Combinations count twice.

Source: budget/Final Act amending the Budget Ministry of Justice, annual reports Central Fine Collection Agency, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.8 Expenditure on support for suspects, 1994-2004**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>											
<i>Probation and After-Care Service</i>											
adults (excl. pre-trial assistance, reports and community services)	27.2	38.1	29.0	43.7	56.5	47.5	52.6	71.0	68.7	72.2	61.1
minors	11.5	13.4	14.7	17.4	14.1	21.3	22.0	26.1	26.0	29.0	30.9
<i>Subsidized legal aid</i>											
criminal cases	45.4	45.7	46.8	52.6	54.5	57.0	72.6	93.1	95.1	121.3	123.1
<hr/>											
Total suspect support	84.2	97.2	90.5	113.7	125.1	125.8	147.2	190.2	189.8	222.6	215.1
 <i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Probation and After-Care Service</i>											
adults (excl. pre-trial assistance, reports and community services)	35.2	47.8	36.1	53.5	68.5	56.0	59.4	76.8	71.8	73.6	61.1
minors	14.9	16.8	18.4	21.3	17.1	25.1	24.9	28.3	27.2	29.6	30.9
<i>Subsidized legal aid</i>											
criminal cases	58.7	57.3	58.4	64.5	66.0	67.3	82.1	100.8	99.4	123.6	123.1
<hr/>											
Total suspect support	108.9	121.9	112.9	139.2	151.6	148.3	166.4	205.9	198.4	226.8	215.1
 <i>euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Expenditure on suspect support</i>											
<i>per...</i>											
Capita	7	8	7	9	10	9	10	13	12	14	13
district court case	398	473	450	555	625	632	713	872	789	839	785

Source: budget/Final Act amending the Budget Ministry of Justice, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.9 Total government expenditure on combating crime and law enforcement, 1994-2004**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>											
<i>By public body</i>											
Ministry of the Interior	666.7	678.8	714.5	752.9	804.3	881.1	1,029.3	1,148.7	1,204.9	1,295.5	1,352.5
Ministry of Justice	1,104.3	1,171.7	1,246.7	1,434.0	1,535.9	1,797.8	1,781.3	2,076.4	2,289.6	2,389.7	2,571.8
<i>Of which</i>											
Victim support	5.6	5.7	4.5	5.1	5.9	6.1	7.3	8.4	9.5	8.3	11.1
Violent crime injuries compensation fund	4.2	5.9	5.2	5.2	5.5	6.1	6.9	8.7	11.9	13.7	13.9
Special investigation services and police tasks	278.2	276.5	278.5	303.9	270.7	276.0	95.7	116.0	200.2	135.3	41.6
Netherlands Forensic Institute	14.9	16.6	19.9	20.6	15.3	18.5	21.6	24.6	29.9	35.3	43.1
Public Prosecution Services	152.9	131.6	137.1	154.2	165.8	182.2	215.1	257.9	275.2	297.1	335.3
Council for the Judiciary	41.5	48.2	49.7	61.0	68.8	85.4	112.4	145.2	161.5	169.8	201.3
Supreme Court	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.9	5.7	6.5	7.2	6.8	10.3	10.6	11.3
Correctional Institution services	450.7	512.4	570.9	672.6	774.5	970.0	1,003.2	1,134.7	1,216.5	1,305.6	1,483.5
Central Fine Collection Agency	0.2	0.7	1.7	2.2	2.2	3.4	3.8	4.2	4.5	5.5	10.5
Probation and After-Care Services	56.6	72.3	68.0	83.4	97.0	97.7	110.1	129.0	133.8	138.6	137.2
Community Service for juvenile first-time offenders	5.0	5.9	6.4	7.6	7.6	10.4	9.6	11.3	9.9	10.2	10.4
Child Protection Board	18.5	19.4	22.6	26.0	30.3	38.8	42.2	49.8	57.6	57.5	62.5
Youth Care Agency	11.5	13.4	14.7	17.4	14.1	21.3	22.0	26.1	26.0	29.0	30.9
Subsidized legal aid	53.4	53.7	56.1	62.0	64.2	66.9	85.1	109.2	110.7	140.9	144.7
Other	6.5	4.8	6.5	7.8	8.1	8.6	39.0	44.4	32.0	32.4	34.3
Ministry of Defense	50.9	53.4	60.5	68.1	70.6	76.4	82.4	92.6	104.5	112.8	114.2
Ministry of Finance	53.2	57.1	61.1	66.5	72.1	80.0	91.5	95.0	100.0	119.6	123.8
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.7	2.5	3.1	6.2	5.5	5.0	4.7	7.6
Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment	5.7	5.7	3.1	4.1	4.5	3.5	7.4	9.8	9.7	19.5	20.0
Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.7	4.7	5.8	6.9	6.1	5.1
Municipalities, provinces, other ministries			0.7	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.6	2.9	3.2	4.1	4.1
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>											
<i>By policy area</i>											
victim care	9.9	11.5	10.5	11.1	12.1	13.0	15.6	21.0	25.5	27.1	32.1
investigation and prevention	1,087.3	1,104.4	1,156.8	1,236.8	1,259.3	1,358.2	1,381.0	1,547.3	1,700.2	1,773.2	1,756.0
Prosecution	174.2	155.9	165.0	184.1	199.5	228.7	270.5	319.2	349.7	372.9	411.1
criminal procedures	46.0	52.9	54.4	65.9	74.5	91.9	119.6	152.1	171.9	180.4	212.7
Execution	482.4	548.0	612.7	718.7	823.5	1,028.1	1,069.4	1,206.9	1,286.7	1,375.8	1,572.1
suspect support	84.2	97.2	90.5	113.7	125.1	125.8	147.2	190.2	189.8	222.6	215.1
<b>Total law enforcement</b>	<b>1,884.0</b>	<b>1,969.9</b>	<b>2,089.9</b>	<b>2,330.3</b>	<b>2,494.0</b>	<b>2,845.8</b>	<b>3,003.3</b>	<b>3,436.7</b>	<b>3,723.8</b>	<b>3,952.0</b>	<b>4,199.0</b>

To be continued on the next page.

**Table A.9 (continued)**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>By public body</i>											
Ministry of the Interior	862.2	851.5	890.9	922.2	974.8	1,038.8	1,163.2	1,243.3	1,259.5	1,320.2	1,352.5
Ministry of Justice	1,428.1	1,469.7	1,554.5	1,756.6	1,861.4	2,119.4	2,013.0	2,247.3	2,393.4	2,435.1	2,571.8
<i>Of which</i>											
Victim support	7.3	7.1	5.6	6.2	7.2	7.1	8.3	9.1	9.9	8.5	11.1
Violent crime injuries compensation fund	5.5	7.4	6.5	6.4	6.7	7.2	7.8	9.4	12.4	13.9	13.9
Special investigation services and police tasks	359.8	346.8	347.3	372.3	328.1	325.4	108.2	125.6	209.3	137.8	41.6
Netherlands Forensic Institute	19.3	20.9	24.8	25.2	18.6	21.8	24.4	26.6	31.3	35.9	43.1
Public Prosecution Services	197.7	165.0	171.0	188.9	201.0	214.8	243.1	279.2	287.6	302.7	335.3
Council for the Judiciary	53.6	60.5	61.9	74.7	83.4	100.6	127.0	157.2	168.9	173.0	201.3
Supreme Court	5.8	5.8	6.0	6.0	6.9	7.7	8.1	7.4	10.8	10.8	11.3
Correctional Institution services	582.8	642.8	711.8	824.0	938.7	1,143.5	1,133.7	1,228.1	1,271.7	1,330.4	1,483.5
Central Fine Collection Agency	0.2	0.9	2.1	2.7	2.7	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.8	5.6	10.5
Probation and After-Care Services	73.2	90.7	84.8	102.2	117.5	115.2	124.4	139.6	139.8	141.2	137.2
Community Service for juvenile first-time offenders	6.5	7.4	8.0	9.3	9.3	12.3	10.9	12.2	10.4	10.4	10.4
Child Protection Board	23.9	24.4	28.2	31.9	36.8	45.7	47.7	53.9	60.2	58.6	62.5
Youth Care Agency	14.9	16.8	18.4	21.3	17.1	25.1	24.9	28.3	27.2	29.6	30.9
Subsidized legal aid	69.0	67.3	70.0	75.9	77.8	78.8	96.2	118.2	115.7	143.6	144.7
Other	8.4	6.0	8.1	9.6	9.8	10.1	44.0	48.0	33.5	33.0	34.3
Ministry of Defense	65.8	67.0	75.4	83.4	85.6	90.1	93.2	100.2	109.2	114.9	114.2
Ministry of Finance	68.8	71.6	76.2	81.5	87.4	94.3	103.4	102.8	104.5	121.9	123.8
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.9	3.0	3.6	7.0	6.0	5.2	4.8	7.6
Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment	7.3	7.1	3.9	5.0	5.5	4.1	8.3	10.6	10.1	19.9	20.0
Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.3	5.3	6.3	7.2	6.2	5.1
Municipalities, provinces, other ministries			0.9	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.6	3.1	3.4	4.2	4.1
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>By policy area</i>											
victim care	12.7	14.5	13.0	13.6	14.7	15.4	17.6	22.8	26.6	27.6	32.1
investigation and prevention	1,406.1	1,385.4	1,442.4	1,515.1	1,526.2	1,601.2	1,560.6	1,674.6	1,777.2	1,806.9	1,756.0
Prosecution	225.3	195.5	205.7	225.5	241.8	269.6	305.7	345.5	365.5	380.0	411.1
criminal procedures	59.5	66.3	67.9	80.7	90.3	108.3	135.2	164.6	179.7	183.8	212.7
Execution	623.9	687.4	764.0	880.4	998.0	1,212.1	1,208.6	1,306.2	1,345.1	1,402.0	1,572.1
suspect support	108.9	121.9	112.9	139.2	151.6	148.3	166.4	205.9	198.4	226.8	215.1
Total law enforcement	2,436.3	2,471.0	2,606.0	2,854.6	3,022.6	3,355.0	3,394.0	3,719.5	3,892.5	4,027.1	4,199.0
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Expenditure on law enforcement per...</i>											
capita	158	160	168	183	192	212	213	232	241	248	258
victim	746	756	890	879	901	994	1,019	1,144	1,089	1,191	1,246
recorded crime	1,855	2,014	2,191	2,328	2,470	2,612	2,600	2,740	2,736	2,910	3,170

Source: see tables A.3 to A.8.

**Table A.10 Turnover of the security industry, 1995-2002**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>									
<i>Security activities regarding crime prevention*</i>									
personal protection	2.7	3.2	3.6	3.6	8.9	0.2	1.6	5.1	6.6
company security	306.9	369.4	411.3	419.8	477.9	552.9	571.8	695.0	904.4
order services	3.4	4.1	4.6	4.7	4.5	7.5	23.3	30.1	39.2
Security for car parks	2.8	3.3	3.7	3.8	4.0	5.2	4.3	6.6	8.5
<hr/>									
Total	315.8	380.0	423.2	431.9	495.3	565.8	601.0	736.8	958.8
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>									
<i>Security activities regarding crime prevention*</i>									
personal protection	3.3	4.0	4.3	4.3	10.4	0.3	1.7	5.4	6.8
company security	387.0	457.6	500.8	499.1	556.9	630.7	635.8	739.6	930.5
order services	4.3	5.1	5.6	5.6	5.3	8.5	25.9	32.1	40.3
Security for car parks	3.5	4.1	4.5	4.5	4.7	6.0	4.8	7.0	8.8
<hr/>									
Total	398.2	470.8	515.2	513.5	577.3	645.4	668.3	784.1	986.5
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>									
Costs per capita	26	30	33	33	37	41	42	49	61

\* These data refer to organisations with five or more staff. Activities that are not directly related to crime have not been included.  
Source: Statistics Netherlands, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.11 Material damage as a result of common crime, 1992-2002**

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>											
Violent crime	59.9	31.3	82.6	48.1	31.8	49.0	65.0	104.0	6.1		4.7
Theft	796.4	649.4	621.7	772.3	582.7	682.0	547.0	652.0	736.3		1,002.6
<i>of which</i>											
burglary	359.4	253.7	210.6	389.8	236.0	205.0	142.0	218.0	257.0		206.8
bicycle theft	85.8	103.0	82.1	83.0	83.9	98.0	102.0	110.0	189.5		177.9
car theft	128.9	69.0	72.2	84.9	59.9	105.0	80.0	79.0	55.5		86.8
theft from cars	91.2	130.2	106.2	101.2	93.9	143.0	103.0	128.0	140.1		256.0
other theft	131.1	93.5	150.7	113.4	240.0	131.0	120.0	117.0	94.2		275.1
Vandalism	152.9	239.1	271.4	245.9	221.9	437.0	360.0	442.0	582.6		892.1
<i>of which</i>											
damage to cars	115.3	187.9	210.1	199.7	173.3	273.0	237.0	263.0	499.4		643.4
other vandalism	37.7	51.3	61.3	46.3	48.6	164.0	123.0	178.0	83.1		248.7
Hit-and-run accident	182.0	80.8	83.9	104.4	102.6	97.0	73.0	101.0	81.5		129.1
Other crimes									130.0		43.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,191.2</b>	<b>1,000.6</b>	<b>1,059.6</b>	<b>1,170.8</b>	<b>938.9</b>	<b>1,265.0</b>	<b>1,045.0</b>	<b>1,298.0</b>	<b>1,536.5</b>		<b>2,071.7</b>
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>											
Violent crime	79.8	40.6	104.1	59.6	38.7	58.3	75.7	118.6	6.8		4.8
Theft	1,061.0	841.3	783.9	956.7	709.3	810.8	637.4	743.7	818.8		1,031.6
<i>of which</i>											
burglary	478.8	328.6	265.5	482.9	287.3	243.7	165.5	248.7	285.8		212.8
bicycle theft	114.3	133.5	103.6	102.9	102.2	116.5	118.9	125.5	210.7		183.1
car theft	171.7	89.4	91.0	105.1	72.9	124.8	93.2	90.1	61.7		89.3
theft from cars	121.5	168.7	133.9	125.4	114.4	170.0	120.0	146.0	155.8		263.4
other theft	174.7	121.1	190.0	140.5	292.2	155.7	139.8	133.5	104.8		283.0
Vandalism	203.7	309.8	342.2	304.7	270.1	519.5	419.5	504.2	647.8		917.9
<i>of which</i>											
damage to cars	153.6	243.4	264.9	247.3	211.0	324.6	276.2	300.0	555.4		662.0
other vandalism	50.2	66.4	77.2	57.3	59.1	195.0	143.3	203.0	92.4		255.9
Hit-and-run accident	242.4	104.6	105.9	129.3	124.9	115.3	85.1	115.2	90.6		132.9
Other crimes									144.6		44.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,587.0</b>	<b>1,296.4</b>	<b>1,336.0</b>	<b>1,450.3</b>	<b>1,143.0</b>	<b>1,503.9</b>	<b>1,217.8</b>	<b>1,480.6</b>	<b>1,708.6</b>		<b>2,131.5</b>
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>											
Costs per capita	105	85	87	94	74	96	78	94	107		132
Reimbursed by insurance											
company	45%	nb	45%	nb	45%	nb	45%	nb	48%		46%

Source: up to and including 1999 Statistics Netherlands, as of 2000 Police Monitor on Population, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.12 Payments by the Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund, 1994-2004**

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>											
<i>Payments</i>											
material damages	0.9	1.4	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.9	2.3	3.2	3.5
immaterial damages	1.9	3.1	2.7	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.4	4.1	4.3	6.0	6.6
Total	2.9	4.5	3.8	3.9	4.1	4.3	4.7	5.9	6.7	9.2	10.1
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Payments</i>											
material damages	1.2	1.8	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.4	2.0	2.5	3.2	3.5
immaterial damages	2.5	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.9	4.4	4.5	6.1	6.6
Total	3.7	5.7	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.1	5.3	6.4	7.0	9.3	10.1
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>											
<i>Amount paid per..</i>											
capita	0.24	0.37	0.31	0.30	0.32	0.32	0.33	0.40	0.43	0.58	0.62
Victim*	1.15	1.73	1.64	1.46	1.49	1.52	1.60	1.98	1.95	2.76	2.99

\* This concerns all victims of crime, not just victims that have submitted applications.

Source: annual reports Violent Crime Injuries Compensation Fund, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.13 Fraud detected by special investigation services, 1983-2004**

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004		
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>																								
<i>Tax Inquiries and Investigation Service*</i>																								
detected criminal damages**													783.7	434.7	135.7	129.8	239.6	247.1	316.7	409.0	277.0	689.0		
detected tax damages**	64.4	62.2	98.9	142.5	47.6	125.7	54.9	123.4	106.6	159.3	106.2	673.0	521.4	155.6	145.2	240.0	257.6	301.8						
<i>General Inspectorate</i>																								
detected unlawfully obtained advantage																				1.8				
<i>Social Inquiries and Investigation Service</i>																								
social security contributions lost																						16.7	18.0	
tax lost																						43.4	26.8	
social damages***																							39.7	
<i>Housing and Environment Inquiries and Investigation Service</i>																								
housing benefit fraud																					0.4	1.2	1.2	
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>																								
<i>Tax Inquiries and Investigation Service*</i>																								
detected criminal damages**													1013.4	545.3	169.2	159.0	290.4	291.3	357.9	442.7	289.6	702.1		
detected tax damages**	100.0	93.4	145.5	209.6	70.2	186.6	80.8	178.0	148.8	214.1	139.3	870.3	654.0	194.1	177.9	290.9	303.7	341.0						
<i>General Inspectorate</i>																								
detected unlawfully obtained advantage																					2.0			
<i>Social Inquiries and Investigation Service</i>																								
social security contributions lost																						17.0	18.0	
tax lost																						44.2	26.8	
social damages***																							39.7	
<i>Housing and Environment Inquiries and Investigation Service</i>																								
housing benefit fraud																						0.4	1.2	1.2

\* As of 2000, including the Economic Investigation Service.

\*\* Criminal damage is the detected damage as laid down in the official police reports for all investigations conducted on tax fraud and customs fraud. Tax damage is the detected damage as laid down in tax reports to the tax authorities. In 2003 the figure includes 1 investigation with 325 mln euro worth of fraud.

\*\*\* Social damage refers to the assumed yield arising from identity fraud detected. On the basis of data from the Ministry of Justice, the potential damage amount for a false or forged identity document can be estimated at € 36,300.

Source: budget Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, annual reports tax authorities, the Tax Inquiries and Information Service, General Inspectorate, Social Inquiries and Investigation Service, Housing and Environment Inquiries and Investigation Service.



**Table A.14 Suspicious unusual transactions, 1999-2004**

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>						
Total amount	385.7	499.0	1,100.0	860.7	1,552.0	3,238.0
<i>Notified by</i>						
money transfers organisations	6.9	11.6	33.4	52.7	99.1	114.4
dealers in high-value goods				12.2	21.1	59.6
independent professionals					35.5	108.9
customs and tax authorities				214.6	81.2	46.5
traditional notifiers				581.2	1,315.2	2,908.6
<i>of which</i>						
money exchange offices				68.2		
banks				469.5		
casino's				10.5		
credit card companies				32.6		
life insurers, stock brokers, insurance brokers				0.4		
<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>						
Total amount	440.0	554.9	1,170.7	885.6	1,570.4	3,238.0
<i>Notified by</i>						
money transfers organisations	7.9	12.9	35.5	54.2	100.3	114.4
dealers in high-value goods				12.6	21.3	59.6
independent professionals					35.9	108.9
customs and tax authorities				220.8	82.1	46.5
traditional notifiers				598.0	1,330.7	2,908.6
<i>of which</i>						
money exchange offices				70.2		
banks				483.1		
casino's				10.8		
credit card companies				33.5		
life insurers, stock brokers, insurance brokers				0.4		
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>						
Costs per capita		35	73	55	97	199

Source: annual reports Unusual Transactions Unit, adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.

**Table A.15 Overview social costs**

	Source	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Estimated annual costs mln euro, price level 2004	
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>																				
<i>Prevention measures corporate sector</i>																				
Turnover security industry regarding crime prevention*	a)							315.8	380.0	423.2	431.9	495.3	565.8	601.0	736.8	958.8			986.5	
<i>Prevention measures by industry</i>																				
Construction	b)												44.0				58.0		58.7	
Transport, storage and communication	b)												51.7				58.0		58.7	
Retail trade	c)				317.6				281.3						220.0	270.0	290.0		293.4	
Catering	b)																37.0		37.4	
Financial and commercial services	b)																156.0		157.8	
Culture, sport and other services	b)												39.0						44.5	
Combination of industries	d)							1,134.5	1,134.5	1,134.5					643.0					
<b>Subtotal</b>																			<b>1,637.1</b>	
<i>Prevention measures households (price level 2004)</i>																				
Extra lights, locks, alarm, guard dog	e)				1,104.8	1,210.8	1,253.7	1,221.7	1,179.2	1,337.9	1,434.5	1,118.8	1,196.4	1,209.3	1,195.3	1,432.0	1,197.8		1,197.8	
<b>Subtotal</b>																			<b>1,197.8</b>	
<i>Other prevention measures</i>																				
Theft and fire insurance	f)													306.0	347.3	367.0	478.9		484.6	
Voluntary contributions to victim support	g)								0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	1.5	2.0	2.3			2.4	
<b>Subtotaal</b>																			<b>486.9</b>	

To be continued on the next page.

**Table A.15 (continued)**

	Source	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Estimated annual costs 2004
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>																			<i>mln euro, price level 2004</i>
<i>Damages for the government</i>																			
Tax and economic fraud	h)							783.7	434.7	135.7	129.8	239.6	247.1	316.7	409.0	277.0	689.0		702.1
detected unlawfully obtained advantage	i)														1.8				2.0
Severe social security fraud	j)				72.1	95.0	127.6	129.8	118.8	87.6	71.7						60.1	44.8	44.8
Less severe social security fraud	k)															82.6	90.4	95.7	95.7
housing benefit fraud	l)															0.4	1.2	1.2	1.2
identity card fraud	j)																	39.7	39.7
<b>Subtotal</b>																			<b>885.5</b>
<i>Damages for the corporate sector</i>																			
<i>Material damage by industry</i>																			
Construction	b)												163.4		131.0		120.0		121.4
Transport, storage and communication	m)												152.0	54.5	37.0		74.0		74.9
Retail trade	c)			612.6				549.1				680.7			530.0	750.0	780.0		789.2
Catering	b)									113.4					46.0		46.0		46.5
Financial and commercial services	b)														98.0		175.0		177.1
Culture, sport and other services	b)											20.0			75.0				79.8
Agriculture	b)														60.0				63.9
Industry	b)														75.0				79.8
Health care and Welfare	b)														57.0				60.7
Wholesale	b)														122.0				129.8
Public administration and education	b)														59.0				62.8
Combination of industries	n)	680.7				680.7		340.3	340.3	340.3									
Internal fraude	o)												93.0		263.0	200.0	210.0	5,714.0	5,714.0
Insurance fraud by insured persons	p)																	500.0	500.0
Energy theft	q)																	200.0	200.0
Loss of income due to interrupted prodction	b)												200.0		244.0		119.5		120.9
sick leave by victims	r)							529.8				578.6		632.4		758.7			780.6
<b>Subtotal</b>																			<b>9,001.5</b>

To be continued on the next page.

**Table A.15 (continued)**

	Source	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Estimated annual costs mln euro, price level 2004
<i>mln euro, nominal</i>																			
<i>Damages for households</i>																			
Material damage	e)					1,191.2	1,000.6	1,059.6	1,170.8	938.9	1,265.0	1,045.0	1,298.0	1,536.5		2,071.7			2,131.5
Bank card fraud	s)																	1.1	1.1
Injuries	f)															146.5			150.7
Child abuse	t)																	435.0	435.0
<b>Subtotal</b>																			<b>2,718.3</b>
<b>Total social costs</b>																			<b>15,927.1</b>
<i>euro, price level 2004</i>																			
<i>Social cost of crime per...</i>																			
Capita (2004)																			979
Victim (2004)																			4,727
Recorded crime (2004)																			12,024

Source: a) Statistics Netherlands; b) Trade and Industry Crime Monitor; c) Retail trade; d) Stichting Trendmeter; e) up to and incl.1999 Statistics Netherlands, since 2000 Police Monitor on Population; f) Statistics Netherlands, Police Monitor on Population; g) Annual report Victim Support Netherlands; h) budget Ministry of Finance, annual reports Tax Service and Tax Inquiries and Investigation Service; i) budget Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, annual reports General Inspectorate; j) budget Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, annual reports Social Inquiries and Investigation Service; k) Statistics Netherlands, budget Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment; l) budget Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment, annual reports Housing and Environment Inquiries and Investigation Service; m) Trade and Industry Crime Monitor; 2000: Public Prosecution Service; n) Stichting Trendmeter, Trade and Industry Crime Monitor, Statistics Netherlands; o) Dutch Association of Insurers ; p) Platform Energy Theft; q) Hoffmann (2005); r) Smulders et al. (1999), Police Monitor on Population, Statistics Netherlands, Vektis, s) Consumers' Association; t) Meerding (2005); adapted by the Research and Documentation Centre.