



Ministry
of Justice

Guide to Proven Reoffending Statistics

Published October 2018

Contents

Contents	2
1. Introduction	3
2. Measuring reoffending	4
2.1. Definitions for the measurement of proven reoffending.....	5
2.2. Definitions for the measurement of interim proven reoffending for Community Rehabilitation Companies and the National Probation Service	11
2.3. Comparing the effectiveness of sentences.....	22
3. Data quality	22
3.1. Police National Computer data.....	24
3.2. Probation data (nDelius).....	24
3.3. Prison data	25
3.4. Young offenders in secure accommodation	26
3.5. Data processing and analysis	26
3.6. Matching offender records for proven reoffending.....	27
4. Confidentiality	29
5. Users	30
Appendix A: Glossary of terms	31
A.1. Reoffending.....	31
A.2. Disposal (sentence type).....	32
A.3. Pre-CJA03 Court Orders – Community sentences.....	33
A.4. Youth disposal (sentence type).....	34
A.5. First-tier penalties.....	34
A.6. Miscellaneous terms.....	35
Appendix B: Explanatory notes	37
Contact details	38

1. Introduction

This document provides a comprehensive guide to the quarterly Proven Reoffending Statistics bulletin. It covers:

- the concepts and definitions published in the Ministry of Justice statistics and the counting procedures used to produce them;
- a comparison of the effectiveness of different sentence types;
- an explanation of the data sources and quality; and
- the users of the Proven Reoffending quarterly bulletin.

This bulletin is published alongside two inter-related bulletins:

Offender Management Statistics Quarterly: provides key statistics relating to offenders who are in prison or under Probation Service supervision.

Safety in Custody Statistics Quarterly: provides statistics on death, self-harm and assault incidents whilst in prison custody.

In February 2015, various reforms to the management and rehabilitation of offenders in the community in England and Wales were introduced. These included:

- opening up the market to a diverse range of rehabilitation providers from the private, voluntary and social sectors through 21 Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs);
- using a 'payment by results' approach to develop and implement effective ways of rehabilitating offenders and rewarding providers that devise and deliver the most effective rehabilitation programmes;
- extending statutory rehabilitation to short-sentenced offenders released from prison, who have the highest reoffending rates and yet previously received no supervision after release;
- reorganising the prisons to resettle offenders 'through the gate', with continuous support from custody to community; and
- creating a new public sector National Probation Service (NPS) to manage high-risk offenders.

Following implementation of these reforms, a public consultation was run in summer 2015, proposing various changes to the Proven Reoffending National Statistics in order to support the reforms to the system and ensure the Ministry of Justice continued to meet its commitment of statistical best practice by giving a coherent overview of all statistics relating to reoffending.

Recent changes

This is the fifth publication of proven reoffending statistics based on the new methodology, as announced in '[Response to consultation on changes to proven reoffending statistics](#)' in April 2016 and previous publications. The main changes to the methodology are:

- **Changing to a three-month cohort** instead of the previous twelve-month cohort. The publication reports on offenders who are released from custody, received a non-custodial conviction at court, or received a caution within a three-month period, for all measures of reoffending, including for juveniles.
- Production of **adjusted reoffending rates** for adults (alongside the raw rates), using the Offender Group Reconviction Scale (OGRS4/G) to take account of the influence that differences in offender mix can have on the binary reoffending rates.
- A change from **calendar year to financial year for annual figures**. Annual figures are formed by taking a weighted average of the four preceding three-month offender cohorts. Figures for the April 2015 to March 16 financial year were published in January 2018. The next annual figures will be published in January 2019.

In addition, **the data source** used to compile the statistics has changed from October 2015 following probation services reforms. For more information on the impact of these changes please see [How the measure of proven reoffending has changed and the effect of these changes](#).


2. Measuring reoffending

The underlying principle of measuring reoffending (or recidivism, which is the most commonly used term internationally) is that someone who has received some form of criminal-justice sanction (such as a conviction or a caution) goes on to commit another offence within a set time period.

Measuring true reoffending is difficult. Official records are taken from either the police or courts, but they will underestimate the true level of reoffending because only a proportion of crime is detected and sanctioned and not all crimes and sanctions are recorded on one central system. Other methods of measuring reoffending, such as self-report studies, are likely to also underestimate the rate.

Following the Ministry of Justice *Consultation on Improvements to Ministry of Justice Statistics*, a **proven reoffence** is defined as any offence committed in a one-year follow-up period that resulted in a court conviction, or caution in the one-year follow-up or a further six month waiting period (to allow time for cases to progress through the courts), as shown in the diagram below. The data source is an extract of the Police National Computer (PNC) held by the Ministry of Justice.

For example, an offender enters the cohort if they are released from custody, received a non-custodial conviction at court or received a caution in a given three-month period (latest publication based on October to December 2016).



The group of offenders whose offending behaviour is proven are likely to be a sub-group of all active offenders. The *Offending, Crime and Justice Survey (2003)*¹ estimated that around one in ten people in England and Wales aged between 10 and 65 had committed an offence in the previous 12 months, which translates into approximately 3.8 million people. This compares to around 629,000 offenders in the April 2005–March 2006² cohort used to measure proven reoffending, underlining that the offenders whose proven reoffending behaviour is presented in the *Proven Reoffending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin* are a small and probably unrepresentative sample of the population of all active offenders.

2.1. Definitions for the measurement of proven reoffending

Quarterly cohort

This is the group of offenders for whom reoffending is measured. For the *Proven Reoffending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin*, this is defined as all offenders in a given three-month period who received a caution, a final warning or reprimand (for juveniles prior to April 2013), a non-custodial conviction or who were released from custody.

Offenders who were released from custody or secure accommodation (juveniles only) or commenced a court order are matched to the PNC database. A proportion of cases are lost in this process because they cannot be matched (see [section 3.6](#) below for further details). Additionally, offenders who appear multiple times in the cohort are only included once (see section "[Multiple offender entries](#)" below for further details).

¹ The Offending, Crime and Justice Survey (2003) was a random probability survey of 10,079 people aged from 10 to 65 and asked people about their offending history. Like any such survey, its accuracy is dependent upon the level of honesty with which respondents completed the survey.

² This annual figure is formed by taking a weighted average of the four preceding three-month offender cohorts.

Annual cohort

Annual figures are calculated by taking an average of the four preceding three-month offender cohorts. There was a data source change in October 2015, so users should be careful when using the April 2015 to March 2016 cohort and any subsequent annual figures to compare to the April 2014 to March 2015 cohort and earlier years. Annual figures are published in January each year.

The annual figures are largely provided to allow geographical breakdowns. Some of the geographical breakdowns provided would not be possible with quarterly data, due to small cohort sizes. In addition, they are provided to allow comparisons across years without the variability of the quarterly data.

Index disposal (sentence type)

The index disposal of the offender is the type of sentence the offender received for their index offence. For the *Proven Reoffending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin*, this is defined as custody; court order; or other disposal resulting from a conviction at court, such as a fine or discharge, caution, reprimand or final warning (young offenders).

Index offence

The index offence is the proven offence that leads to an offender being included in the cohort. An offence is only counted as an index offence if it is:

- recordable (see the definition [Proven reoffence](#) below);
- committed in England and Wales;
- prosecuted by the police; and
- not a breach offence.

Start point (index date)

This is the point in time from when proven reoffences are measured. For the *Proven Reoffending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin*, this is defined as the date of prison release, the date of court conviction for non-custodial sentences, or the date of receipt for a caution, reprimand or final warning.

Follow-up period


This is the length of time over which proven reoffending is measured. For the *Proven Reoffending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin*, this is defined as 12 months from the start point.

Waiting period

This is the additional time beyond the follow-up period to allow for offences which are committed towards the end of the follow-up period to be proven by a court, resulting in a conviction, caution, reprimand or final warning. For the *Proven Reoffending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin*, this is six months.

Figure 1 illustrates why different offences for an example offender are included or excluded in the proven reoffending measure.

Figure 1: How events of reoffending are included in the measure?



Events A to D all occur in the one-year follow-up period, but events E and F are outside this period, so would not be counted. Events A to C are all counted because they were all proven within the one-year follow-up period or the further six month waiting period. Event D would not be counted as the conviction happened outside of the one-year follow-up, or the six-month waiting period. The offender has, therefore, committed six proven offences during the one-year follow-up period (two for event A, one for event B and, three for event C).

Proven reoffence

Offences are counted as proven reoffences if they meet all of the following criteria:

- They are recordable. Not all offences are on the PNC, and more recordable offences than non-recordable offences are entered. Analysis comparing offences proven at court with offences recorded on the PNC suggests the most common offences that are not recorded relate to motor vehicles, e.g. using a motor vehicle whilst uninsured against third-party risks, speeding offences or keeping a vehicle on the highway without a driving licence, or television-licence-fee evasion.
- They were committed in England or Wales.
- They are offences that were prosecuted by the police. PNC data are collected and entered by the police, and offences prosecuted by the police are likely to be recorded more comprehensively on the PNC than offences prosecuted by other organisations. For example, benefit fraud is prosecuted by the Department for Work and Pensions. Therefore, benefit fraud offences may be poorly represented on the PNC.
- Offences are only counted if they are proven through caution, reprimands or final warnings (for juveniles) and court convictions. Offences that are not proven, or which are met with other responses from the Criminal Justice System, are not counted. The *Offending, Crime and Justice Survey (2003)* estimated that 6% of all offences resulted in any contact with the Criminal Justice System.

- The offence is not a breach offence, i.e. breach of a court order, since we are only interested in new offences.

If an offender commits multiple offences on the same day, each offence will be counted separately. For example, if an offender commits three offences on the same day, this will count as three reoffences.

Adjusted proven reoffending rates

As proven reoffending is related to the characteristics of offenders, the actual rate of proven reoffending will depend, in part, on the characteristics of offenders coming into the system. The actual reoffending rate provides users with sufficient information on what the level of reoffending is and how it is changing over time. Additionally, the Offender Group Reconviction Score (OGRS) 4/G has been used to adjust the raw reoffending rates for adults, to take account of the influence that differences in the offender mix can have on the binary reoffending rates. OGRS-adjusted rates will also be used to determine Payment by Result outcomes. The consultation response suggested using the Youth Offender Group Reconviction Scale to adjust the reoffending rate for juveniles. This has not proved possible to date, but further work is ongoing.

Measures of proven reoffending


Proven reoffending data are presented in the following ways:

- the number of offenders;
- the proportion of offenders who are proven reoffenders;
- the adjusted proven reoffending rate for adults;
- the Offender Group Reconviction Scale (OGRS) average score for adults;
- the average number of proven reoffences among reoffenders; and
- the proportion of proven offenders who committed a proven indictable reoffence.

Multiple offender entries

Each offender is tracked over a fixed period of time and any proven offence committed in this period is counted as a proven reoffence. A multiple offender entry refers to an offender who, after entering the cohort in a three-month period, commits a reoffence and is either cautioned, discharged from prison or gets a non-custodial conviction in the same period. This reoffence could also be included as a second entry for this offender into the cohort.

Figure 2: Example of an offender with multiple offender entries



To date, publications have avoided the double counting of these multiple offender entries (MOE) by only counting an individual once based on their first proven offence in the relevant time period. In the illustration above, the caution would be counted as the index disposal and the further two proven offences would be counted as reoffences. This avoids double counting of proven offenders.

Since the recent change from a 12-month to a three-month cohort, annual cohorts are formed by combining the four quarterly cohorts of the relevant year. An individual offender can, therefore, appear up to four times within a single annual cohort (one from each quarter). This can lead to an increase of reoffending rates for the annual cohort compared to the old methodology based on a 12-month cohort, since prolific offenders may be counted multiple times.

Additionally, since any individual three-month cohort contains fewer offenders than a 12-month cohort would, three-month cohorts are subject to greater statistical fluctuations. Therefore, their results are likely to vary more than those of 12-month cohorts.

In this publication, the main tables (tables A1 to A7 and B1 to B4) in the report have been produced on the basis of the 'first proven offence in the relevant time period', which led to an offender being included. This provides a picture of proven reoffending which tracks an offender, irrespective of the disposal they receive, to when they commit a proven reoffence.

Table 1 shows the number of offenders in each cohort period by their number of entries.

The number of offenders with multiple entries has remained fairly constant over time—the proportion of the total that had multiple offender entries has remained around 5% to 7% between April 2005–March 2006 and April 2015–March 2016.

Table 1: Number of offenders and their respective number of entries from April 2005 – March 2006 to April 2015 – March 2016 cohorts³

	<i>New Data Source</i>										
Multiple Offender Entries	Apr 2005 to Mar 2006	Apr 2006 to Mar 2007	Apr 2007 to Mar 2008	Apr 2008 to Mar 2009	Apr 2009 to Mar 2010	Apr 2010 to Mar 2011	Apr 2011 to Mar 2012	Apr 2012 to Mar 2013	Apr 2013 to Mar 2014	Apr 2014 to Mar 2015	Apr 2015 to Mar 2016¹
1	779,954	811,882	825,173	789,751	738,014	693,243	650,559	586,211	557,904	520,162	487,522
2x	42,053	43,298	46,096	46,110	44,292	44,596	42,817	36,295	35,284	32,083	30,965
3x	4,240	4,116	4,838	5,124	5,147	5,514	5,584	4,745	4,656	4,264	3,842
4x	643	660	772	893	1,044	1,042	1,088	920	916	775	692
5x	155	172	194	243	239	274	290	243	234	203	140
6 - 10x	127	113	107	161	170	165	142	145	121	100	74
Greater than 10x	9	5	13	12	7	14	11	2	12	9	2
Total MOEs	47,227	48,364	52,020	52,543	50,899	51,605	49,932	42,350	41,223	37,434	35,715
% of total cohort (pp)	5.7	5.6	5.9	6.2	6.5	6.9	7.1	6.7	6.9	6.7	6.8
Cohort	827,181	860,246	877,193	842,294	788,913	744,848	700,491	628,561	599,127	557,596	523,237

1. The annual average figures for 2015/16 have been calculated by taking an average of the four preceding three month offender cohorts. There is a data source change in the middle of 2015/16 and users should be careful when using this figure to compare to previous years.

³ Annual cohorts are currently available up to April 2015 to March 2016 and are formed by taking a weighted average of the four preceding three-month offender cohorts.

Proven reoffending by disposal, probation trust and prison

In order to measure proven reoffending on a consistent and representative basis by offender management groups, it is necessary to distinguish between the disposal types, i.e. sentence types, that led to an offender being included. Doing this allows the cohort to be defined according to the relative start point of an offender's interaction with the prison (released from custody) or probation services (court order commencement).

Tables C1–C3 provide reoffending data by disposal types. These are produced on the basis of an individual's first disposal in that category. In figure 2 above, the individual could appear once in the caution category, once in the community order category and once in the custody category. These tables include an overall prison and probation proven reoffending rate.

These figures should not be used when comparing proven reoffending rates across different disposals to compare effectiveness of sentences. Instead, the [Compendium of Reoffending Statistics and Analysis 2013](#) publication should be referred to, as this analysis controls for offender characteristics in order to give a more reliable estimate of the relative effectiveness of different disposals (also see [section 2.3](#), Comparing the effectiveness of sentences). Please note that statistics published in the Compendium of Reoffending Statistics and Analysis publication are based on the previous reoffending methodology, and so are not directly comparable with the figures published alongside this guide.

The prison/youth secure accommodation/probation trust data tool (published annually) provides reoffending rates by individual prison and former probation trust, and National Probation Service Division (NPS). These are produced on the basis of an individual's first disposal from each specified prison or probation trust. If the individual offender is discharged from two different prisons in the year, they will appear in both of the prisons' reoffending rates. The same applies for offenders commencing court orders in more than one probation trust within the year. This is to allow prisons and probation services to track their caseload of offenders. Due to data quality issues, prisons data is only available until September 2015. Work is ongoing to improve the quality of this information, with the aim of resuming production in future.

2.2. Definitions for the measurement of interim proven reoffending for Community Rehabilitation Companies and the National Probation Service

The Transforming Rehabilitation reforms included opening up the probation service to a diverse range of rehabilitation providers from the private, voluntary and social sectors through 21 Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs) and creating a new public sector National Probation Service (NPS) to manage high-risk offenders.

A Payment by Results (PbR) approach was adopted for the 21 CRCs to develop and implement effective ways of rehabilitating offenders and reward providers that devise and deliver effective rehabilitation programmes.

Final reoffending results for the CRC PbR offender cohorts are based on a **one-year proven reoffending measure**. The October 2017 publication was the first to feature one-year proven reoffending statistics for PbR and these will continue to be published on a quarterly basis. In order to allow for CRCs' progress to be assessed at the earliest opportunity, the Ministry of Justice also publishes **interim reoffending results** before the publication of final results. These interim results are based on a **reoffending-to-date measure**. Equivalent interim figures for the NPS divisions are also produced. These estimates will only give a broad indication of progress and, therefore, care should be taken when interpreting them.

The following two reoffending measures will be used to assess CRC and NPS performance:

- the **binary** rate (proportion of offenders who reoffend); and
- the **frequency** rate (the average number of reoffences per reoffender).

The binary rate for each CRC is subject to an adjustment for changes in the case mix of offenders being supervised, using the Offender Group Reconviction Scale (OGRS), version 4/G, to allow performance to be assessed against the baseline year 2011⁴. This is referred to as the **adjusted binary reoffending rate**.

Owing to CRC contract variations, two changes have been made to the binary and frequency measures, for assessing CRC performance:

1. An additional adjustment has been made to the **adjusted binary reoffending rate** to account for a change in the data source in October 2015, as explained in the published technical note⁵.
2. As announced in the 'Strengthening probation, building confidence' consultation document⁶, the baseline year, against which CRC performance on the frequency of reoffending is compared, has now changed. All CRCs are now compared against a 2015/16 baseline, with the exception of Merseyside CRC, which has retained the 2011 baseline.

Both adjustments have been applied retrospectively to all CRC cohorts from October 2015 onwards. To aid the user, and in the interests of transparency, we publish the actual binary rates in the tables before any adjustments alongside the adjusted binary rates. Further information on these changes is available in the "[Changes to the CRC contracts](#)" section below.

⁴ The 2011 PbR baselines and associated methodology documents are available at: www.gov.uk/government/collections/transforming-rehabilitation

⁵ www.gov.uk/government/publications/changes-to-community-rehabilitation-companies-contracts

⁶ consult.justice.gov.uk/hm-prisons-and-probation/strengthening-probation-building-confidence

Note that results for the NPS have not changed since they are not compared against a baseline threshold in the same way.

Cohort


This is the group of offenders for whom reoffending is measured. For the *Final and Interim Proven Reoffending Statistics for the Community Rehabilitation Companies and the National Probation Service Bulletin*, this is defined as all adult offenders in any one quarter (April to June, July to September, October to December, January to March) who begin a community order, a suspended sentence order or who were released from custody. For CRC proven reoffending, this group represents the **eligible cohort**.

Offenders who were released from custody or commenced a court order are matched to the PNC database. A small proportion of cases cannot be matched to the PNC and are therefore excluded from any further analysis. See [section 3.6](#) for further details on the matching procedure. For CRC proven reoffending, **eligible** offenders that can be matched to the PNC database represent the **measurable cohort**. This is the group for whom reoffending can be measured.

Offenders who appear multiple times in the cohort are only included once (see the section below titled "[Multiple offender entries](#)" for further details).

Offenders are only included in a CRC's PbR cohort the first time they commence an eligible sentence (see below for exclusions) in the three-month period. The same methodology will be used for each NPS division's proven reoffending performance measure.

Figure 3: Which offenders are included/excluded from the PbR cohort?



The cohort is extracted from the nDelius case management system (for further information on nDelius, please see [section 3.2](#) below on “Probation data” under “Data quality”) on the 20th day of the end month of the following quarter. For example, the January to March 2017 cohort was extracted on the 20 June 2017. A schedule of extraction dates is provided in the table below:

Table 2: Quarterly cohort nDelius extraction dates

Quarterly cohort	Planned nDelius extraction date⁷
January to March 2018	20 June 2018
April to June 2018	20 September 2018
July to September 2018	20 December 2018
October to December 2018	20 March 2019
January to March 2019	20 June 2019

Matching to the PNC

See [section 3.6](#) for details on the matching procedure.

Index offence

The index offence is the proven offence that leads to an offender being included in the cohort. An offence is only counted as an index offence if it is:

- recordable (see below);
- committed in England and Wales;
- prosecuted by the police; and
- not a breach offence.

Start point (index date)

This is the set point in time from when proven reoffences are measured. For the *Interim Proven Reoffending Statistics for CRCs and NPS Quarterly Bulletin*, this is defined as the date of prison release or the date of sentence for court orders.


Follow-up period for interim results

This is the length of time over which proven reoffending is measured. For the *Interim Proven Reoffending Statistics for CRCs and NPS Quarterly Bulletin*, instead of measuring reoffending with a defined follow-up and waiting period, this interim estimate will count any proven reoffending to date as recorded on the Ministry of Justice's PNC data extract (see diagrams below).

For example, interim statistics for the **October to December 2017** offender cohort will, therefore, include any proven reoffences committed between 1 October 2017 and 3 August 2018. This will mean that some offenders in the three-month cohort will have had a longer follow-up period in which to reoffend than others, e.g. an 'offender start' on the 1 October 2017 will have had up to 10 months to reoffend, whereas an 'offender start' on the 31 December 2017 will have had up to seven months to reoffend as shown in the diagram below. Note that the reoffending and waiting periods are limited to 12 and 6 months, respectively.


⁷ Subject to change if factors outside our control (e.g. technical or resource issues) prevent extraction on these dates.

January to March 2017 cohort




An offender enters the cohort if they are released from custody or are sentenced to a community order or a suspended sentence order in the period January to March 2017.

April to June 2017 cohort




An offender enters the cohort if they are released from custody or are sentenced to a community order or a suspended sentence order in the period April to June 2017.

July to September 2017 cohort



An offender enters the cohort if they are released from custody or are sentenced to a community order or a suspended sentence order in the period July to September 2017.

October to December 2017 cohort




An offender enters the cohort if they are released from custody or are sentenced to a community order or a suspended sentence order in the period October to December 2017.


Follow-up period for final results

The final reoffending results for the CRC and NPS offender cohorts will be based on a **one-year proven reoffending measure**. One-year proven reoffending is defined as any offence committed in a one-year follow-up period that leads to a court conviction or caution in the one-year follow-up period or within a further six-month waiting period to allow the offence to be proven in court, as shown in the diagrams below.


January to March 2017 cohort




April to June 2017 cohort



July to September 2017 cohort



October to December 2017 cohort



Proven reoffence

See definition in the [section on measurement of proven reoffending](#).

Measures of interim proven reoffending

Interim proven reoffending data are presented in the following ways:

- the number of eligible offenders;

- the number of measurable offenders;
- the proportion of measurable offenders who are proven reoffenders;
- the average number of proven reoffences among **reoffenders**; and
- the average Offender Group Reconviction Scale score.

Multiple offender entries

Each individual offender is allocated to a quarterly cohort only once, based on their first eligible entry in a given quarter. However, for the final results, annual cohorts will be formed by combining the four quarterly cohorts of the relevant year. An individual offender can, therefore, appear up to four times within a single annual cohort (one from each quarter).

Interim proven reoffending by CRCs and NPS divisions

An offender can move within the three-month cohort period, and supervision can be transferred to another CRC provider. An offender can also be transferred from being supervised by a CRC to being supervised by an NPS division if a high-risk offence is committed within the three months. If an offender is managed by more than one CRC or NPS division within the same three-month cohort period, reoffending is measured against the first CRC or NPS division the offender is allocated to.

Offender Group Reconviction Scale

For the final reoffending results, CRCs' performance in reducing reoffending will be assessed against the baseline year of 2011. As proven reoffending is related to the characteristics of offenders, the actual rate of proven reoffending will depend, in part, on the characteristics of offenders coming into the system. This actual rate provides users with sufficient information on what the level of reoffending is and how it is changing over time.

In addition to the actual rate, the Offender Group Reconviction Scale (OGRS), version 4/G⁸ is used to control for some differences in offender characteristics across different offender groups. OGRS4/G is based on a well-established, peer-reviewed methodology for assessing and representing reoffending risk⁹.

OGRS4/G uses age, gender and criminal history to assess the reoffending risk of a given group of offenders by producing a score between 0 and 1. These scores can be used to compare the relative likelihood of reoffending either over time or between different groups of offenders, with a higher score meaning a group of offenders is more likely to reoffend.

For the final reoffending results, the reoffending rate for each CRC will be adjusted by using OGRS4/G, to take account of the influence that differences in offender mix

⁸ For further details on OGRS4 see Chapter 8 of the publication at: www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/449357/research-analysis-offender-assessment-system.pdf

⁹ For further details on how to access the OGRS4 methodology, please contact the Crown Copyright and Licences team within the HM Prison and Probation Service at crowncopyright@noms.gsi.gov.uk

can have on binary rates. OGRS4/G-adjusted rates will be used to determine final PbR outcomes. The frequency rate will not be adjusted.

The OGRS4/G-adjusted reoffending rate for a given CRC cohort will be calculated as the observed reoffending rate for that cohort plus any difference between the OGRS4/G score in that cohort and the 2011 baseline cohort for that CRC. This calculation standardises the mix of offenders in each cohort of a given CRC to the 2011 mix for that same CRC.

It will not be possible to adjust the reoffending rate for interim results because OGRS4/G only offers a one-year and a two-year prediction of reoffending, whereas interim results are based upon a reoffending-to-date measure.

Changes to the CRC contracts

Adjustment to the binary result

1. The data source for offender starts in each PbR cohort changed between the procurement process for CRC contracts and the measurement of outcomes for the first PbR cohort: moving from pNOMIS (prison releases) and Form 20 (community order / suspended sentence starts) to nDelius (the case management system for probation).
2. The Ministry of Justice explored the reoffending results, and found a difference in the overall binary reoffending measures of changing data source¹⁰. Further analysis found this would have had a subsequent impact on the PbR mechanism, i.e. the “adjusted” binary rate that incorporates OGRS4/G adjustments.
3. As a consequence, the Ministry of Justice decided to make an adjustment to the binary reoffending rate for all CRCs. The adjustment is a reduction in the binary reoffending rate of 0.44. Further information on the data source adjustment and the analysis is available in the PbR Technical note¹¹.

¹⁰ www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/658380/how-the-measure-of-reoffending-has-changed-and-the-effect-of-these-changes.pdf

¹¹ www.gov.uk/government/publications/changes-to-community-rehabilitation-companies-contracts

Adjustment to the frequency result

1. In July 2018, the Ministry of Justice launched a public consultation about the future of probation services¹². In order to stabilise probation delivery in the immediate term, the Ministry of Justice announced an adjustment to the baseline year against which we compare performance on the frequency of reoffending. This was to better reflect the performance of providers since contracts began.
2. As a result, all CRCs are now compared against a 2015/16 frequency baseline, with the exception of Merseyside which has retained its 2011 baseline.

Both the adjustment to the frequency and binary has been applied retrospectively to all CRC cohorts from October 2015 onwards.

Publication timetable

Table 3: Publication timetable of interim and final results for CRCs and NPS divisions

Publication date	Interim reoffending results	One-year reoffending results
	Quarterly cohort	Quarterly cohort
October 2016	Oct15 to Dec15	-
January 2017	Jan16 to Mar16	-
April 2017	Apr16 to Jun16	-
July 2017	Jul16 to Sep16	-
October 2017	Oct16 to Dec16	Oct15 to Dec15
January 2018	Jan17 to Mar17	Jan16 to Mar16
April 2018	Apr17 to Jun17	Apr16 to Jun16
July 2018	Jul17 to Sep17	Jul16 to Sep16
October 2018	Oct17 to Dec17	Oct16 to Dec16
January 2019	Jan18 to Mar18	Jan17 to Mar17
April 2019	Apr18 to Jun18	Apr17 to Jun17
July 2019	Jul18 to Sep18	Jul17 to Sep17
October 2019	Oct18 to Dec18	Oct17to Dec17

¹² consult.justice.gov.uk/hm-prisons-and-probation/strengthening-probation-building-confidence/

2.3. Comparing the effectiveness of sentences

Proven reoffending rates by disposal (sentence type) should not be compared to assess the effectiveness of sentences, as there is no control for known differences in offender characteristics and the type of sentence given.

The report '[The impact of short custodial sentences, Community Orders and Suspended Sentence Orders on reoffending](#)' compares like for like offenders, which enables a more reliable comparison of proven reoffending rates between offenders receiving different sentences. This is based on the previous reoffending methodology, and so is not directly comparable with the figures published alongside this guide.

In the '[2013 Compendium of Re-offending Statistics and Analysis](#)', suspended sentence orders had a lower reoffending rate than matched offenders given community orders (3.2 percentage points for 2010);

Other non-custodial sentences are compared in Annex D of the [Proven reoffending statistics quarterly bulletin, January to December 2014, England and Wales](#).

3. Data quality


The data required for measuring proven reoffending are based on a range of sources (prison data, probation data, young offenders in secure accommodation and criminal records from the Police National Computer) from a range of agencies (Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service¹³, the Youth Justice Board, local authorities and the National Police Improvement Agency). These figures have been derived from administrative IT systems that, as with any large scale recording system, are subject to possible errors with data entry and processing.

The diagram below shows the data sources used to compile the proven reoffending statistics up until the September 2015 cohort (before October 2017 publication), and those used for the October 2015 cohort onwards (October 2017 publication).


¹³ Formerly known as the National Offender Management Service (NOMS).

Data sources used to compile proven reoffending statistics

Before October 2017



October 2017 and beyond



3.1. Police National Computer data

Information regarding the proven reoffending behaviour of offenders has been compiled using the Ministry of Justice's extract from the Police National Computer (PNC). The process involves matching offender details from the prison and probation data to the personal details recorded on the PNC. Like any large-scale recording system, the PNC is subject to errors with data entry and recording. The PNC is regularly updated so that further analysis at a later date will generate revised figures.

The quality of the information recorded on the PNC is generally assumed to be relatively high, as it is an operational system on which the police depend, but analysis can reveal errors that are typical when handling administrative datasets of this scale. Since the PNC is a unique data source, it is difficult to draw comparisons with other sources that would allow us to estimate the proportion of erroneous or missing records.

However, a number of improvements are routinely carried out:

- updates to the coding and classification of offences and court disposals, including the reduction of uncoded offences, the reduction in the use of miscellaneous offence codes and the clarification of the coding of breach offences;
- updates to the methods used to identify the primary offence, where several offences are dealt with on the same occasion, and to the methods used to identify the primary disposal, where an offence attracts more than one court disposal; and
- removal of some duplication of records within the database to improve the efficiency and reliability of the matching process.

3.2. Probation data (nDelius)

From June 2014, the Transforming Rehabilitation programme was launched, which changed the way offenders are managed in the community. Management of offenders serving their sentence in the community has been split into two groups: high-risk offenders are managed by the National Probation Service (NPS), and low- to medium-risk offenders are managed by Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs).

To support the implementation of these reforms, the Ministry also introduced IT changes through the national Delius (nDelius) system for recording the flow of offenders released from prison and starting community sentences. The nDelius system also identifies whether an offender is managed by a CRC or the NPS after being sentenced.

From October 2015, proven reoffending statistics have been compiled using data from the nDelius system. This is for all adult offenders discharged from custody (determinate and indeterminate sentences) and for those managed in the community.

The quality of the information recorded on the probation data is generally assumed to be relatively high, as it is a direct extract from an operational system upon which the probation service depends for managing offenders locally. The extract consists of a small number of key fields for which completion is mandatory. However, proven reoffending statistics have been compiled using nDelius data from October 2015 cohorts onwards, and as with any large-scale recording system, it is subject to possible errors with data entry and processing. Therefore, further work is ongoing to assess the quality of nDelius data.

Prior to October 2015, detailed information on the supervision of offenders (at the individual offender level) had been submitted by probation trusts on a monthly basis. These monthly 'probation listings' included information on offenders starting probation supervision.

3.3. Prison data

Prison establishments record details for individual inmates on the prison IT system (Prison-NOMIS or LIDS). The information recorded includes details such as date of birth, gender, religion, nationality, ethnic origin, custody type, offence, reception and discharge dates and sentence length for sentenced prisoners. The data from individual prison establishments then feeds through to a central computer database, called the Inmate Information System (IIS).

On 30 June 2015, the data extracts used to produce prison statistics transitioned to a new extract which extracts information from the Prison-NOMIS system directly and without needing to be processed by the Inmate Information System. As a result, vast improvements in data quality were observed, and more detailed information became available.

The IIS system is used for proven reoffending prison statistics covering the period from January 2005 to September 2015. As already discussed, from October 2015 onwards proven reoffending statistics source adult custodial discharges from the nDelius case management system to align with the data source used for PbR statistics. For juveniles released from Youth Offender Institutions, the data is sourced from the new prison-NOMIS source directly.

Indeterminate-sentence prisoners

Data on the discharge of prisoners on indeterminate sentences, i.e. prisoners given a life sentence or an Indeterminate Sentence for Public Protection (IPP), is held in the Public Protection Unit Database (PPUD). This holds data jointly owned by the Offender Management and Public Protection Group (OMPPG) in HMPPS and by the Parole Board.

PPUD is the data source for prisoners discharged from indeterminate sentences for the January 2005 to September 2015 proven reoffending statistics. From October 2015 onwards, proven reoffending and PbR statistics source adult prison discharge information for those given indeterminate sentences from the nDelius case management system (to align with the data source used for PbR statistics).

PPUD records details of all indeterminate-sentence prisoners at the point of conviction, those engaged in the Generic Parole Process and prisoners (determinate and indeterminate) who have been recalled from licence. It also covers those who have received a restricted hospital order/direction from a Crown Court, and those convicted and on-remand prisoners who have been transferred from prison/detention centres to psychiatric hospital under the relevant sections of mental-health legislation.

All decisions taken by the HMPPS casework sections and the Parole Board are recorded on the system.

Personal information recorded includes (but is not limited to) name, date of birth, gender, identifying numbers, ethnicity, last known address, probation area and sentencing information.

OMPPG and the Parole Board run monthly and ad-hoc reports to cleanse data that are not otherwise identified by data validation routines built into the system.

3.4. Young offenders in secure accommodation

Information about secure training centres (STCs) and secure children's homes (SCHs) comes from the Youth Custody Service, HM Prisons and Probation Service eAsset database (prior to this October 2016, eAsset data came from the Youth Justice Board (YJB)). Information about young people aged 17 and under and held in Young Offender Institutions (YOIs) is supplied by the Prison Service and private YOIs.

The YJB's monthly custody report has traditionally used data from the Secure Accommodation Clearing House System (SACHS), this was the system used by the YJB to book young people into custody. To meet information management challenges of a growing department and whilst improving our processes, the YJB has migrated to the use of the new eAsset system since March 2012.

As part of the work to implement the new system both SACHS and eAsset were run in parallel from 5th March to 1st July 2012. The YJB now has the ability to produce some reports from eAsset and has done work to quality assure the outputs against SACHS. While this work is ongoing and further reports are being developed, we now believe the quality of data from this system is of a suitable level to publish as management information.

The quality of the information recorded on the eAsset database is generally assumed to be relatively high as it is a direct extract from an operational system which is used to place young people in custody. The extract uses a number of key fields for which completion is mandatory when booking a young person into custody.

3.5. Data processing and analysis

The data underpinning the results are considered by Ministry of Justice to be broadly robust. This is the fifth publication of proven reoffending statistics compiled using the

nDelius system, and as with any new system, further work is required to fully understand the reliability and quality of the information held.

3.6. Matching offender records for proven reoffending¹⁴

Matching to an offender record on the PNC database

This process involves matching data on prison discharges and court order commencements to the PNC database. Automated matching routines use various combinations of the following variables (matching options) to match an offender from the cohort to an offender on the PNC:

- PNCID
- CRO Number
- Surname
- First Forename
- Second Forename
- Gender
- Date of Birth

Thirteen matching options are applied sequentially. At each step, unmatched records are passed to the next matching option. All 13 matching options are first compared to the **person** PNC table and those that are unmatched are then compared to the **alias** and **aliasdateofbirth** PNC tables. Any offender who cannot be matched to an offender record on the PNC or who has multiple matches will be excluded from the measurement of reoffending or PbR outcomes.

The matching code uses exact name matching along with a variety of ‘sounds like’ algorithms on the surname variable, and exact/initial name matching on the forename variables.

Matching to an index offence record on the PNC

For offenders who are successfully matched to the PNC, the next stage of the matching process identifies the offence record on the PNC that is associated with the index offence.

The index offence matching code uses the conviction and sentence date variables from the nDelius case management system (for further information on nDelius, please see [section 3.2](#)) and compares them to the court-caution and subsequent-appearance-date variables on the PNC. Note that the subsequent-appearance-date variable is only used if it relates to a sentencing event. As with the PNC matching, the index-offence matching code uses various combinations of the conviction and sentence date variables. In all, four matching options are applied sequentially.

¹⁴ For more on matching for CRCs and the NPS see “Matching to the PNC” in the “Definitions for the measurement of interim proven reoffending for Community Rehabilitation Companies and the National Probation Service” section above.

A date from the PNC is deemed to match to a date from nDelius if and only if their absolute difference is not more than seven days. If two or more offences from the PNC are considered to match to a given offence from nDelius, the one that is closer to the nDelius offence date is selected. If at this point there is still more than one PNC offence matched to the index offence from the cohort, the most serious one is selected.

If an index offence cannot be matched to a PNC offence record, then its associated offender start will be excluded from the measurement of reoffending and PbR outcomes.

The PNC snapshot is extracted on the following dates¹⁵:

Table 4: Quarterly cohort PNC snapshot extraction dates

Quarterly bulletin	Interim results	Final results	PNC snapshot
April 2018	Jul16-Sep16 Oct16-Dec16 Jan17-Mar17 Apr17-Jun17	Apr16-Jun16	Includes data up to 2 February 2018
July 2018	Oct16-Dec16 Jan17-Mar17 Apr17-Jun17 Jul17-Sep17	Jul16-Sep16	Includes data up to 4 May 2018
October 2018	Jan17-Mar17 Apr17-Jun17 Jul17-Sep17 Oct17-Dec17	Oct16-Dec16	Includes data up to 3 August 2018
January 2019	Apr17-Jun17 Jul17-Sep17 Oct17-Dec17 Jan18-Mar18	Jan17-Mar17	Includes data up to 2 November 2018

Note that if a CRC is trying to replicate the reoffending results, they would need to take an extract of PNC data as close to these dates as possible.

Match rates

Not all offenders are matched and a thorough analysis of bias in the matching system has yet to be undertaken. The match rate to the PNC using the new data sources (from the October to December 2015 cohort onwards) has improved compared to the match rates from previous data sources. The percentage that matched to the PNC and an index offence for the October to December 2016 cohort

¹⁵ Subject to change if factors (e.g. technical or resource issues) outside our control prevent extraction on these dates.

using the new data sources is above 90% whereas matching with previous data sources ranged from 50% to 90% from 2000 to 2012 (see Table 5 in the version of the guide to reoffending published in July 2017). Further investigations into match rates are ongoing.

The total number of offenders matched to the PNC is higher than the final figure for the cohorts. The main reasons for these discrepancies are:

- PNC index offence dates could not be matched to index offence dates from nDelius. In order to match, two dates are required to be no more than seven days apart, as described in section [Matching to an index offence record on the PNC](#) above.
- The index offence was not dealt with by a Home Office police force. This is required in order to ensure that only offences in England and Wales are counted.
- Exclusion of all offenders where the index offence is a breach, since we are only interested in new offences.
- Exclusion of multiple offender entries (see section above titled "[Multiple offender entries](#)" for further details).

Custodial Discharges

According to the [prison national statistics](#) based on prison-NOMIS data, around 18,000 offenders are discharged from a determinate sentence each quarter. According to the nDelius system, a similar number of offenders are discharged on a quarterly basis. However, when investigating the data in more detail, it is clear that there are differences, and so the number of offenders discharged from custody in the proven reoffending statistics will not exactly match the prison-release National Statistics. Both datasets are derived from administrative IT systems which, as with any large scale recording system, are subject to possible errors with data entry and processing. Further work is ongoing to understand more about the differences in the data sources.

4. Confidentiality

This statement sets out the arrangements in place for protecting persons' confidential data when statistics are published or otherwise released into the public domain. The Code of Practice for Statistics¹⁶ states that:

"Organisations should look after people's information securely and manage data in ways that are consistent with relevant legislation and serve the public good". (Trustworthiness pillar, T6 Data governance)

¹⁶ www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/code-of-practice/

To comply with this and with the Data Protection Act of 1998, and to maintain the trust and co-operation of those who use reoffending statistics, the following provisions have been put in place.

Private information collected by the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) is stored in line with MoJ data security policies. Electronic data are held on password-protected networks. All new staff undergo MoJ security vetting before receiving access to data systems, and all staff undertake mandatory training on information responsibility annually.

Three types of disclosure risk are considered in relation to reoffending statistics: general attribution, identification (including self-identification) and residual through combination of sources.

Assessment of the risk of disclosure considers the following:

- level of aggregation (including geographic level) of the data;
- size of the population;
- likelihood of an attempt to identify; and
- consequences of disclosure.

As a result, the number of offenders, reoffenders, reoffences and previous offences based on five or fewer offenders are suppressed for individual prisons, probation areas and the following geographical areas: County, Upper Tier Local Authority, Lower Tier Local Authority and Youth Offending Team. This is to prevent the disclosure of individual information.

5. Users

The contents of this bulletin will be of interest to Government policy makers, the agencies responsible for offender management at both national and local levels, providers, practitioners and others who want to understand more about proven reoffending.

Government policy makers also use these statistics to develop, monitor and evaluate key elements of government policies, including those on payments by results, legal aid and sentencing guidelines. Offender management agencies use these statistics to gain a local understanding of the criminal justice system, to understand performance and to highlight best practice. Key agencies include: Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service, the Youth Justice Board, private and voluntary sector providers of prison and probation services and local authorities.

Appendix A: Glossary of terms

A.1. Reoffending

Cohort – the group of individuals whose reoffending is measured.

Cohort definition used in the Proven Reoffending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin – the proven reoffending cohort consists of all offenders discharged from custody, otherwise sanctioned at court, receiving a caution, reprimand or warning in a three-month period. This cohort's criminal history is collated, and criminal behaviour is tracked over the following year. Any offence committed in this one-year period which is proven by a court conviction or out-of-court disposal (either in the one-year period, or in a further six-month waiting period) counts as a proven reoffence.

Cohort definition used in the Interim Proven Reoffending Statistics for CRCs and NPS Quarterly Bulletin – the payment by results proven reoffending cohort consists of all adult offenders in any one quarter (January to March, April to June, July to September, October to December) who begin a community order or a suspended sentence order or who were released from custody. This cohort's criminal behaviour to date is tracked and collated. Any offence committed in this period which is proven by a court conviction or out-of-court disposal counts as a proven reoffence.

Index offence – the proven offence that leads to an offender being included in the cohort.

Index disposal – the index disposal of the offender is the type of sentence the offender received for their index offence.

Start point (index date) – the set point in time from when reoffences are measured.

Follow-up period – the length of time proven reoffending is measured over.

Waiting period – the additional time beyond the follow-up period to allow for offences committed during the follow-up period to be proved by a court conviction, caution, reprimand or final warning.

Reconviction – where an offender commits an offence within the follow-up period and is convicted at court within either the follow-up period or the waiting period.

Proven reoffence – where an offender is convicted at court or receives some other form of criminal justice sanction for an offence committed within a set follow-up period and disposed of within either the follow-up period or the waiting period.

Adjusted²⁰¹¹ proportion of offenders who reoffend – is calculated by 'the proportion of offenders who reoffend' (observed proven reoffending rate) for the cohort plus any difference between the average Offender Group Reconviction Scale (OGRS4/G) score in that cohort and the 2011 cohorts. Adjusted reoffending rates are calculated for adults only. OGRS4 is based on a well-established, peer reviewed

methodology for assessing and representing reoffending risk. The raw rates are adjusted to the 2011 calendar year, in line with the Payment by Result statistics.

A.2. Disposal (sentence type)

Fine – a financial penalty imposed following conviction.

Court orders – court orders include community sentences, community orders and suspended sentence orders supervised by the Probation Service. They do not include any pre- or post-release supervision from a custodial sentence.

Criminal Justice Act 2003 (CJA03) – for offences committed on or after 4 April 2005, the new community order replaced all existing community sentences for adults. The Act also introduced a new suspended sentence order for offences which pass the custody threshold, and it changed the release arrangements for prisoners. See Appendix A of Offender Management Caseload Statistics 2009 for more information.

Community order – for offences committed on or after 4 April 2005, the new community order introduced under the CJA 2003 replaced all existing community sentences for those aged 18 years and over. This term refers to all court orders except suspended sentence orders and deferred sentences which may have a custodial component to the sentence. The court must add at least one, but could potentially add all 12 requirements depending on the offences and the offender. The requirements are:

- unpaid work (formerly community service/community punishment) – a requirement to complete between 40 and 300 hours' unpaid work;
- activity – for example, to attend basic skills classes;
- programme – there are several designed to reduce the prospects of reoffending;
- prohibited activity – a requirement not to do something that is likely to lead to further offence or nuisance;
- curfew – which is electronically monitored;
- exclusion – this is not used frequently as there is no reliable electronic monitoring yet available;
- residence – requirement to reside only where approved by probation officer;
- mental health treatment (requires offender's consent);
- drug rehabilitation (requires offender's consent);
- alcohol treatment (requires offender's consent);

- supervision – meetings with probation officer to address needs/offending behaviour; and
- attendance centre – between a minimum of 12 hours and a maximum of 36 in total which includes three hours of activity.

Typically, the more serious the offence and the more extensive the offender's needs, the more requirements there will be. Most orders will comprise one or two requirements, but there are packages of several requirements available where required. The court tailors the order as appropriate and is guided by the Probation Service through a pre-sentence report.

Suspended sentence order (SSO) – the CJA 2003 introduced a new suspended sentence order which is made up of the same requirements as a community order and, in the absence of breach, is served wholly in the community supervised by the Probation Service. It consists of an 'operational period' (the time for which the custodial sentence is suspended) and a 'supervision period' (the time during which any requirements take effect). Both may be between six months and two years, and the 'supervision period' cannot be longer than the 'operational period', although it may be shorter. Failing to comply with the requirements of the order or committing another offence will almost certainly result in a custodial sentence.

A.3. Pre-Criminal Justice Act (CJA) 2003 Court Orders – Community sentences

Community punishment order (CPO) – the offender is required to undertake unpaid community work.

Community rehabilitation order (CRO) - a community sentence which may have additional requirements such as residence, probation centre attendance or treatment for drug, alcohol or mental-health problems.

Community punishment and rehabilitation order (CPRO) – a community sentence consisting of probation supervision alongside community punishment, with additional conditions like those of a community rehabilitation order.

Custody – the offender is awarded a sentence to be served in prison or a Young Offender Institution (YOI). If the offender is given a sentence of 12 months or over, or is aged under 22 on release, the offender is supervised by the Probation Service on release. It is important to note that the sentence lengths and youth disposals awarded will be longer than the time served in custody. For more information please refer to Appendix A of Offender Management Caseload Statistics 2009.

Short sentences (under 12 months) – those sentenced to under 12 months (made under the Criminal Justice Act 1991) spend the first half of their sentence in prison and are then released and considered 'at risk' for the remaining period. This means they are under no positive obligations and do not report to the Probation Service, but if they commit a further imprisonable offence during the 'at risk' period, they can be made to serve the remainder of the sentence in addition to the punishment for the

new offence. The exception to this is those aged 18 to 20 who have a minimum of three months' supervision on release.

Sentences of 12 months or over – the CJA03 created a distinction between standard determinate sentences and public-protection sentences. Offenders sentenced to a standard determinate sentence serve the first half in prison and the second half in the community on licence.

A.4. Youth disposal (sentence type)

Reprimand or warning – a reprimand is a formal verbal warning given by a police officer to a juvenile offender who admits they are guilty for a minor first offence. A final warning is similar to a reprimand, but can be used for either the first or second offence, and includes an assessment of the juvenile to determine the causes of their offending behaviour and a programme of activities is designed to address them. Reprimands and warnings for youths were abolished under Legal Aid Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 with effect from 8 April 2013 and replaced with youth cautions.

Youth cautions – a formal out-of-court disposal that can be used as an alternative to prosecution for young offenders (aged 10 to 17) in certain circumstances. A youth caution may be given for any offence where the young offender admits an offence, there is sufficient evidence for a realistic prospect of conviction, but it is not in the public interest to prosecute.

A.5. First-tier penalties

Discharge – a juvenile offender is given an absolute discharge when they admit guilt, or are found guilty, with no further action taken. An offender given a conditional discharge also receives no immediate punishment, but is given a set period during which, if they commit a further offence, they can be brought back to court and re-sentenced.

- **Fine** – the size of the fine depends on the offence committed and the offender's financial circumstances. In the case of juveniles under 16, the fine is the responsibility of the offender's parent or carer.
- **Referral order** – this is given to juveniles pleading guilty and for whom it is their first time at court (unless the offence is so serious it merits a custodial sentence or it is of a relatively minor nature). The offender is required to attend a Youth Offender Panel to agree a contract, aimed to repair the harm caused by the offence and address the causes of the offending behaviour.
- **Reparation order** – the offender is required to repair the harm caused by their offence either directly to the victim or indirectly to the community.

Youth Rehabilitation Order – a community sentence for juvenile offenders, which came into effect on 30 November 2009 as part of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008. It combines a number of sentences into one generic sentence and is the standard community sentence used for the majority of children and young

people who offend. The following requirements can be attached to a Youth Rehabilitation Order (YRO):

- activity requirement;
- curfew requirement;
- exclusion requirement;
- local-authority residence requirement;
- education requirement;
- mental-health treatment requirement;
- unpaid work requirement;
- drug testing requirement;
- intoxicating-substance misuse requirement;
- supervision requirement;
- electronic monitoring requirement;
- prohibited activity requirement;
- drug treatment requirement;
- residence requirement;
- programme requirement;
- attendance centre requirement;
- intensive supervision and surveillance; and
- intensive fostering.

The YRO is only available for those who committed an offence on or after the 30 November 2009. The following community sentences are replaced by the YRO but will continue to exist for those that committed an offence before 30 November 2009:

- action plan order;
- curfew order;
- supervision order;
- supervision order and conditions;
- community punishment order;
- community punishment and rehabilitation order;
- attendance centre order;
- drug treatment and testing order;
- exclusion order; and
- community rehabilitation order.

A.6. Miscellaneous terms

Community Rehabilitation Company - From June 2014, the Transforming Rehabilitation programme was launched, which changed the way offenders are managed in the community. Low to medium risk offenders are now managed by Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs).

National Probation Service – the National Probation Service generally deals with those aged 18 years and over (those under 18 are mostly dealt with by Youth Offending Teams, answering to the Youth Justice Board). They are responsible for supervising offenders who are given community sentences and suspended sentence orders by the courts, as well as offenders given custodial sentences, both before and after their release.

Police National Computer – the Police National Computer (PNC) is the police's administrative IT system used by all police forces in England and Wales and managed by the National Policing Improvement Agency. As with any large-scale recording system, the PNC is subject to possible errors with data entry and processing. The Ministry of Justice maintains a database based on weekly extracts of selected data from the PNC in order to compile statistics and conduct research on reoffending and criminal histories. The PNC largely covers recordable offences – these are all indictable and triable-either-way offences plus many of the more serious summary offences. All figures derived from the Ministry of Justice's PNC database, and in particular those for the most recent months, are likely to be revised as more information is recorded by the police.

Recordable offences – recordable offences are those that the police are required to record on the PNC. They include all offences for which a custodial sentence can be given plus a range of other offences defined as recordable in legislation. They exclude a range of less serious summary offences, for example television licence evasion, driving without insurance, speeding and vehicle tax offences.

Offence group (based on ONS crime classifications) – offences classified into 13 separate offence categories using the Office for National Statistics (ONS) crime classifications.

Indictable and summary offences – Proven reoffending statistics quarterly (published 28 July 2016) included a table (B1.1) on serious sexual/violent proven reoffences and serious acquisitive proven reoffences. Another way to classify the seriousness of an offence is to classify the offence as 'summary', 'triable-either-way' or 'indictable-only'. Indictable-only offences cover the most serious offences that must be tried at the Crown Court; these offences include murder, manslaughter, rape and robbery. These are reported in table B1. Note that summary offences are triable only by a magistrates' court. This group includes motoring offences, common assault and criminal damage up to £5,000. Triable-either-way offences are more serious offences; these can be tried either at the Crown Court or at a magistrates' court, and include criminal damage where the value is £5,000 or greater, theft and burglary. Summary and triable-either-way are not reported.

Youth Offending Teams (YOTs)

YOTs work with young people who come into contact with the criminal justice system, and each one covers a certain number of local authorities. The YOTs were updated in the proven reoffending publication of the 28th July 2016.

Appendix B: Explanatory notes

The United Kingdom Statistics Authority has designated these statistics as National Statistics, in accordance with the Statistics and Registration Service Act 2007 and signifying compliance with the Code of Practice for Official Statistics.

Designation can be broadly interpreted to mean that the statistics:

- Meet identified user needs.
- Are well explained and readily accessible.
- Are produced according to sound methods.
- Are managed impartially and objectively in the public interest.

Once statistics have been designated as National Statistics it is a statutory requirement that the Code of Practice shall continue to be observed.

Symbols used

..	Not available
0	Nil or less than half the final digit shown
-	Not applicable
*	One or both of the comparison figures are less than 30
(p)	Provisional data

Contact details

For queries, comments or further information, please contact:

Nick Mavron

Ministry of Justice
Justice Statistics Analytical Services
7th floor
102 Petty France
London
SW1H 9AJ

Email: ESD@justice.gov.uk

Alternative formats are available on request from ESD@justice.gov.uk



© Crown copyright 2015

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.