



Chief Victims Advisor to Government

Data Collected About Victims of Serious Crime

Dr Kim McGregor

Report

2017

This report was prepared by Zoë Lawton LLM.

Zoë is a freelance legal researcher and writer specialising in family, criminal, and medical law. She has worked for the Principal Family Court Judge of New Zealand in a research and advisory role. She is the recipient of research funding from the New Zealand Law Foundation, and was awarded the Honourable Rex Mason Prize for Excellence in Legal Writing in 2013.

Contents

1.	The current state of agency data on victims of serious crime	1
2.	Purpose of the research	1
3.	Main findings	2
3.1	Introduction	2
3.2	Administrative data.....	2
3.3	Survey data	3
3.4	Attached appendices	3
4.	Approach	4
5.	Limitations	5
6.	Research previously undertaken on the collection of data about victims of serious crime	5
7.	Other Ministry of Justice work on the collection of data about victims of serious crime	7
7.1	Victims of Crime National Minimum Dataset	7
7.2	New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey	7
7.3	Consolidation of Ministry of Justice databases	7
8.	Administrative data	8
8.1	Agencies that collect administrative data about victims of serious crime	9
8.2	Type of administrative data collected	10
8.3	How the data is collected.....	15
8.4	Where the data is stored	15
8.5	Inter-agency transfer of the data.....	16
8.6	Main gaps in the administrative data	19
9.	Survey data	26
9.1	Agencies that collect survey data about victims of serious crime	26
9.2	Type of survey data collected	29
9.3	Survey methodologies	33
9.4	Where survey data is stored	33
9.5	Publication of the survey data	33
9.6	Main gaps in the survey data	1

List of tables

- Table 1:** Agencies included in the scope of the research
- Table 2:** Agencies that have contact with victims of serious crime
- Table 3:** Agencies that collect administrative data and number of databases data stored in
- Table 4:** Types of administrative data agencies have the ability to collect
- Table 5:** Administrative data transferred from agency to agency
- Table 6:** Agencies that collect survey data, name of survey, survey frequency and age of respondents
- Table 7:** Agencies that collect survey data, name of survey, specific types of data collected
- Table 8:** Agencies which collect survey data, name of survey, how survey data is collected, and whether the results of the survey are published
- Table 9:** Agencies which collect survey data, name of survey, and the number and percentage of survey respondents who identify as victims of serious crime

1. The current state of agency data on victims of serious crime

Accurate and reliable data about service users is an important asset for any social or justice agency. When delivering services to victims of crime, it is also important that justice agencies operating as a *sector* can reliably analyse and respond to the needs of victims who may be interacting with some or all of those agencies.

The results of this research show that, across the government sector, victims come into contact with many agencies, and most of these agencies collect personal data about the victims they come into contact with. In addition, agencies have mechanisms in place to collect a wide range of data types about victims. The research highlights opportunities to improve the quality of that data, and improve the linkages between different agency data collections.

Non government organisations also have the ability to collect victims' data, but the combined value of these collections is yet to be realised.

2. Purpose of the research

The purpose of the research is to identify the type of administrative and survey data currently collected by New Zealand government and non-government agencies about victims of serious crime. For the purposes of this research, a victim of violence is a person who has:

- a) experienced physical, sexual, and psychological violence and either has or has not reported the violence to Police;
- b) been injured or died as the result of a workplace injury and the victim's employer is criminally liable; or
- c) died as the result of manslaughter or homicide or is a whānau member of a person who has died as the result of manslaughter or homicide.

The research then identifies how data about victims of serious crime is collected, where it is stored, and whether it is transferred between agencies. The main gaps in the data overall are also identified and where possible, examples of data types collected in other jurisdictions which could potentially indicate options to fill these gaps are provided.

The findings of the research are primarily intended to inform the Minister of Justice and Chief Victims Advisor's understanding of data collected about victims of serious crime.

The research focussed on data about victims of serious crime due to the more complex nature of their needs and experiences. It was assumed that this complexity would mean the collection of a wide range of data types across the government and NGO sectors. In addition, the consequences (and therefore the risks to the justice system) arising from gaps in data collection are higher for these victims.

3. Main findings

3.1 Introduction

Administrative data is collected by agencies on an ongoing basis about the interaction between the agency and each individual victim. It is primarily used for operational purposes although it can also be used at a group level for research purposes to inform policy development. Examples of administrative data include basic demographic data about an individual victim, contact details, data about the type of violence experienced, and the outcome of a Police investigation and subsequent court proceedings. Administrative data can be updated and is usually stored in a database so that it can be reported and analysed alongside other administrative data.

In contrast, survey data is usually collected on an interim or one off basis for a specific purpose. For example the *Restorative Justice Victim Satisfaction Survey* collected data on a sample of victims' experiences and views on Ministry of Justice funded restorative justice conferences. Surveys also have the ability to capture more detailed demographic data about victims and to measure the rate of victimisation in a cross section of society, see for example *the New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey*. In contrast to administrative data, survey data is about a group of anonymous victims as opposed to individual identifiable victims. It is also collected at one point in time and cannot be updated.

Both types of data are included in this research as they provide different insight into the experiences, needs, and views of victims of serious crime.

3.2 Administrative data

Depending on their individual circumstances, a victim of violence may have contact with a range of government and non-government agencies. This research has identified 12 government agencies and 8 of the main non-government agencies that currently have contact with victims. At present all government agencies identified by this research collect some administrative data about each victim who has contact with the agency, with the exception of MBIE and Crown Law. All non-government agencies which agreed to participate in the research also collect some administrative data.

Agencies currently have the ability to collect a range of different data types depending on the nature of the agency's contact with victims. These include demographic data such as age, gender and ethnicity, the type of violence experienced by the victim, the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator, the outcome of a Police investigation and court proceedings, and the details of support provided to a victim. The most detailed types of data on victims are currently collected by Police and Victim Support. With the exception of Victim Support, non-government agencies included in the scope of this research tend to collect less detailed data than government agencies as the agencies' focus is on delivering front line services as opposed to data collection for research and operational purposes.

While a range of administrative data types are currently collected by agencies, a major issue identified by this research is that there is very limited transfer or sharing of data between agencies. As a result, it is not possible to easily track a victim through the government or non-government sector, or parts

of it, to determine which agencies victims are having contact with. This is particularly relevant in respect of victims who have not reported violence to Police but may be particularly vulnerable and have had multiple contacts with the Ministry of Health, ACC, Ministry of Social Development and non-government agencies.

Another major issue identified by this research is that there is minimal linkage of data about individual victims within the Ministry of Justice. This data is spread out and isolated in 7 different databases and 1 spreadsheet meaning it is not possible to easily identify victims' different interactions with the Ministry at a group or individual level, of which there can be many. Further, data about the offender(s) who has perpetrated violence against the victim as well as the outcome of the case(s) is not linked to the data about the individual victim. As a result, it is difficult to undertake accurate and detailed research about victims at a group level. In contrast, Police store data about individual victims in one database and it is clearly linked to data on the offender(s). Police are able to clearly identify all interactions an individual victim has had with Police and undertake accurate and detailed research about victims at a group level.

3.3 Survey data

This research has identified 13 surveys which have collected data about victims of serious crime. Nine were conducted on a semi-regular basis and four were one off surveys. The majority of the surveys were undertaken by the Ministry of Justice with the remaining surveys undertaken by Police, the Ministry for Women, Victim Support, Auckland University and Otago University.

These surveys cover a range of issues and have collected a wide range of data types about victims. However, one of the main issues identified by this research is the low number of respondents to some of the main surveys who identify as victims. Notably, only 1% of respondents to both the *Citizens' Satisfaction Survey of Police* and *Court User Survey* identify as victims. Surveys with a low number of respondents who identify as victims will have collected a small amount of data about victims. The smaller the amount of data collected, the more difficult it is to draw accurate conclusions and identify trends. The ultimate utility of this data is undermined by low victim participation.

A major gap in the type of data collected by surveys is data on victims' experience of, and satisfaction with, the Police investigation process and the prosecution process in court. Only one survey has been undertaken which collected data of this nature - *Responding to Sexual Violence: Pathways to Recovery*. This was a one off survey undertaken in 2009. Police has recently commenced an online survey to obtain feedback on the Police investigation process although this survey only includes respondents who are victims of sexual violence and is not included in the research as it has not yet been completed.

Finally, no surveys have been undertaken which collect data on victims' experience of and satisfaction with Parole Board process. This process involves notifying victims when offenders are eligible for parole and receiving submissions from victims in support or opposition of parole.

3.4 Attached appendices

This report is accompanied by detailed appendices that list the type of administrative and survey data currently collected by each government and non-government agency included in the scope of this research. Information on how the data is collected, where it is stored, and whether it is transferred between agencies is also provided in these appendices.

4. Approach

In total 20 agencies were included in the scope of the research; 12 government agencies and 8 non-government agencies. All government agencies which have contact with victims of serious crime were included in the scope of the research and Statistics New Zealand was included as this agency consolidates some data provided by different government agencies in the Integrated Data Infrastructure. Eight non-government agencies which have contact with victims of serious crime were also included in the scope of the research. A range of non-government agencies were selected based on the type of violence (physical, sexual or psychological) experienced by the victims who have contact with these agencies.

Table 1: Agencies included in the scope of the research

Government agencies	Non-government agencies
Police	Victim Support
Ministry of Justice	Women's Refuge
Parole Board	Wellington and Auckland HELP
Ministry of Social Development	Salvation Army
Department of Internal Affairs	Family Works
Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment - Immigration NZ	Barnardos
Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment - WorkSafe	Shine
Crown Law	Netsafe
ACC	
Ministry of Health	
New Zealand Defence Force	
Statistics New Zealand	

All publically available information on the type of data that is currently collected by the 20 government and non-government agencies was identified.

These agencies were then contacted to request cooperation from relevant staff with knowledge of the data collected by each agency. This information was obtained through a combination of face to face meetings, emails, and phone calls. The most in depth consultation was undertaken with the key justice sector agencies, being Police, Ministry of Justice, and the Parole Board as well as Victim Support, the largest non-government agency currently providing support to victims.

Once potential gaps in the New Zealand data were identified, research was undertaken to identify whether there are any data types collected in other jurisdictions that could potentially fill the gaps in the New Zealand data. This component of the research is a partial comparison between New Zealand

and other jurisdictions as it was based solely on publically available information about data collection by agencies in other jurisdictions; consultation with agencies was not undertaken.

5. Limitations

All government agencies that have contact with victims were consulted for this research. However, it was not possible to consult with every non-government agency due to the large number of non-government agencies that have contact with victims and the timeframe available to undertake the research. Therefore, only selected non-government agencies were consulted.

All agencies co-operated and responded fully or partially to requests for information within the stipulated timeframe with the exception of the New Zealand Defence Force and the Salvation Army. Only limited information on the data collected by the Ministry of Social Development, Netsafe and Family Works was possible to obtain as several relevant staff were unavailable for consultation or could not be contacted.

It was not possible to ascertain many examples of administrative data types collected in other jurisdictions which could potentially fill gaps in the New Zealand administrative data as only limited information on administrative data types in other jurisdictions is publically available.

Finally, this research does not make assumptions or findings about the extent of each agency's data collection which will vary from agency to agency depending on the nature of the agency's contact with victims. It also does not make assumptions or findings about the particular uses of data or agencies' security or safety practices with data.

6. Research previously undertaken on the collection of data about victims of serious crime

This research is the first to explore the collection of data about victims of serious crime in detail by all relevant government agencies and several of the main non-government agencies. However, two research projects have previously been undertaken on:

- a) the collection of data about victims of family violence; and
- b) the type of data that government agencies should collect about victims of family violence.

In 2012, the New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse (NZFVC) published an issues paper entitled *Measurement of family violence at a population level: what might be needed to develop reliable and valid family violence indicators?* The Issues Paper provides a brief overview of administrative datasets held by Police, the Ministry of Justice, Child Youth and Family, Ministry of Health, and several non-government agencies. Several population based surveys are also discussed. The issues paper then considered whether these datasets could be used to monitor trends in family violence and/or develop indicators of family violence.

Major conclusions in the issues paper include:

- no one government or non-government agency has responsibility to ensure consistent, reliable, complete data on family violence is collected and maintained;
- the same types of administrative data on victims of family violence need to be collected consistently by agencies over an extended period of time in order to be used to monitor trends and to develop indicators of family violence;
- although there are some useful administrative data sets in New Zealand, none could currently be considered a reliable source of data for monitoring trends in family violence in the community over time or to develop indicators; and
- data from population based surveys could be used to develop indicators but surveys need to be carried out consistently over time to build up a collection of consistent data.

The NZFVC issues paper was used to inform the preliminary scoping of this research before contact was made with agencies. However, it has three main limitations: it does not go into detail about the type of data collected by each agency and appears to only be based on publically available information. Further, some parts of the research are now out of date. For example, Police data on victims has been improved since the research was undertaken in 2012 and is now far more detailed.

In 2013, the Social Policy Evaluation and Research Unit of the Families Commission (now SUPERU) published a study entitled *Family Violence Indicators: Can Administrative Data Sets be Used to Measure Trends in Family Violence in New Zealand?* SUPERU recommended that where possible, agencies which have contact with family violence victims should collect several baseline types of data as consistent data collection would greatly enhance the ability to measure family violence trends in New Zealand.

The baseline data types SUPERU recommended that agencies collect about victims of family violence are:

1. A unique identifier
2. Age of the victim at the time of the violent event
3. Gender
4. Ethnicity
5. Type of relationship between the victim and perpetrator
6. Type of violence sustained
7. Outcome for the victim
e.g. substantiated abuse apprehension or conviction information, hospital discharge.

The SUPERU study, although focussed on family violence in particular, is very useful for the purposes of this research as it recommends specific data types that should be collected. SUPERU's recommendations were made based on the need for comparability of data across time and across regions. Table 4 on page 14 of this report identifies which agencies currently collect these recommended data types to provide an indication of the current level of consistency across government and non-government agencies.

7. Other Ministry of Justice work on the collection of data about victims of serious crime

7.1 Victims of Crime National Minimum Dataset

The Ministry of Justice is responsible for leading the development of a victims of crime national minimum dataset in conjunction with justice sector partners. The aim of this project is to determine how victim data could be integrated (potentially in the Statistics New Zealand Integrated Data Infrastructure) to provide a whole-of-system view. Ultimately the national minimum dataset could assist key justice sector agencies to make informed and timely decisions in respect of victims, design and deliver better services for victims, as well as understand the performance and costs of the overall justice system.

This research could be used to assist with the development of the dataset as it identifies the type of data collected about victims by these agencies and the gaps in these agencies' data collection. In particular, the working group could give consideration to collecting the baseline data types recommended in the SUPERU study *Family Violence Indicators: Can Administrative Data Sets be Used to Measure Trends in Family Violence in New Zealand?*

7.2 New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey

The New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey (NZCASS) was a semi regular face-to-face survey of almost 7000 adults about their feelings of safety and experiences of crime. The survey aimed to provide data on:

- the extent and nature of crime and victimisation;
- how much crime gets reported to Police;
- who experiences crime and how they react;
- the groups who are more at risk of being a victim; and
- the experiences and needs of victims and measurements of crime trends.

The NZCASS was carried out in 2006, 2009 and 2014. The survey is currently being re-developed by the Ministry of Justice and will be renamed the New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey. The survey design including the drafting of questions is underway with the aim of finalising the survey (including the completion of a pilot survey) by December 2017.

7.3 Consolidation of Ministry of Justice databases

The Ministry of Justice is exploring whether it would be possible to consolidate all or some of the Ministry of Justice databases. This would result in greater linkage between Ministry of Justice data generally and the ability to determine what type(s) of contact individuals are having with various Ministry of Justice services. The project is currently in the preliminary stages of identifying what type of data is contained in each of the databases.

This research has identified that various types of victim data collected by the Ministry of Justice are isolated and stored in multiple databases which do not have an electronic interface. As a result, it is currently not possible to run a report which identifies whether the same victim has two or more of the following contact types with the Ministry of Justice:

- involvement in criminal proceedings in the District, Youth or Higher Courts;
- granted an exemption from attending a pre Family Court mediation;
- involvement in Family Court proceedings;
- attended a restorative justice conference;
- attended a Ministry of Justice funded safety programme;¹
- opted to have the support of a court victim advisor;
- received legal aid;
- received advice from a lawyer at a community law centre; or
- received reparation.

While it could be possible to undertake research that attempts to match the data about victims stored in separate databases, this would be a very manual time consuming process and therefore not feasible to do on a regular basis.

Further, there is strong anecdotal evidence from Ministry of Justice staff that the Court Services for Victims Database is no longer fit for purpose. This database is used by court victim advisors primarily to record contact between court victim advisors and victims and the type of support provided. It is not possible to report the data stored in the database in an in depth way and compare different data types. Most of the data is also free text (as opposed to data fields) which also makes reporting very difficult as data in free text form needs coding before being analysed, which is a time consuming task. The software is also quite old (purchased in 2003) and it is no longer possible to obtain software updates to ensure the database continues to run effectively.

Provider and Community Services, who contract third party organisations to deliver services to victims, are currently working with the Sector and ICT groups to improve data collection, to better assess the effectiveness of the services being delivered.

8. Administrative data

Administrative data is collected on an ongoing basis by agencies primarily for operational purposes. For example, Police collect demographic data about a victim when they report a violence crime, data about the type of violence experienced, and the outcome of the investigation.

¹ The only exception to this statement is that it is possible to determine whether a victim is involved and a criminal proceeding and has completed a safety programme as there is an interface between the two databases which hold this data.

8.1 Agencies that collect administrative data about victims of serious crime

Table 2 below lists the agencies that victims of serious crime may have contact with. The table is divided into three sections to highlight that victims in these scenarios may have contact with a range of different agencies. Also, many victims choose not to report their victimisation to an agency that has the authority to investigate and prosecute the offending as a crime.

Table 2: Agencies that have contact with victims of reported and unreported violence

	Victimisation NOT reported	Victimisations reported	Victimisation reported as a result of workplace injury resulting in death
Agency responsible for investigation and/or prosecution	Ministry of Justice (Family Courts) Ministry of Health ACC Netsafe Ministry of Social Development Victim Support Women's Refuge Wellington and Auckland HELP Salvation Army Family Works Barnardos Shine	Police Department of Internal Affairs MBIE - Worksafe MBIE – Immigration NZ Ministry of Justice (District, Higher, Youth and Family Courts) Parole Board Crown Law Ministry of Health ACC Ministry of Social Development Netsafe Victim Support Women's Refuge Wellington and Auckland HELP Salvation Army Family Works Barnardos Shine	Police MBIE - Worksafe Ministry of Justice (Higher Courts) Parole Board Crown Law ACC Ministry of Health Victim Support ²

Each agency that has contact with victims has the potential to collect some data about each individual victim. Table 3 below provides an overview of which agencies currently collect administrative data about each victim the agency has contact with and the number of databases this data is stored in. At present all government agencies collect some administrative data about each victim with the exception of MBIE/Immigration NZ and Crown Law. All non-government agencies which agreed to participate in the research also collect some administrative data.

Table 3: Agencies that collect administrative data and number of databases data stored in

NAME OF AGENCY	NUMBER OF DATABASES
-----------------------	----------------------------

² Victim Support is the only non-government agency which provides a specialised support service for whānau of homicide victims.

Police	1 database
Ministry of Justice	7 databases and one spreadsheet
Parole Board	1 database
Crown Law	Not collected by agency
Ministry of Health	1 database
ACC	1 database
Ministry of Social Development	1 database ³
Department of Internal Affairs	1 database
MBIE - Worksafe	1 database
MBIE - Immigration NZ	Not collected by agency
NZ Defence Force	Information not provided or unclear whether it is collected by agency
Statistics New Zealand	1 database
Netsafe	1 database
Victim Support	1 database
Women's Refuge	1 database
Wellington and Auckland HELP	1 database
Barnardos	1 database
Salvation Army	Information not provided or unclear whether it is collected by agency
Shine	1 database
Family Works	1 database

8.2 Type of administrative data collected

Agencies currently have the ability to collect a range of different data types depending on the nature of the agency's contact with victims. A detailed list of the different administrative data types that agencies currently collect is provided in appendix 1. Table 4 below provides an overview of 12 selected data types that agencies currently do or do not collect in order to give an indication of consistency and gaps in overall data collection. The data types included in this table are:

1. Unique identifier*
2. Name
3. Date of birth
4. Gender*
5. Ethnicity*
6. Address
7. Type of violence*
8. Age at time of violent event(s)*
9. Type of relationship between victim and perpetrator*
10. Whether violence was reported to Police
11. Whether support was offered to the victim
12. Type of support provided to victim

³ There is also a family violence flag collected in one other MSD database used to collect work and income data.

The data types marked with an * are the data types the previously discussed SUPERU study recommended government agencies collect in respect of family violence victims.⁴ The study also recommended that outcome data be collected but this is not included in the table as this is very broad data type that is not easy to define and victims could have multiple types of outcomes in respect of each agency. A description of each of the data types is provided below along with brief comments as to the utility of each data type.

Unique identifier*

This is a unique number that can be assigned to the victim by each agency. All data relating to the victim can be recorded against this number to avoid duplicate records.

First name and surname

This is a data variable which helps to verify the identity of a victim and should be used in conjunction with date of birth as there may be multiple victims with the same name.

Date of birth

In addition to assisting with verifying the identity of the victim, date of birth is also a key demographic variable used to determine the age of a victim and to differentiate between child and adult victims. It is important to note that date of birth is a much more useful data type than age or age range (which is collected by some agencies instead of date of birth). This is because age or age range will, as a person's age changes over time, become meaningless unless it can also be linked to a specific date on which the age or age range was originally recorded.

Gender*

This is a key demographic variable.

Ethnicity*

This is a key demographic variable.

Address

This can be used to determine a victim's geographical location in New Zealand and to estimate the victim's level of deprivation in the absence of data on their income and education level. Every address in New Zealand is assigned to a Statistics NZ mesh block which has a deprivation score. This deprivation score indicates the level socioeconomic deprivation and is based on nine Census variables.

Type of violence*

There is a range of different types of violence which can be grouped into three main categories: physical, sexual and psychological. As the experiences and needs of victims of different types of violence may vary, it is arguably important to collect data on victims of each type of violence as opposed to solely collecting data about victims of serious crime generally.

Type of offence

Australian and New Zealand Standard Offence Classification (ANZSOC).

⁴ [Family Violence Indicators: Can Administrative Data Sets be Used to Measure Trends in Family Violence in New Zealand?](#)

Age at time of violent event(s)*

This can be used to measure the amount of time that has passed between the violence occurring and the victim engaging with an agency to either seek support or report the violence. As the experiences and needs of victims of historical violence may be different to victims of recent violence it is arguably important to collect data which clearly indicates the amount of time that has passed. A large gap in time between the violence occurring and victims seeking support may also indicate a lack of awareness or availability of support services. Where the date of birth of a victim and the date of the offence is recorded in the same administrative dataset, the age of that victim can be automatically calculated without the victim having to provide it.

Type of relationship between victim and perpetrator*

This can be used to determine whether the violence was perpetrated by a family member, another person known to the victim, or a total stranger. It is usually recorded as the relationship between the victim and offender at the time of the offence, not when the violence was reported to the Police/prosecuted in court. This data type can differentiate family violence victims from non-family violence victims, who again may have different experiences and needs.

Whether violence was reported to Police

This is arguably a useful data type to collect as it indicates the level of reported violence compared with unreported violence. Often agencies do not collect this as a specific data type but it can be self evident due to the nature of contact the victim has with the agency.

Whether the victim has been referred to/offered a support service

For the purposes of this report 'support' means support offered by a non-government agency e.g. Victim Support or a staff member employed by a government agency whose specific role is to provide support to victim e.g. a Ministry of Justice court victim advisor. Alternatively, an agency may refer a victim to a support service e.g. the Ministry of Justice may refer a victim to a safety programme offered by a non-government agency following the granting of a protection order.

Type of support provided to victim

Some agencies simply record that a victim was supported, whereas others collect more detailed data on the type of support provided. This is arguably a useful data type to collect as can indicate at what stage of the Police investigation, court or Parole Board process a victim is receiving support. For example, a victim may be provided with support when giving a statement to Police, support with writing a victim impact statement, or support in making submissions to the Parole Board. The type of support may also be outside this justice sector process and be, for example, counselling or accommodation at a Women's Refuge.

This data type could also potentially measure the rate of attrition between a victim being offered/referred to a support service and actually receiving that support service. Some victims may elect not have the support of a Ministry of Justice court victim advisor for example, or the referral may get 'lost' in the system and not result in any service provision to the victim.

Table 4: Types of administrative data agencies have the ability to collect

AGENCY	DATABASE	Unique ID	Name	Date of birth	Gender*	Ethnicity*	Address	Type of violence*	Type of offence (ANZSOC)	Age at time of violent event(s)	Relationship between victim and perpetrator*	Whether violence reported to Police	Whether support offered to victim	Type of support
Police	National Intelligence Application (all offences)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Police	Inspector (homicide and manslaughter while under investigation)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ministry of Justice	Court Services for Victims	✓	✓	Age range	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Case Management System (criminal cases)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓
	Case Management System (family cases)	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
	Domestic Violence Programme Management System	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓
	Restorative Justice Conference data	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
	Resolution Management System	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
	COLLECT database	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
	Community Law Centre Timevault	✗		Age	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
	Legal Aid database	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Crown Law	N/A	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Parole Board	Victim Notification Register	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗
MSD	CYRAS Case Management System	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?	?	?	?	✓	?
Ministry of Health	National Minimum Dataset	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗
ACC	Name of database not provided	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
DIA	Interpol Child Sexual Exploitation	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
MBIE – Immigration NZ	N/A	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
MBIE - Worksafe	Guardian	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗
NZ Defence Force	Name of database not provided	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Netsafe	Name of database not provided	?	✓	Age range	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Victim Support	VIVA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Women's Refuge	Recordbase	✗	✓	Age range	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
Wgtn and Akl HELP	Penelope	✓	✓	Age	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Barnardos	BConnect	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Shine	Exess	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Salvation Army	Name of database not provided	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Family Works	Name of database not provided	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?

Key

✓	Administrative data type is collected by agency
✗	Administrative data type is not collected by agency
?	Unclear whether administrative data type collected by agency

It is important to note that while agencies may have the ability to collect certain types of data, these are not necessarily collected in respect of every victim. Depending on the circumstances it may not be appropriate to ask a victim for a certain data type, or staff may not collect certain data types in regards to all victims due to training or resourcing issues. Further, the level of engagement a victim has with an agency will also determine whether a certain data type is collected about that victim or not.

It is also important to note that agencies have different types of contact with victims and therefore collect data for different purposes. Some agencies may not need to collect certain types of data collected by other agencies for operational or research purposes so a 'failure' to collect a certain data type(s) may not ultimately be detrimental for victims.

8.3 How the data is collected

Most demographic data appears to be collected by agency staff directly from victims via face to face, phone and email contact, or a form completed by the victim. However, there is a small amount of anecdotal evidence that certain demographic data is sometimes assumed by agency staff without asking the victim, for example ethnicity. This can result in inaccuracies in the data. Other administrative data is collected by staff with no input from victims as it is not necessary, for example data on the type of service delivered, or the outcome of a Police investigation or court proceeding.

In some agencies the staff member who collects the data also inputs it into the relevant agency database. The vast majority of data collected by non-government agencies appears to be collected and inputted by the same person. In government agencies, there are often multiple people involved in data collection and input. For example in respect of the Ministry of Health data, doctors and other clinicians record notes about a victim's hospitalisation then a specialised clinical coder interprets the doctor or clinician's notes and decides what data types to enter into the Ministry of Health database.

8.4 Where the data is stored

8.4.1 Databases

All agencies currently use databases to store what they regard as key administrative data. However, some key administrative data is still stored in spreadsheets. For example, data about victims who attend restorative justice conferences is currently collected in spreadsheets as there is no suitable database at the Ministry of Justice to input this data into. The benefit of storing data in databases as opposed to spreadsheets is that data can be grouped and sorted in more complex ways. It is also possible to build electronic interfaces between databases to enable automatic and accurate data transfer whereas this is not possible between databases and spreadsheets.

The Police National Intelligence Application has the ability to link all data about the same victim together to provide a full and accurate history of the victim's history with Police. This may include multiple notifications, investigations, and prosecutions the victim has been involved in. Data about the offender(s) who has perpetrated violence against the victim is also linked to the victim. Having all this data in one database means that Police can do accurate and detailed research about victims as a group and the agency has excellent knowledge about individual victims for operational purposes. Police is currently the only justice sector agency with this capability.

In contrast, Ministry of Justice data about victims is spread out and isolated in multiple databases. As a result, data about a victim's different types of interactions with the Ministry are not linked together. Further, data about the offender(s) who has perpetrated violence against the victim as well as the outcome of the case(s) is not linked back to the victim. It is therefore far more difficult to undertake accurate and detailed research about victims as a group and the Ministry has limited knowledge about individual victims for operational purposes.

8.5 Inter-agency transfer of the data

8.5.1 Government agency to government agency

Overall, little data about individual victims is transferred between government agencies for operational purposes. This is most likely due to the Privacy Act which limits the type of data which can be transferred between agencies. The Victims Rights Act does provide for the transfer of limited types of data such as name and contact details so victims can be notified if, for example, the offender is up for deportation or escapes from a mental health facility. At present, the Ministry of Justice does not appear to formally transfer any data about individual victims to other government agencies.

8.5.2 Non-government agency to government agency

There is also minimal data transfer from non-government agencies to government agencies, again likely due to the restrictions on data transfer in the Privacy Act. However, non-government agencies do provide a small amount of demographic and service related data to the Ministry of Justice in accordance with their respective funding contracts. The names, dates of birth and other identifying data is not provided (except where the victim has been referred by the court to a safety programme).

In contrast, no demographic and only limited service related data is currently provided by non-government agencies to the Ministry of Social Development (MSD), although this may change in the future.

8.5.3 Government agency to non-government agency

There is minimal data transfer from government to non-government agencies,. The only government agency that currently transfers data to a non-government agency is Police to Victim Support. Selected Victim Support staff and volunteers have read only access to the National Intelligence Application (NIA) and manually transfer data into the Victim Support database. It is of note that Victim Support can access data in NIA about all victims not just victims Victim Support is supporting. Further, Police does not provide any other non-government agency with access to NIA.

Table 5 outlines the type of data currently transferred between each agency.

8.5.4 Statistics New Zealand Integrated Data Infrastructure

The Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI) is a large research database containing micro data about individual people which equates to over 166 billion facts. Data in the IDI is provided by a range of government agencies and Statistics NZ surveys including the 2013 Census. At present only a small amount of data about individual victims of serious crime is provided by ACC, Ministry of Health and Police. The Ministry of Justice and Parole Board do not currently provide any victim related data to the IDI.

The IDI is an incredibly useful research tool as data about an individual victim provided by multiple agencies can be linked together. However, data in the IDI can only be used for research purposes to

identify trends at a group level as opposed to an individual level. All identifying data about individual victims is removed before the data is provided to researchers at government agencies and universities. Therefore, it is not possible to use the IDI data to track individual victims in real time through the government sector to assist with service delivery to individual victims.

8.5.5 Mode of data transfer

At present the vast majority of data transfer is done manually via email, over the phone, or by providing the data in PDF reports. Manual data transfer increases the risk of errors in the receiving agency's database as it has to be manually entered and human error can occur. There are also potential risks associated with emailing sensitive data between government agencies, such as the email being sent in error to the wrong person or agency. There are no electronic interfaces between government agencies' databases which allow for the automatic, accurate and potentially more secure transfer of data with the exception of the Police database (NIA) and the Ministry of Justice case management system. However, only one data type is currently transferred via this interface i.e. a flag that a criminal charge has an associated victim.

Other ways in which agencies are transferring data is to provide the receiving agency with read only access to their database. As previously discussed, Police provides Victim Support staff and volunteers with read only access to the NIA database. These staff and volunteers type various data stored in NIA into the Victim Support database (VIVA).

Table 5 on the next page outlines how the data is transferred by each agency.

Table 5: Administrative data transferred from agency to agency

AGENCY	DATA SOURCE	DATA TYPE	WITH WHICH AGENCY	MODE OF DATA TRANSFER	DETAILS
Police	National Intelligence Application	All victim level data	Victim Support (VIVA)	Manual	Victim Support volunteers have access to the National Intelligence Application (NIA) and manually transfer data from NIA into the Victim Support database (VIVA) by typing it in.
Police	National Intelligence Application	Name, contact details, basic demographic data and sometimes a description of incident	Ministry of Justice (Court Services for Victims Database)	Manual	Data is provided in a PDF form which is emailed to the Ministry of Justice then Court Victim Advisors manually enter the data into the Court Services for Victims database.
Police	National Intelligence Application	Offence has an associated victim 'flag'.	Ministry of Justice (Case Management System)	Electronic interface between NIA and CMS	There is an electronic interface between NIA and CMS so the flag is transferred into CMS automatically.
Police	National Intelligence Application	Name, address, phone number	Parole Board (Victim Notification Register)	Manual	Name and contact details (check others) are provided in a PDF form. Staff at Parole Board manually type the data into.
Parole Board	Victim Notification Register	Name and contact details (upon request in respect of an individual victim)	Ministry of Health MBIE Ministry of Justice (Court Services for Victims Database) Police	Manual	Data about an individual victim is provided over the phone or via email.
Ministry of Health	National Minimum Dataset	Name and contact details (upon request in respect of an individual victim)	Police (upon request for an individual victim) MSD (upon request for an individual victim)	Manual	Data about an individual victim is provided over the phone or via email.
Ministry of Social Development	CYRAS Case Management System	Name and contact details where joint investigation undertaken with Police	Police	Manual	Data about an individual victim is provided over the phone or via email.
Department of Internal Affairs	Interpol Child Sexual Exploitation	Non-identifiable victim data	Police, NZ Customs	Manual	Data about an individual victim is provided over the phone or via email.
Worksafe	Guardian	Name and other relevant victim level data (upon request in respect of an individual victim)	Ministry of Justice (Court Services for Victims Database)	Manual	Data about an individual victim is provided over the phone or via email.
Netsafe	Name of database not provided	Non-identifiable victim data	Ministry of Justice	Manual	Data is provided in a PDF report.
Victim Support	VIVA	Non-identifiable victim data	Ministry of Justice (under Victim Support Contract)	Manual	Data is provided in a PDF report.
Women's Refuge	Recordbase	Non-identifiable victim data	Ministry of Justice, Police, MSD	Manual	Data is provided in a PDF report.
Wgtn and Akl HELP	Penelope	Non-identifiable victim data	MSD, ACC	Manual	Data is provided in a PDF report.
Barnardos	BConnect	Non-identifiable victim data	MSD, Ministry of Justice	Manual	Data is provided in a PDF report.
Shine	Exess	Non-identifiable victim data	Ministry of Justice, MSD	Manual	Data is provided in a PDF report.

8.6 Main gaps in the administrative data

This section discusses the main gaps in the *type* of data agencies in the government and non-government sector are able to collect. However, as previously discussed consultation with agencies has also indicated that there are some significant gaps in the *amount* of data collected. In other words, while agencies may have the ability to capture certain types of data about all individual victims, in reality data may only be collected for a percentage of those victims. Poor quality data collection can occur for a range of reasons:

- staff are not sufficiently trained in how to capture the data;
- agencies do not have clear minimum data collection standards resulting in inconsistency between staff;
- staff do not have the capacity to capture the data;
- data collection is simply not a priority for agencies (especially those delivering front line services which have limited resourcing); and
- there is a breakdown in communication between the staff collecting the data and the staff who are ultimately responsible for inputting it into the agency's database.

Many of the gaps identified in the data are quite specific. As previously discussed in the limitations section of this report, only basic information on the type of administrative data collected by agencies in other jurisdictions is publically available. Therefore, it was not possible to clearly ascertain whether comparable agencies in other jurisdictions collect data types which could potentially fill the specific gaps identified.⁵ Consultation with these agencies would be necessary in order to do so.

8.6.1 Police

Police collect the most detailed data about victims out of all the government agencies. While there are no main gaps, one additional data type that could be added is 'victim withdrawal' as an official police investigation outcome category. This would identify where a victim either does not want to proceed or co-operate with the investigation.

Collecting data on the rate of victim withdrawal would be useful because previous research on attrition rates for sexual violence cases has determined that this is a relatively common outcome of a Police investigation. The study *Responding to Sexual Violence: Attrition in the New Zealand Criminal Justice System* concluded that based on analysis of around 2000 files, one in five victims withdrew from the investigation.⁶

The reasons for withdrawal would also be a useful data type to collect as it could provide insight into what types of support victims might need to stay engaged in an investigation or improvements that could be made in regards to the court process. Reasons for withdrawing identified by researchers who undertook the study included:

- the victim did not want the offender charged but instead warned or trespassed
- someone else reported the incident or the victim felt pressured to report

⁵ The only exception being data on compliance with the Victims Code in the UK.

⁶ See page 49.

- the victim had limited recall of the incident and was uncertain whether violation had occurred
- the victim retracted the allegation
- the victim was not yet ready to proceed
- the victim felt afraid of or threatened by the offender
- the victim couldn't face the court process
- the victim was seeking help or advice
- the victim forgave the offender
- the victim was concerned about family reaction

8.6.2 Ministry of Justice

There are four main gaps in Ministry of Justice data.

First, the Ministry of Justice does not have a record of every victim who is involved in criminal court proceedings. This is because data is only collected about victims who accept the support of a court victim advisor. Consultation with Police indicated that all victims are referred to a court victim advisor (by filling in a referral form and emailing this to the local court) although anecdotal evidence from Ministry of Justice staff indicated that some victims are not referred. As a result, no data is collected about these victims. It could be possible to ascertain an indication of this potential gap by comparing the total number of recorded victims in a given year (using Police data on court proceedings) and compare this with the number of victims who are offered the assistance of a court victim advisor in the same year (using Ministry of Justice data).

It could be useful to begin recording the name, date of birth and basic demographic data of all victims into the main Ministry of Justice database, the Case Management System, where data about offenders and cases is currently stored. This would ensure that the Ministry of Justice knows the identity of all victims who are going through the court process. In order for the Ministry of Justice to do this, data on all victims would need to be provided by Police, perhaps in the charging document. If victims were made a primary statistical count this would result in consistency with Police data collection which does have victims as a primary statistical count.

Second, the outcome of the criminal court proceedings a victim is involved in is currently linked to the offender but not to the victim. Therefore it is not possible to tell what the court outcomes are in respect of victims at a group or individual level. In order for this data to be linked it would need to be inputted into the Case Management System. Again, if the data was linked this would result in consistency with Police data collection which does link the outcome of the investigation to an individual victim.

Third, there is currently no family violence flag for Family Court proceedings involving victims of serious crime. While it is evident that applicants for protection orders are victims of serious crime (unless it is made using false evidence) it is not possible to identify victims of serious crime who are party to Care of Children Act, Child Support Act or Property (Relationships) Act proceedings. These proceedings may or may not be occurring concurrently with protection order proceedings. It is also unclear whether these victims have reported the violence to Police as this is not recorded.

In contrast to victims in criminal proceedings in the District, Youth and Higher Courts, victims in Family Court proceedings are not currently provided with support from a court victim advisor. It could be useful to introduce a family violence flag for these types of Family Court proceedings to ascertain what percentage of individuals involved are victims of family violence. If the percentage is high, this could indicate a gap in support being provided to victims. Involvement in Family Court proceedings can potentially be a very traumatic experience for victims, especially if they cannot afford a lawyer and have to represent themselves in court. A percentage of these victims may not have reported the violence to Police (out of fear or a range of other reasons) which potentially makes them even more vulnerable.

Fourth, all adult victims of family violence who are involved in criminal proceedings are offered a safety programme. They are referred by their local court to a local non-government agency which then provides the programme. Data about the victim, including whether they started and completed a programme and have a safety plan in place is then emailed by non-government agencies back to local court staff who are then responsible for inputting this data into the Domestic Violence Programme Management System (DVPMS).

Consultation with Ministry of Justice staff indicates that due to a lack of training and/or resourcing, a significant number of victim records who had been referred to a safety programme have been 'lost'. This is because the data was simply sitting in the email inboxes of court staff who had not inputted it into DVPMS, or staff had left, their email accounts closed and the emails containing the data automatically deleted. Consideration could be given to ways to recover some of this data and improve the collection of data about victims attending safety programmes so that in future data about these victims is not lost. This could involve further training or resourcing for registry staff.

8.6.3 Parole Board

The Victim Notification register maintained by the Parole Board is primarily used to maintain and record details about the type of contact with victims and what was discussed. At present no data is collected on victims' engagement with the Parole Board process. Therefore it is not possible to measure the number of victims who:

- decide to make a submission to the Parole Board or decide not to;
- support or oppose parole; or
- are supported by a professional support person from an NGO during this process.

Data types to capture this information could be introduced so that the level of victims' engagement with the Parole Board process can be measured as well as what support (if any) victims are receiving during this process.

Victims who are eligible to be added to the Parole Board victim notification register are not automatically added to the register, instead they must fill in a form and provide this to Police which determines if the victim should be added. If Police approves the application, it is sent to the Parole Board and the victim's data is then inputted into the victim notification register.

Consultation with the Parole Board indicated that a considerable number of eligible victims may not be on the register because they are either unaware that it exists or are unaware that they need to apply and assume they have automatically been added. This causes issues for the Parole Board when having to make decisions regarding an offender's parole with no information about the victim and where they are living. Distressed victims subsequently contact the Parole Board when they discover the offender has been released (sometimes to a nearby location).

Consideration could be given to making the victim notification register 'opt out' rather than 'opt in'. This would ensure that all eligible victims would automatically be added and data collected about them. To enable this Police and the Ministry of Justice would need to transfer data about eligible victims to the Parole Board.

8.6.4 Ministry of Health

At present the Ministry of Health only flags patients as victims of serious crime if the victim has been admitted to hospital. Where a victim is hospitalised it is possible to collect very detailed data on the type of injury, cause of the injury, and relationship between the victim and the person who caused the injury. However, this data can only be collected where the relevant health professional treating the victim makes very clear notes which can easily be interpreted by the specialised clinical coder who decides what data types to enter into the Ministry of Health database. Further, some health professionals do not record that a patient is a victim of family violence unless there is a clear disclosure made by the victim whereas others may assume this based on the circumstances or nature of the patient's injuries. Consultation with Ministry of Health staff indicated that these data types are rarely inputted into the MOH database about individual victims.

Where the victim has received medical treatment at a hospital emergency room but has not been admitted to hospital they are not flagged as victims and the above data types are not collected at all. Consultation with the Ministry of Health indicated that many victims may not be hospitalised because their injuries are not deemed serious enough. These may include potentially traumatic injuries, such as a broken arm or a laceration requiring stitches.

Finally, the Ministry of Health advised that it is unclear whether all general practitioners flag victims of serious crime in their clinic's databases because there are no standard Ministry of Health data collection policies with respect to victims of serious crime. It is totally up to the discretion of each health clinic.

8.6.5 Ministry of Business Employment and Innovation – Immigration NZ

As previously discussed the Ministry for Business Innovation and Employment does not currently collect administrative data on the small number of victims it deals with. MBIE advised that there has been some discussion around establishing a national register of victims with data held in a new database. Alternatively, data could be inputted to Immigration New Zealand's existing administrative database (the Application Management System). In contrast, Worksafe does collect some data about victims of violent crimes in the workplace although this is quite limited.

8.6.6 Crown Law

Crown Law National Office does not currently collect any data on victims who are a witness in a crown prosecution nor does the agency require solicitors with Crown warrants throughout New Zealand to collect and report data to Crown law National Office. However, consultation with Crown Law indicated that this is not necessarily a detrimental gap in the data. This is because all contact Crown solicitors have with victims is under the supervision of a Police Officer in charge of the investigation. As a result, there is no information (that could be reported as data) that Crown Law would know that Police do not.

8.6.7 Agencies with obligations under the Victims Rights Act

The Victims Rights Act provides numerous rights to victims of crime that has been reported to Police or is before the courts. The Act lists eleven rights, including the right for victims to be informed, make a victim impact statement, receive notifications after sentencing, be informed about and express views on bail, and make a submission relating to parole or extended supervision orders.

In order to ensure these rights are upheld, the Act sets out specific statutory obligations on the following government agencies:

- a) New Zealand Police
- b) Ministry of Justice
- c) Department of Corrections
- d) Ministry of Social Development
- e) Crown Law Office
- f) Ministry of Business, Innovation, and Employment
- g) Accident Compensation Corporation
- h) DHBs (as defined in [section 6\(1\)](#) of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000)

At present government agencies that have various statutory obligations are not required to publish data which demonstrates that they are meeting these obligations.⁷ In contrast, the UK Commissioner for Victims and Witnesses has made it a priority since her appointment in 2013 to monitor government agencies compliance with the Victims Code to ensure that victims' rights are not merely regarded by agencies as a "wish list".

In 2013/2014 the Commissioner began to asking agencies to account for how they are assessing their compliance, what steps they are taking to rectify failings and how they are engaging with victims as part of this process.⁸ In 2014/2015 the Commissioner advised that she had analysed the reports submitted by agencies regarding their plans to comply with the Victims' Code and a summary of the data they intend to publish to show how they are improving services for victims. She then provided written feedback to each agency highlighting any concerns and drawing attention to good practice.⁹

⁷ The only exception is that agencies are required to publish data on the number and outcome of complaints received.

⁸ 2013/2014 Commissioner for Victims and Witnesses Annual Report

⁹ 2014/2015 Commissioner for Victims and Witnesses Annual Report

In 2015/2016 the Commissioner continued monitoring compliance generally and also began undertaking in depth reviews into compliance with specific rights. The first review concerned a victim's right to make a Victim Personal Statement (VPS) at Court and at Parole Board hearings.¹⁰ The data collected as part of the review provided valuable insight as it revealed that only 15 per cent of all victims of crime were offered the opportunity to make a VPS in 2015/16; and the proportion of victims offered has languished at this rate for the last three years. Other findings demonstrated by the data include:

- victims of violent attacks were more likely to be offered a VPS than victims overall;
- victims aged 65-74 were less likely to be offered a VPS than victims overall;
- incidents involving black victims were less likely to be offered a VPS, compared to 2014/15; and
- victims in the East of England were less likely to be offered the opportunity to make a VPS for incidents that took place in 2015/16, compared to incidents overall.

8.6.8 Non-government agencies and reported victimisation

A main gap in regards to the data of all non-government agencies is that it is not clearly recorded whether a victim has reported the violence to Police. Most non-government agencies record which agency (if any) has referred the victim to them and in some cases it is self evident that the victim has reported the violence to Police, for example where a victim is referred by the Ministry of Justice to a safety programme provided by the non-government agency. In other cases victims are referred by the Ministry of Health, ACC, or are not referred by a government agency and instead self refer. At present it is not possible to tell whether these victims have reported the violence to Police.

If non-government agencies were to collect data on whether each victim has reported the violence to Police and this data was consolidated, this may provide a clearer indication of the percentage of reported violence compared with the level of unreported violence. If the victim has chosen not to report the violence to Police, data could also potentially be captured on their reasons why they have chosen not to. For example, they do not have confidence in the Police and/or court process, they are too afraid of the offender, they don't want the offender to get in trouble or they don't think what happened to them is a criminal offence (when in fact it is).

It is also unclear from non-government agencies' data how much time has passed between the time of the violent offence and the victim receiving support. It could be useful to record the date of the violent event(s) and compare this to the date contact was first made with or by the victim. If there is a long delay between victims receiving support this could indicate that improvements needs to be made to the referral process from government agencies to non-government agencies.

8.6.9 More detailed demographic data on victims

¹⁰ 2015/2016 Commissioner for Victims and Witnesses Annual Report and the following press release: <http://victimscommissioner.org.uk/victims-code-is-not-delivering-entitlements-for-victims/>

Most agencies collect basic demographic data, namely the victim's age, gender, and ethnicity. However, generally speaking both government and non-government agencies do not collect more detailed demographic data about victims such as the victim's:

- Highest level of education;
- Occupation;
- Income range;
- Sexual orientation; or
- Disability status

Detailed demographic data could be very useful for research purposes to have a better understanding of the factors of victimisation, and the personal characteristics of victims. However, government agencies, particularly Police, did not think that it was appropriate to ask victims for detailed demographic data because doing so may interfere with service delivery to the victim. For example, a victim may take offence or lose trust in the Police if asked detailed personal questions and may assume this information will be used against them. Alternatively, this may simply confuse a victim who does not consider it necessary to provide the information.

Non-government agencies appear not to collect detailed demographic data because the focus of the agency is on delivering front line services to victims (often under urgency) and not data collection/research. These agencies also considered that it could interfere with their service delivery and it would not be appropriate to ask victims for this information, particularly when in a distressed state.

It could be possible to link detailed demographic data about an individual victim with other justice related data about the same victim in the Statistics New Zealand Integrated Data Infrastructure. This would avoid the need for agencies such as Police to ask victims detailed (and potentially sensitive) demographic data. This data could then be provided at a group level to researchers. Of particular use could be the matching of disability data held by ACC to justice related data as disability could be a factor which makes a person more vulnerable to victimisation.

9. Survey data

Survey data is collected on an interim or one off basis and can provide insight or feedback from victims of serious crime on a particular issue or agency.

9.1 Agencies that collect survey data about victims of serious crime

This research has identified 13 surveys which have collected data about victims of serious crime. Nine of the surveys have been conducted on a semi-regular basis whereas the remaining 4 were one off surveys.

The only government agencies included within the scope of the research that have conducted surveys are Police and the Ministry of Justice. The Ministry for Women has also undertaken two surveys in conjunction with Police and the Ministry of Justice. Half of the non-government agencies included in the scope of this research have conducted surveys to collect data on victims' satisfaction with the services provided although it was not possible to obtain detailed information about all of these surveys. Victim Support provided detailed information on the two surveys the agency has undertaken although Women's Refuge, Shine and Barnardos were reluctant to do so. Auckland University and Otago University carried out the remaining surveys.

The majority of surveys had a minimum age requirement of 15 - 18 years for respondents. Therefore, the vast majority data collected by these surveys is about adult as opposed to teenage and child victims. Only one survey, undertaken by Auckland University, solely surveyed teenagers who were aged 13 - 18. The only survey which has collected data on child victims is the longitudinal survey undertaken by Otago University; respondents were asked retrospective questions on violence they experienced as children.

Table 6 below identifies the agencies which have carried out surveys, the frequency in which they are carried out, and the age of the respondents.

Table 6: Agencies that collect survey data, name of survey, survey frequency and age of respondents

AGENCY	No. OF SURVEYS	SURVEY NAME	FREQUENCY	AGE OF RESPONDENTS
Police	1	Citizens' Satisfaction Survey of Police	2016 – 2008 (biannual)	16 +
Ministry of Justice	5	New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey	2014, 2009, 2006	15 +
		Public Perceptions of Crime and the CJS Survey	2014, 2013	18 +
		Court User Survey	2014, 2012, 2010	18 +
		Restorative Justice Victim Satisfaction Survey	2016, 2011	15 +
		The needs of Pacific Peoples when they are victims of crime	2003	16 +
Parole Board	No surveys have been undertaken			
Ministry of Health	No surveys have been undertaken			
ACC	Information not provided by agency			
MBIE	No surveys have been undertaken			
MSD	Information not provided by agency			
DIA	No surveys have been undertaken			
Worksafe	No surveys have been undertaken			
Crown Law	No surveys have been undertaken			
NZ Defence Force	Information not provided by agency			
Victim Support	2	Client Satisfaction Survey	2016, 2015, 2014	18 +
		Evaluation of the Homicide Caseworker Support Service	2015	18 +
Netsafe	Information not provided by agency			
Women's Refuge	N/A	Client Satisfaction Survey	Info not provided by agency	Info not provided by agency
Wgtn and Akl HELP	No surveys have been undertaken			

Barnardos	N/A	Client Satisfaction Survey	Info not provided by agency	Info not provided by agency
Shine	N/A	Client Satisfaction Survey	Info not provided by agency	Info not provided by agency
Family Works	No surveys have been undertaken			
Salvation Army	Information not provided by agency			

Ministry for Women	1	Responding to Sexual Violence: Attrition in the Criminal Justice System	2009	16 +
		Responding to Sexual Violence: Pathways to Recovery	2009	16+
Auckland University	2	Violence against women: Prevalence and health consequences	2003	18+
		The Health and Wellbeing of NZ Secondary School Students	2012, 2007, 2001	13 - 18
Otago University	1	The Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study	1972 - ongoing	3+

9.2 Type of survey data collected

The 13 identified surveys have collected a range of data types which vary depending on the purpose of the survey. A detailed list of the different data types collected by each of these surveys is provided in appendix 2. Table 7 below provides an overview of 12 selected data types that these surveys did or did not collect in order to give an indication of consistency and gaps in overall survey data collection.

The data types included in this table are:

1. Date of birth
2. Gender*
3. Ethnicity*
4. Location
5. Type of violence*
6. Age at time of violent event(s)*
7. Relationship between victim and perpetrator*
8. Whether violence was reported to Police
9. Whether support was offered to the victim
10. Type of support provided to the victim
11. Impact of the violence on the victim
12. Victim's feedback on the Police investigation and/or court process

The data types marked with an * are the data types the previously discussed SUPERU study recommended government agencies collect in respect of family violence victims.¹¹ The study also recommended that outcome data be collected but this is not included in the table as this is very broad data type that is not easy to define and victims could have multiple types of outcomes in respect of each agency. A description of each of the data types is provided below along with brief comments as to the utility of each data type.

Date of birth

This is a key demographic variable used to determine the age of a victim and to differentiate between child and adult victims.

Gender*, Ethnicity*, Location

Key demographic variables for surveys.

Type of violence*

There is a range of different types of violence which can be grouped into three main categories: physical, sexual and psychological. As the experiences and needs of victims of different types of violence may vary, it is arguably important to collect data on victims of each type of violence as opposed to solely collecting data about victims of serious crime generally.

¹¹ [Family Violence Indicators: Can Administrative Data Sets be Used to Measure Trends in Family Violence in New Zealand?](#)

Age at time of violent event(s)*

This can be used to measure the amount of time that has passed between the violence occurring and the victim engaging with an agency to either seek support or report the violence. As the experiences and needs of victims of historical violence may be different to victims of recent violence it is arguably important to collect data which clearly indicates the amount of time that has passed, as opposed to collecting data about violence that has occurred in the past generally.

Type of relationship between victim and perpetrator*

This can be used to determine whether the violence was perpetrated by a family member or by another person known to the victim, or a total stranger. It is usually recorded as the relationship between the victim and offender at the time of the offence, not when the violence was reported to the Police/prosecuted in court.

Whether violence was reported to Police

This is arguably a useful data type to collect as it indicates the level of reported violence compared with unreported violence. Some surveys do not specifically ask whether the violence was reported to Police but sometimes it is self evident depending on the nature of the survey and the agency conducting it, for example Police.

Whether support was offered to the victim

For the purposes of this report 'support' means support offered by a non-government agency e.g. Victim Support or a staff member employed by a government agency whose specific role is to provide support to victim e.g. a court victim advisor. The Chief Victims Advisor has advised that this is a key data type of interest.

Type of support provided to victim

Some surveys simply record that a victim was supported whereas others collect more detailed data on the type of support provided. This is arguably a useful data type to collect as can indicate at what stage of the Police investigation, court or Parole Board process a victim is receiving support. For example, a victim may be provided with support when giving a statement to Police, support with writing a victim impact statement, or support in making submissions to the Parole Board. The type of support may also be outside this justice sector process and be counselling or accommodation at a Women's Refuge. The Chief Victims Advisor has also advised that this is a key data type of interest.

Impact of the violence on the victim

This is an example of a data type that is unique to surveys and is not usually collected by agencies as part of their administrative data sets. Examples of impacts include whether a physical injury was inflicted on the victim, psychological consequences such as mental illness and alcohol/drug dependency, or financial consequences as a result of having to relocate to escape a violent partner. It is arguably useful to collect these data types to identify the main impacts on victims and where more support could potentially be provided.

Victims' feedback on the Police investigation and/or court process

This is another example of a data type that is unique to surveys and is not usually collected by agencies as part of their administrative data sets. It is arguably a useful data type to collect to gain useful insight

of victims' experience and level of satisfaction with this process and the type of improvements that could potentially be made.

Table 7: Agencies that collect survey data, name of survey, specific types of data collected

AGENCY	SURVEY NAME	AGE OR AGE RANGE	GENDER	ETHNICITY	LOCATION	TYPE OF VIOLENCE	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VICTIM & PERPETRATOR	WHETHER VIOLENCE REPORTED TO POLICE	SUPPORT OFFERED TO VICTIM OR SOUGHT BY VICTIM	TYPE OF SUPPORT	IMPACT OF VIOLENCE ON VICTIM	FEEDBACK ON INVESTIGATION/ COURT PROCESS
Police	Citizens' Satisfaction Survey of Police	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓ ¹²	✗	✗	✗	✗
Ministry of Justice	New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗
	Public Perceptions of Crime and the Criminal Justice System Survey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓ ¹³	✗	✗	✗	✗
	Court User Survey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓ ¹⁴	✗	✗	✗	✗
	Restorative Justice Victim Satisfaction Survey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ ¹⁵	✗	✓ ¹⁶	✓	✓	✗	✓ ¹⁷
	The needs of Pacific Peoples when they are victims of crime	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Ministry for Women	Responding to Sexual Violence: Attrition in the CJS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗
	Responding to Sexual Violence: Pathways to Recovery	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Victim Support	Annual consumer survey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ ¹⁸	✓	✓	✗	✗
	Evaluation of the Homicide Caseworker Support Service	✓ ¹⁹	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Auckland University	Violence against women: Prevalence and health consequences	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗
	The Health and Wellbeing of New Zealand Secondary School Students	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ ²⁰	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗
Otago University	The Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

Key

✓	Data type is collected by survey
✗	Data type is not collected by survey

¹² Respondents weren't specifically asked this but it is self evident for respondents who say their reason for interacting with Police because of an 'assault' or 'domestic incident'.

¹³ Respondents weren't specifically asked this but it is self evident for respondents who say their reason for interacting with Police was because they were a victim of crime.

¹⁴ Respondents weren't specifically asked this but it is self evident for respondents who said their reason for being at court was because they were the 'victim in a criminal case'.

¹⁵ Respondents were only asked whether their case was family violence or non-family violence related. Further detailed categories on the type of violence were not included.

¹⁶ Respondents weren't specifically asked this but it is self evident due to the fact victim is attending a restorative justice conference.

¹⁷ Feedback was only obtained on the restorative justice conference component of the court process.

¹⁸ Respondents weren't specifically asked this but it could be assumed the majority of respondents did report to Police as most victims supported by Victim Support are referred by Police.

¹⁹ Administrative data previously collected about respondents was used in respect of age, gender, ethnicity and location. Respondents were not asked to provide this data again.

²⁰ Respondents were asked whether they have been physically harmed by an adult 'in the home' as opposed to specific type of relationship between themselves and the perpetrator.

9.3 Survey methodologies

Survey data is usually provided directly by victims to researchers via online forms, telephone or face to face interviews. Other surveys are conducted with no direct input from respondents, for example the *Responding to Sexual Violence: Attrition in the Criminal Justice System* which collected data from reviews of case files.

The way in which data is collected is important as it may influence the number and type of victims who ultimately agree to take part in surveys. For example, researchers who surveyed respondents for the Court User Survey were based in courthouses and approached potential respondents as they were exiting the courthouse. A rape victim who has just given evidence at a criminal trial is perhaps far less likely to agree to disclose sensitive information on their court experience with a stranger in the open foyer of a courthouse compared with someone who is at court to pay a speeding ticket. A further example is NZCASS which is conducted via face to face interviews in respondents' homes. Victims of family violence are perhaps far less likely to agree to participate in a survey where their violent partner or other violent family members are present in the household.

The number of victims who agreed to take part in the identified surveys compared with other types of respondents is provided in table 9.

9.4 Where survey data is stored

All survey data is stored by the agency which conducted or commissioned a university or independent research company to conduct the survey. It is usually stored in spreadsheets or databases which are separate from the databases used to store administrative data.

9.5 Publication of the survey data

It appears that none of the full datasets obtained from each survey are shared between agencies although most agencies publish a publically available report which provides an overview of the majority of the data collected. If agencies were more transparent about the data collected from surveys and published the full dataset, this could enable other agencies to use the data in different ways that are potentially more useful for that particular agency. For example, an agency may want to compare different data variables collected by a survey than those compared in the report published by agency which conducted the survey. Also, the publication of the full dataset would enable independent analysis of the survey results by universities. The Ministry of Justice has shared full datasets in the past, for example in 2006 the New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey dataset was provided to Victoria University researchers to undertake in depth analysis of the Maori experience of victimisation²¹, although this does not appear to be common practice.

²¹ Cunningham C, Triggs S, Faisandier (2009) Analysis of the Maori Experience: Findings From the New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey 2006.

Table 8 details how the data was collected in respect of each survey, where it is stored and whether the data collected is transferred between agencies.

Table 8: Agencies which collect survey data, name of survey, how survey data is collected, and whether the results of the survey are published

AGENCY	SURVEY NAME	HOW DATA COLLECTED	PUBLICATION OF THE SURVEY DATA
Police	Citizens' Satisfaction Survey of Police	Phone interview	Report containing majority of data is publically available
Ministry of Justice	New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey	Face to face interview	Report containing majority of data is publically available
	Public Perceptions of Crime and the Criminal Justice System Survey	Online survey	Report containing majority of data is publically available
	Court User Survey	Face to face interview	Report containing majority of data is publically available
	Restorative Justice Victim Satisfaction survey	Phone interview	Report containing majority of data is publically available
	The needs of Pacific Peoples when they are victims of crime	Face to face interview	Report containing majority of data is publically available
Victim Support	Consumer Satisfaction Survey	Phone interview	Report containing majority of data only provided to Ministry of Justice
	Evaluation of the Homicide Caseworker Support Service	Face to face interview	Report containing majority of data only provided to Ministry of Justice
Ministry for Women	Responding to Sexual Violence: Attrition in the Criminal Justice System	Extracted from Police files	Report containing majority of data is publically available
	Responding to Sexual Violence: Pathways to Recovery	Face to face interview and paper based survey	Report containing majority of data is publically available
Auckland University	Violence against women: Prevalence and health consequences	Face to face interview	Report containing majority of data is publically available
	The Health and Wellbeing of NZ Secondary School Students	Online survey	Report containing majority of data is publically available
Otago University	The Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study	Face to face interview	Data not publically available ²²

²² Data on the most recent component of this longitudinal study (which contains victimisation questions) appears not to be published.

9.6 Main gaps in the survey data

This section identifies both the gaps in terms of the *type* of data collected by surveys about victims of serious crime as well as the *amount* of data collected by surveys on victims of serious crime.

9.6.1 Low number of respondents to surveys who are victims of serious crime

Table 9 provides an overview of both the number and percentage of respondents to each survey who identify as victims of serious crime. For surveys that have been carried out multiple times, only information about the most recent survey is included in the table.

Table 9: Agencies which collect survey data, name of survey, and the number and percentage of survey respondents who identify as victims of serious crime

AGENCY	SURVEY NAME	NO. OF RESPONDENTS WHO IDENTIFY AS VICTIMS OF SERIOUS CRIME	% OF RESPONDENTS WHO IDENTIFY AS VICTIMS OF SERIOUS CRIME
Police	Citizens' Satisfaction Survey of Police	98 / 9,266	1%
Ministry of Justice	New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey	865 / 6,950	12%
	Public Perceptions of Crime and the Criminal Justice System Survey ²³	348 / 2,051	17%
	Court User Survey ²⁴	33 / 3,508	1%
	Restorative Justice Victim Satisfaction Survey ²⁵	119 / 329	36%
	The needs of Pacific Peoples when they are victims of crime ²⁶	47 / 90	52%
Ministry for Women	Responding to Sexual Violence: Attrition in the Criminal Justice System	1,955 / 1,995	100%
	Responding to Sexual Violence: Pathways to Recovery	75 / 75	100%
Victim Support	Annual consumer survey	342 / 342	100%
	Evaluation of the Homicide Caseworker Support Service ²⁷	30 / 72	41%

²³ Respondents who identified themselves as victims or witnesses were grouped together in one category. It is therefore not possible to differentiate the data between victims and witnesses.

²⁴ A further 167 respondents (5%) were 'involved in a Family Court case'. Some of these respondents could include victims of family violence who have applied for protection orders although the survey does not differentiate between different types of Family Court proceedings.

²⁵ 119 respondents were victims of family violence and the remaining respondents were victims of non-family violence offences. There were no further sub-categories.

²⁶ 47 respondents were victims of serious crime or family violence and the remaining victims were victims of property related offences. There were no further subcategories.

²⁷ 30 respondents were whānau of homicide victims and the remaining respondents were professional stakeholders.

Auckland University	The Health and Wellbeing of New Zealand Secondary School Students	2,805 / 8,500	33%
	Violence against women: Prevalence and health consequences	457/ 2,855	16%
Otago University	The Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study	Unknown ²⁸ /1037	Unknown

The surveys with the lowest number of respondents who identify as victims of serious crime are the Citizens' Satisfaction Survey of Police and the Court User Survey. Therefore, at present it is not possible to generalise about victims' level of engagement and satisfaction with the service provided by Police and selected aspects of the court system included in the Court User Survey such as satisfaction with court facilities, court staff, wait times, and the availability of information on the court process.

Consideration could be given to introducing quotas of respondents who are victims of serious crime in respect of some surveys in order to obtain sufficient data. However, this would not be appropriate for surveys which are designed to measure the rate of victimisations amongst the population, for example NZCASS, as a quota would result in an inaccurate rate of victimisation.

9.6.2 Victim engagement and satisfaction with the investigation of violent offences and the court process

Only one survey, *Responding to Sexual Violence: Pathways to Recovery (2009)*, has been conducted which measures victims' experiences of, and satisfaction with, the Police investigation and court process in detail including their interaction with Police Prosecutors, Crown Prosecutors and defence counsel.²⁹ This survey was only limited to sexual violence victims and had a sample of 75 respondents. Police have recently commenced an online survey to obtain feedback on the Police investigation process although again this survey only includes respondents who are victims of sexual violence.³⁰

Data variables from this survey could be added to the *New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey* which is currently under development by the Ministry of Justice Research and Evaluation Team. This would enable data on victims' experiences of, and satisfaction with, the Police investigation and court process to be collected in respect of a wider range of offence types including family violence.

Alternatively, a survey *solely* of victims could be undertaken by the Ministry of Justice to collect the above data types (as opposed to a survey like the *New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey* which surveys a cross section of the population and is likely to only include a small percentage of victims). This would ensure a larger quantity of data is collected about victims which may further enable accurate conclusions to be drawn and trends identified.

9.6.3 Data on victim engagement and satisfaction with Ministry of Justice funded safety programmes

In 2011 and 2016 surveys were carried out on victims experience of restorative justice conferences provided by non-government agencies contracted to the Ministry of Justice. The 2011 survey collected around 100 data

²⁸ Researchers have not yet published data on the number of people included in the longitudinal study who identify as victims of serious crime. Clarification has been sought from the researchers conducting the study.

²⁹ *Responding to Sexual Violence: Pathways to Recovery (2009)*

³⁰ This survey is not included in the research as it has not yet been completed.

variables which provided a range of insight into the victim's experience of the restorative justice conference, what they thought worked well about the process and what didn't.

In contrast, there have been no surveys undertaken of victims experience and level of satisfaction with the strengthening safety service or safety programmes provided by non-government agencies contracted to the Ministry of Justice. Victims are offered the strengthening safety service when a family violence related charge is laid in the District Court. A victim is offered a safety programme when a judge grants a protection order in the Family Court or a protection order is made as part of a sentence in the District Court.

Data provided by the Ministry of Justice sector group indicate that in the 2015/2016 financial year around 2,985 victims attended a restorative justice conference compared with around 4,259 victims attended a safety programme or strengthening safety service. These figures indicate that a substantial number of victims are using these services; an evaluation could provide valuable insight as to whether they do enhance a victim's safety or whether improvements can be made. The ex-partners of victims attending these programmes are also referred to a concurrent non-violence programme so feedback could also be obtained from victims as to the effect of these programmes on the recidivism rate of their ex-partner.

9.6.4 Victim engagement and satisfaction with the victim notification and Parole Board process

The Parole Board is the only justice sector agency which does not currently survey victims on any aspect of their service. The Parole Board advised an independent contractor was engaged in 2004 to undertake a small scale survey with victims on the victim notification register although the Board was not able to locate a copy of the report for the purposes of this research.

Examples of data that a Parole Board survey of victims on the victim notification register could collect is:

- the level of satisfaction with the Victim Notification Register in terms of the method and timeliness of contact;
- whether victims have opted to make submissions to the Parole Board on the offenders release;
- whether they opposed the offender's release; and
- what type of support they received during the submissions process (either from Parole Board staff or other external non-government agencies).

9.6.5 Data on child victims

Very little recent data has been collected about children who have experienced and/or witnessed violence and the nature of this violence. The *Health and Wellbeing of NZ Secondary School Students Survey* collects some data in respect of children although only several basic questions were asked in the last survey. The *Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study* collects more detailed data on children's experience of violence. This data relates to historic violence as survey participants were asked retrospective questions at the age of 38.

Other jurisdictions have conducted far more detailed surveys on child victims. One of the most comprehensive has been undertaken in Finland on a semi-regular basis since 1988. The most recent study conducted in 2013 involved around 11,000 children in the sixth grade (aged 12 – 13) and the ninth grade (aged 15 -16). The survey is conducted online by the Police University College in conjunction with the Finnish Ministries of Justice, Education and Culture, and Social Affairs and Health.

Data was collected on children's experiences and witnessing of crime (such as robberies, thefts, threats, assaults and domestic violence), sibling and peer victimisation, sexual violence, harassment and threats via the internet and mobile phone (cyber-bullying), violence occurring during instructed activities and violence against family members witnessed in public. Demographic data variables included, among others, the respondent's gender, age, household composition, and country of birth as well as parents' ages, occupations, employment statuses, countries of birth, and level of educations. A total of 903 variables were collected.

[Link to detailed description of the most recent survey - FSD2943 Child Victim Survey 2013](#)

[Link to list of data variables and the results of the 2013 survey](#)

Other jurisdictions do not appear to survey children under the age of 12. Data on victimisation occurring under the age of 12 is usually collected from surveys of adults using retrospective questions about their childhood experiences.

10. Conclusion

This survey confirms that victims of serious crime have multiple contacts with government and NGOs. Most agencies collect data about the victims they deal with. Responses from agencies show that some are, or have the potential to be, well informed about the extent of the contact they have with victims. Some agencies are also capable of understanding the personal characteristics of the victims they provide services to, or develop policy for.

Attempting to assess the needs of, and contacts with, all victims of serious crime across all of government is currently difficult due to the lack of linkages between databases, both between and within agencies. Crucially, the ability for the Ministry of Justice, in particular, to build a picture of victims' needs and contacts across their operation is presently limited. On the other hand, NZ Police appear to give equal status to victim and offender data, and their victim data is fully integrated into a system that includes offender information. The Police approach results in reports that are potentially useful for identifying victims' needs both throughout the organisation, and when linked to other agencies' information.

An ideal future state for information about victims would see agencies:

- capture the types of victim data that would illuminate, and drive the improvement of, victim experiences
- capture information from victims accurately, consistently, and safely
- store victim data safely and compatibly within systems that make it easy to generate reliable insights, both for individual agencies, and across government as a whole.