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Background

Agriculture is a critical part of the Irish economy, yet the extent and nature of agricultural crime in Ireland has never been the subject of a specific crime survey. The study of agricultural crime relates to crimes that occur solely on farms or relating to farming activities; namely: (i) vandalism / criminal damage / trespass (VCDT); (ii) theft; (iii) criminal assault; and (iv) fraud. Agricultural crime is not the same as rural crime; rural crime is generally understood to be any crime occurring outside of urban areas.

Five activities have been identified as necessary for the prevention and reduction of agricultural crime: (i) the collection and analysis of agricultural crime data; (ii) followed by information sharing; (iii) education about the issues; (iv) marking equipment and (v) promoting an aggressive stance towards enforcement and prosecution of offenders. Report 1: Incidence of Agricultural Crime in Ireland and Report 2: Financial Costs of Agricultural Crime in Ireland represented the first sharing of information about the level and financial costs of agricultural crime in Ireland. Two thirds of respondents experienced incident(s) of agricultural crime between 1 January 2014 and 31 May 2016. The average cost of agricultural crime was €4,328 if the farmer experienced agricultural crime and €1,459 if the farmer did not experience an incident of agricultural crime in the prescribed period.

This Report 3: Agricultural Crime Reporting to Gardaí and Crime Prevention Measures Employed by Farmers in Ireland represents the first sharing of information relating to agricultural crime reported and not reported to Gardaí, the reason(s) for reporting and not reporting agricultural crime to Gardaí and crime prevention measures employed by farmers. This data was collected and analysed from the first national independent survey of agricultural crime in Ireland.

---

2 The first agricultural crime survey was conducted in West Virginia in 1978 [L. Bean & L. D. Bean (1978) Crime on Farms in Hampshire County, West Virginia: Pilot Study. Morgantown: Center for Extension and Continuing Education, West Virginia University (R.M. No. 69)]. Since then repeated surveys have been conducted in other countries including Australia, Kenya and the United Kingdom.
6 The costs of agricultural crime arise from: i) direct financial loss arising from an agricultural crime incident; (ii) cost of time spent dealing with the aftermath of agricultural crime; and (iii) expenditure on insurance and crime prevention measures to minimise exposure to financial loss which may arise if agricultural crime were to occur.
Attempting to measure the agricultural crimes reported or not reported to Gardaí is important because the level of reporting is a measure of a farmer’s willingness to participate in the criminal justice system and indirectly reflects a farmer’s confidence in the Irish criminal justice system. This survey sought to collect data on agricultural crime reported and not reported to Gardaí because it has long been recognised that “dark figures” of crime exist. Official statistics as recorded by the Gardaí, and since 2006 published by the Central Statistics Office (CSO), are not an accurate reflection of crimes committed in Ireland. This is due to a couple of factors. Some persons or businesses that experience crime choose not to report these crimes. Further, when crimes are reported the Gardaí have discretion as to whether to record the crimes reported. This is further complicated because other state agencies such as Revenue and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have law enforcement powers. For example, illegal rubbish dumping is a crime that poses a substantial risk and cost to farmers and the food chain, but local county councils may often be the “authority” that receives reports of rubbish dumping.

To determine the extent of crimes not reported to Gardaí crime victimisation surveys were developed to measure the “dark figures” of crime not reflected in official statistics. Commencing in 1998 the CSO began conducting Quarterly National Household Surveys with questions concerning crime. However, specific crime victimisation surveys that examine industries or locations have highlighted the “dark figures” of crimes against businesses as well as challenging the presumption that crime is primarily an urban problem. Although it was outside the scope of this study to gather data on the reporting of agricultural crime to any authority other than Gardaí some respondents noted that they reported incidents of agricultural crime to other state law enforcement agencies.

Attempting to measure the crime prevention measures employed by farmers to prevent or reduce agricultural crime is important because it provides a benchmark for farmer’s contemplating investing in various crime prevention measures as well as providing a benchmark for comparison with crime prevention methods employed by other types of businesses. Further the sharing of information about crime prevention measures specifically relating to agriculture provides an opportunity to inform farmers of crime prevention measures of which they may not be aware.

---

8 Beginning in 2003 the Irish Small and Medium Enterprise Association has conducted annual business crime reports. The most recent is *ISME Crime Survey 2016*. Dublin: ISME.
10 Data collected from this survey relating to reporting agricultural crime to insurance is available in *Report 2: Financial Costs of Agricultural Crime in Ireland*. 

---
Methodology of Agricultural Crime Survey

The authors conducted an independent national survey of agricultural crime in Ireland. For the purpose of this study agricultural crime is defined as: (i) vandalism / criminal damage / trespass (VCDT); (ii) theft; (iii) criminal assault; or (iv) fraud experienced by a farmer in the course of their farming activities. The primary objective of this survey was to gather data about the level and cost of agricultural crime experienced by farmers as well as crime prevention measures employed by farmers. The survey was open to all full-time and part-time farmers engaged in farming in any sector(s) in the period 1 January 2014 to 31 May 2016 regardless of whether the farmer experienced crime.

Respondents completed the independent anonymous survey online. The survey was open for four months between June and October 2016. A number of initiatives were employed to bring a request to complete the survey to the attention of farmers. The Irish Cattle and Sheep Farmers Association (ICSA) conducted a media campaign calling on farmers to complete the survey and hosted a link to the survey site on the homepage of their website. The authors also encouraged participation and circulatated the survey site address when engaging with farmers through farming newspaper and radio interviews, attending ‘farming events’ including agricultural shows, the National Ploughing Championship, mart sales, farming information gatherings as well as communicating with over forty specialist farming groups.

All respondents were asked to answer questions across the three parts of the survey: (i) general farm description; (ii) incidents of agricultural crime; and (iii) crime prevention measures. Questions relating to each incident of an agricultural crime were only asked if the respondent indicated the number of times they experienced that agricultural crime. The questions about the incident(s) of agricultural crime were not available to respondents where the respondent recorded zero incidents of the type of agricultural crime. The maximum number of crimes a respondent could indicate under each crime type was ten.

The survey was completed by 861 respondents from across all sectors and counties. This is comparable to the number of farms sampled by Teagasc in the 2015 National Farm Survey as representative of the nearly 85,000 farms nationally.

---

Overall Victimisation Levels on Farms in Ireland

The agricultural crime survey was open to all farmers engaged in farming activities between 1 January 2014 and 31 May 2016. A third (296) of the respondents did not experience agricultural crime in the prescribed period whereas 565 respondents did experience agricultural crime. 349 of the respondents with experience of agricultural crime experienced more than one incident suggesting chronic occurrence and extensive repeat victimisation.

In total 1,512 incidents of agricultural crime in the prescribed period were recorded. Incidents were recorded across the four categories of agricultural crime namely in descending order: (i) vandalism/criminal damage/trespass (VCDT) 711; (ii) theft 652; (iii) criminal assault 76; and (iv) fraud 73.
Overall Level of Agricultural Crime Reporting to Gardaí

565 of the survey’s 861 respondents experienced 1,512 incidents of agricultural crime between 1 January 2014 and 31 May 2016. Of the 1,512 incidents recorded, respondents recorded whether an incident of agricultural crime was reported to Gardaí for 1,166 incidents. Overall more incidents of agricultural crime were reported to Gardaí (639 incidents) than not (527 incidents). In the context of the types of agricultural crime more incidents of theft and criminal assault were reported to Gardaí than not. However, the converse is true for VCDT and fraud incidents.

Figure 3: Agricultural Crime Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí by Category of Agricultural Crime
Theft Reporting to Gardaí

351 respondents experienced 652 incidents of theft between 1 January 2014 and 31 May 2016. Respondents recorded whether a theft incident was reported to Gardaí for 535 of the 652 theft incidents experienced in the prescribed period. Overall more theft incidents were reported to Gardaí (334 theft incidents) than were not reported to Gardaí (201 theft incidents). The average value of asset(s) stolen in a theft incident reported to Gardaí was higher compared to theft incidents not reported to Gardaí.

Figure 4:
Theft Incidents Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí and Average Value of Asset(s) Stolen in a Reported/Not Reported Theft Incident

Robbery is a more serious crime than theft as the perpetrator used force or threatened to use force in order to steal the asset. Respondents recorded 14 of the 652 incidents where an asset(s) was stolen as robbery. All robbery incidents were reported to Gardaí.

Figure 5:
Incidents of Robbery Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 Reported/ Not Reported to Gardaí
For 246 of the 652 theft incidents experienced respondents recorded a reason why they did or did not report the theft incident to Gardaí. The myriad of responses recorded can be grouped into the following:

**Reasons Did Report Theft Incident to Gardaí**

i. A crime should be reported to Gardaí;
ii. Force was used/threatened (see figure 5);
iii. Repeat incident of theft experienced (see figure 7) and/or neighbour also recently experienced theft;
iv. Multiple theft incidents in the area and/or a belief an ‘organised gang’ was operating in the area;
v. High value of asset(s) stolen (see figures 8 and 9);
vi. Significant quantity of asset(s) stolen;
vii. Potentially dangerous nature of the asset(s) stolen, e.g. fertiliser, chainsaw, shotgun;
viii. Required for insurance claim (see figures 10);
ix. Hoped Gardaí would recover stolen asset(s) (see figure 11);
x. Knew of the stolen asset(s) being offered for sale;
xii. To enable Gardaí to report statistics about levels of theft;
xiii. Gardaí would catch the thief;
xiv. Had information which could be of use, e.g. vehicle registration plate or item left behind by alleged thief;
xv. CCTV was in use at the location of the theft;
xvi. Farmer and/or neighbour saw activity around the time of theft which with hindsight believed to be suspicious or connected to the theft;
xvii. Knew a Garda – either a relative or neighbour;
xviii. Fear the thief would return; and
xix. Wanted advice about crime prevention measures because experienced multiple theft incidents.

**Reasons Did Not Report Theft Incident to Gardaí**

i. “Waste of time,” “no point” and/or “too much hassle;”
ii. No action taken by Gardaí when reported a previous theft incident(s);
iii. No prosecution arose from previous theft incident(s) reported;
iv. Asset(s) previously reported stolen were not recovered;
v. Unsure when asset(s) was stolen;
vi. Gardaí would be unlikely to trace the thief and/or the stolen assets;
vii. Believed value and/or quantity of asset(s) stolen was not significant enough to warrant reporting;
viii. Knew the person(s) involved in the theft;
ix. Farmer dealt with the theft him/herself;
x. Fear of retribution;
xii. Garda station closed (either permanently or at the time when wanted to report the theft incident); and
xiii. No local Garda with knowledge of the area and/or community.

---

Figure 6: Reasons Why Respondents Did or Did Not Report to Gardaí a Theft Incident(s) Recorded as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16
The respondents who recorded experiencing only one theft incident reported a higher percentage of the theft incidents to Gardaí compared to the initial theft incident experienced by respondents who experienced multiple theft incidents. The respondents with experience of multiple theft incidents reported more of the subsequent theft incidents to Gardaí compared to their initial theft incident experienced.

Figure 7: Percentage of Theft Incidents Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí Classified by Whether Respondent Experienced One Theft Incident Only or Repeat Theft Incidents between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16
Respondents recorded the type of asset(s) stolen in the theft incident for 554 of the 652 theft incidents experienced in the prescribed period between 1 January 2014 and 31 May 2016. The farm related assets respondents recorded as stolen in a theft incident (from a menu of 43 options provided) can be broadly categorised into 3 groups, namely thefts related to: (i) machinery and equipment / vehicles; (ii) tools / chemicals / materials / miscellaneous personal property; and (iii) livestock / feed / products. Across all 3 groups more theft incidents were reported to Gardaí than not and the average value of an asset(s) stolen in a theft incident was higher for the theft incidents reported to Gardaí compared to those the theft incidents not reported to Gardaí.

Figure 8:
Theft Incidents Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 Categorised by Group of Assets Stolen in Theft Incident and Whether Theft Incident was Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí
More theft incidents were reported to Gardaí than not for thefts incidents where fuels and oils, tools, machinery and equipment, vehicles or materials for farm structures were stolen. The converse is true for theft of crops, fodder and chemicals. However, for all types of assets the average value of the asset(s) stolen in a theft incident was higher for theft incidents reported to Gardaí compared to those not reported.

Incidents of theft of fuels and oils was the most prevalent type of theft incident but only just over half the theft incidents were reported to Gardaí. Theft of fuels and oils mainly comprised theft of agricultural diesel incidents with exactly half these incidents reported to Gardaí. However, the average value of agricultural diesel reported stolen to Gardaí was €705 compared to an average value of €415 when not reported to Gardaí.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Asset(s) Stolen in Theft Incident</th>
<th>Percentage of Theft Incidents</th>
<th>Whether Theft Incident was Reported to Gardaí and Average Value of Asset(s) Stolen in Theft Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuels and Oils</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Yes 52% €712 / No 48% €444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools (electrical &amp; hand)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Yes 67% €1,421 / No 33% €685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery &amp; Equipment (including trailers &amp; parts)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Yes 63% €2,740 / No 37% €1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Yes 57% €2,146 / No 43% €2,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles (including parts)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Yes 78% €6,602 / No 22% €1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials for maintenance of farm structures</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Yes 62% €1,749 / No 38% €415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Yes 45% €3,067 / No 55% €589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fodder</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Yes 48% €680 / No 52% €632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Yes 70% €888 / No 30% €233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Yes 40% €2,507 / No 60% €115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Whether Theft Incident Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 was Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí and Average Value of Asset(s) Stolen in a Theft Incident Categorised by Asset
The results may indicate that a respondent is more likely to report a theft incident to Gardaí when the asset(s) stolen in the theft incident is insured compared to a theft incident of an uninsured asset(s). Although not all insured assets stolen in a theft incident are reported to insurance, it is very unlikely an insured asset(s) stolen in a theft incident is reported to insurance but not reported to Gardaí. In fact, many respondents recorded that one of their reasons for reporting a theft incident to Gardaí was because it was necessary for an insurance claim.

The average value of the insured asset(s) stolen in a theft incident was higher for the theft incidents reported to Gardaí compared to those that were not reported to Gardaí. The average cost of insured asset(s) stolen in a theft incident reported to both Gardaí and insurance was more than 4 times those reported to neither Gardaí nor insurance.

**Figure 10:**
Whether Asset(s) Insured in a Theft Incident Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 was Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí and/or Insurance
Some respondents specified that their reason for reporting a theft incident to Gardaí was to attempt to recover the asset(s) stolen in the theft incident. The results are likely to indicate that the level of recovery of stolen assets is very low. Respondents recorded that asset(s) stolen were recovered for only one in ten theft incidents and the majority of assets that were recovered were not recovered by the Gardaí.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Theft</th>
<th>No. of Theft Incidents Recorded</th>
<th>Number of Theft Incident Asset(s) Recovered&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In full by Gardaí</td>
<td>Partially by Gardaí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuels and Oils</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools (electrical &amp; hand)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and Equipment including parts and trailers</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles (including parts)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials for maintenance of Buildings &amp; Farm Structures</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fodder</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of all 652 theft incidents recorded&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> 15 of the 55 theft incidents where the asset(s) stolen were recovered were not reported to the Gardaí. The Gardaí recovered in full the asset(s) stolen for one of the theft incidents not reported to them (theft of hand tools).

<sup>b</sup> For each type of asset stolen the number of assets recovered represents less than 0.3% of the number of theft incidents for the type of asset.

**Figure 11:**

Number of Type of Asset(s) Stolen in a Theft Incident and Recovered Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16
Vandalism / Criminal Damage / Trespass (VCDT) Reporting to Gardaí

316 respondents experienced 711 incidents of VCDT between 1 January 2014 and 31 May 2016. Respondents recorded whether a VCDT incident was reported to Gardaí for 524 of the 711 incidents experienced in the prescribed period. Overall slightly less VCDT incidents were reported to Gardaí (247 VCDT incidents) than were not reported to Gardaí (277 VCDT incidents). The average cost arising from a VCDT incident reported to Gardaí was higher compared to VCDT incidents not reported to Gardaí. Although respondents were only asked about reporting VCDT to Gardaí, respondents recorded reporting 84 VCDT incidents (chiefly rubbish dumping incidents) to other agencies / bodies such as their local council as well as or in lieu of reporting to Gardaí.

Arson is a more serious crime because of the increased risk posed to other properties and life. Respondents recorded 34 of the 711 incidents of VCDT were caused by arson. 12 of the 34 arson incidents were reported to Gardaí.

Figure 12: VCDT Incidents Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí and Average Cost Arising from a Reported/Not Reported VCDT Incident

Figure 13: Incidents of Arson Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí
For 246 of the 711 VCDT incidents respondents recorded a reason why they did or did not report the VCDT incident to Gardaí. The myriad of responses recorded can be grouped into the following:

**Reasons Did Report VCDT Incident to Gardaí**

i. A crime should be reported to Gardaí;

ii. Only reported because reporting another crime (e.g. theft) at the same time;

iii. Caused by arson (see figure 13)

iv. Repeat incident of VCDT (see figure 15) or was an ongoing problem experienced and/or their neighbour also recently experienced similar VCDT;

v. High cost of repairing damage caused by VCDT (see figures 16 and 17);

vi. Nature of the VCDT – involved cruelty and/or danger to animals;

vii. Nature of the VCDT – caused animals to get loose and in some instances needed assistance;

viii. Nature of the VCDT – involved irresponsible behaviour with guns; and

ix. Nature of the VCDT – caused/potential to cause environmental damage.

x. Required for an insurance claim (see figure 18);

xi. To enable Gardaí to report statistics about levels of VCDT to persuade various agencies about the need to tackle VCDT, e.g. petition local council to target rubbish dumping blackspots with CCTV;

xii. Hoped Gardaí would find and take action against those responsible for VCDT;

xiii. Had information which could be of use, e.g. photo/video of trespasser or vehicle registration place of trespasser or name and/or address was among items illegally dumped;

xiv. CCTV was in use at the location of the VCDT;

xv. Knew the person(s) involved in the VCDT;

xvi. Farmer and/or neighbour saw activity around the time of VCDT which with hindsight believed to be suspicious or connected to the VCDT;

xvii. Unauthorised use of land by specified group of people and wanted assistance to prevent them from moving onto land and/or removal from land.

**Reasons Did Not Report VCDT Incident to Gardaí**

i. “Waste of time,” or “no point;”

ii. No action taken by Gardaí when reported a previous VCDT incident(s);

iii. No prosecution arose from previous VCDT incident(s) reported;

iv. Gardaí do not have resources to deal with the VCDT;

v. Zero or low cost of damage caused by VCDT therefore not significant enough to warrant reporting;

vi. Unsure when the VCDT took place;

vii. Believe rubbish dumping and/or trespassing is not always a ‘crime;’

viii. In the context of trespassing believe that ‘they’ would be gone before Gardaí arrived;

ix. Reported to a different body/agency, e.g. in the context of rubbish dumping it was reported to the Council instead;

x. Knew the person(s) involved in the VCDT;

xi. Farmer dealt with the VCDT him/herself, e.g. contacted a solicitor;

xii. Garda station closed (either permanently or at the time when wanted to report the VCDT incident);

xiii. No local Garda with knowledge of the area and/or community.

**Figure 14:** Reasons Why Respondents Did or Did Not Report to Gardaí a VCDT Incident(s) Recorded as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16
Half of the respondents who recorded experiencing only one VCDT incident reported the incident to Gardaí. By comparison, respondents who experienced multiple VCDT incidents did not report the majority of either initial or subsequent VCDT incidents to Gardaí. Although respondents who experienced multiple VCDT incidents reported slightly more of the subsequent incidents experienced compared to their initial VCDT incident experienced.

**Figure 15:**
Percentage of VCDT Incidents Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí Classified by Whether Respondent Experienced One VCDT Incident Only or Repeat VCDT Incidents between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16
Respondents recorded the type of VCDT experienced for 561 of the 711 VCDT incidents experienced in the prescribed period between 1 January 2014 and 31 May 2016. Types of VCDT incidents recorded by the respondents from the 29 options provided can be broadly categorised into 3 groups, namely: (i) use of land related crimes more commonly referred to as trespass; (ii) destruction / injury to personal property (including crops); and (iii) destruction or injury to land (land legally includes anything that is permanently attached to the land such as buildings, walls, fences and gates).

Trespass accounts for nearly two thirds of VCDT incidents, yet less than half of VCDT trespass incidents were reported to Gardaí. However, across all 3 groups the average cost of arising from the VCDT incident is significantly higher for VCDT incidents reported to Gardaí compared to VCDT incidents not reported.

Figure 16: VCDT Incidents Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 Categorised by Group of VCDT Incidents and Whether VCDT Incident was Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí
In general, more VCDT incidents were reported to Gardaí where assets subjected to VCDT are more likely to be insured than not insured. However, except for destruction or injury to fuels and oils and farm buildings/sheds/yards, the average costs arising from VCDT is significantly more for the VCDT incidents reported to Gardaí compared to VCDT incidents not reported to Gardaí.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of VCDT</th>
<th>Percentage of VCDT Incidents</th>
<th>Whether VCDT Incident was Reported to Gardaí and Average Cost Arising from VCDT Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trespass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised Hunting/Fishing/Shooting</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>50% €680 / 50% €78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish Dumping</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26% €473 / 74% €97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised Use of Farmland</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>57% €318 / 43% €78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction / Injury to Personal Property, i.e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50% €2,506 / 50% €956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles / Machinery / Equipment / Trailers</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>69% €2,453 / 31% €308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crops and Fodder</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>44% €2,343 / 56% €494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools (electrical and hand)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>44% €1,033 / 56% €483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuels and Oils</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>69% €409 / 31% €506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction / Injury to Land, i.e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences and Gates</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49% €726 / 51% €211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Buildings/Sheds/Yards</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>56% €86 / 44% €264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land (not for use for crops)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>45% €1,033 / 55% €175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmhouse</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>67% €600 / 33% €75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Whether Type of VCDT Incident Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 was Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí and Average Cost of VCDT Incident
Many respondents recorded that one of their reasons for reporting a VCDT incident to Gardaí was because it was necessary for an insurance claim. However, the majority of assets damaged in a VCDT incidents were not insured and even where assets damaged in a VCDT incident were insured the majority of these VCDT incidents were not reported to Gardaí. That said, the average costs arising from a VCDT incident that was reported to both Gardaí and insurance was over 14 times higher than the average costs arising from a VCDT incident reported to neither Gardaí nor insurance.

Figure 18:
Whether Asset(s) Insured in a VCDT Incident Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 was Reported/Not Reported to Gardaí and/or Insurance
Respondents recorded whether a criminal assault was reported to Gardaí for 59 of the 76 incidents experienced by 43 respondents in the prescribed period between 1 January 2014 and 31 May 2016. Overall, more criminal assault incidents were reported to Gardaí (42 incidents) than were not reported to Gardaí (17 incidents).

### Figure 19:
**Whether Types of Criminal Assault Recorded by Respondents as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 were Reported / Not Reported to Gardaí**

Respondents recorded the cost arising from 32 of the 59 incidents where the type of criminal assault was specified. The specified cost arising from 27 of these 32 incidents was €0. Costs greater than zero arising from a criminal assault incident were €10,000 (physical assault, reported), €100 (threat, reported), €100 (threat, not reported), €1,000 (threat, not reported) and €2,000 (threat, not reported).

---

### Table: Number of Criminal Assault Incidents and Whether Reported to Gardaí...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Only Incident Experienced</th>
<th>1st of Multiple Incidents Experienced</th>
<th>Repeat of Multiple Incidents Experienced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Yes</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Yes</td>
<td>1 Yes</td>
<td>3 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Yes</td>
<td>6 Yes</td>
<td>9 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 No</td>
<td>0 No</td>
<td>9 No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Legend:**
- 6% Yes
- 94% No

**Axes:**
- X-axis: Number of Criminal Assault Incidents
- Y-axis: Whether Reported to Gardaí
For 32 of the 76 criminal assault incidents respondents recorded why they did or did not report the criminal assault incident to Gardaí. The responses recorded can be summarised as follows:

**Reasons Did Report Criminal Assault Incident to Gardaí**

i. A crime should be reported to Gardaí;
ii. Did not want the person committing the criminal assault to “get away with it;”
iii. Scared / afraid following the criminal assault;
iv. Feared would experience criminal assault in the future if did not follow through on threat to inform Gardaí of the physical / threat of criminal assault;
v. Was a repeat incident / ongoing problem;
vi. Wanted to create a record with Gardaí of a threat of criminal assault which would be available if the threat resulted in a physical assault experienced; and
vii. Threatened when recovering assets that were stolen.

**Reasons Did Not report Criminal Assault Incident to Gardaí**

i. “Waste of time,” or “no point;”
ii. Believed not a crime if only threatened and/or Gardaí would not be interested in dealing with a threat;
iii. Believed would be too difficult to prove;
iv. Believed Gardaí are not in a position to take action if it is a threat is made by a specified group of people;
v. Farmer dealt with the criminal assault him/herself;
vi. Afraid to make a complaint to Gardaí because afraid of the person committing the criminal assault; and
vii. Believed reporting the criminal assault to Gardaí would likely antagonise the situation.

*Figure 20:*

**Reasons Why Respondents Did or Did Not Report to Gardaí Criminal Assault**

**Recorded as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16**
Respondents recorded whether a fraud incident was reported to Gardaí for 40 of the 73 incidents experienced by 50 respondents in the prescribed period between 1 January 2014 and 31 May 2016. The type of fraud incident experienced was specified for 34 of these 40 incidents. Overall more fraud incidents were not reported to Gardaí (28 incidents) than were reported to Gardaí (12 incidents).

No incident where a respondent was provided with a forged farm document(s) was reported to Gardaí, although the average cost arising from this type of fraud incident was €12,875. Respondents recorded an average cost arising from being sold stolen farm goods(s) of €650 for incidents reported to Gardaí and €270 for incident not reported to Gardaí. The average cost arising from being sold a counterfeit farm good(s) was also higher for incidents reported to Gardaí €658 compared to such incidents not reported to Gardaí €498.
For 34 of the 73 fraud incidents respondents recorded why they did or did not report the fraud incident to Gardaí. The responses recorded can be summarised as follows:

**Reasons Did Report Fraud Incident to Gardaí**

i. A crime should be reported to Gardaí;

ii. Wanted the person who committed the fraud to be brought to justice;

iii. Had evidence / potentially useful information, e.g. car registration number or transaction was recorded;

iv. Believed was getting goods from legitimate / reputable source;

v. To make others aware so they are not duped in the future;

vi. Heard those who committed the fraud were still operating in the area;

vii. To try recover the value of the loss;

viii. Had to return goods to owner which were stolen but bought in good faith; and

ix. Made to do so by family.

**Reasons Did Not Report Fraud Incident to Gardaí**

i. “Waste of time,” or “no point;”

ii. Felt foolish / stupid - should have known was a con / too good to be true so;

iii. Farmer dealt with the fraud him/herself;

iv. No evidence / proof;

v. No action taken by Gardaí when reported a fraud related crime in the past;

vi. Reported to the bank and money was recovered; and

vii. Believed amount of money involved was not significant enough to warrant reporting.

*Figure 22:*

**Reasons Why Respondents Did or Did Not Report to Gardaí Fraud Recorded as Experienced between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16**
Overall Level of Crime Prevention Measures Employed by Farmers

The respondents were asked to indicate the crime prevention measures employed on their farm from a list of specified answers (including ‘other’ where respondents could specify the nature of their crime prevention measure). The crime prevention measures can be broadly grouped across the categories of: (i) locking away assets; (ii) securing and/or monitoring land or buildings; (iii) recording a unique identifier for assets; and (iv) employing warnings or deterrents such as signage or guard dogs.

Almost nine out of ten respondents employed at least one crime prevention measure on their farm. Almost all of the respondents (99%) that did not experience agricultural crime in the prescribed period 1 January 2014 to 31 May 2016, employed at least one crime prevention measure. By comparison 83% of the respondents that did experience agricultural crime employed at least one crime prevention measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Prevention Measure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lock Away Assets</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure and/or Monitor Land or Buildings</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Identifier for Assets</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ a Warning or Deterrent</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23: Percentage of Respondents that Employed a Crime Prevention Measure by Category

Locking Away Assets

Three quarters of all respondents (647 of 861) recorded that they used locking away assets as a crime prevention measure either habitually or on occasion. Almost two-thirds of respondents that recorded locking away assets as a crime prevention measure experienced agricultural crime. By comparison almost three quarters of the respondents that did not record locking away assets as a crime prevention measure experienced agricultural crime.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whether Respondents Locked Away Assets as a Crime Prevention Measure</th>
<th>Yes (75%)</th>
<th>No (25%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether Respondents Experienced Agricultural Crime</td>
<td>Yes 72%</td>
<td>No 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 64%</td>
<td>No 36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24: Whether Respondents Locked Away Assets as a Crime Prevention Measure and Experienced Agricultural Crime between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16
Respondents that locked away farm assets as a crime prevention measure were far more likely to lock away the asset only if not in use rather than only at night or only if away from the farm. The type of assets with the highest number of theft incidents recorded as experienced in the prescribed period was theft of fuels and oils. Fifty percent of farmers did not record that they ever locked away fuels and oils. However, 12% of all respondents recorded ‘other’ and principally described either no longer keeping agricultural diesel or as little agricultural diesel as possible on the farm as a crime prevention measure.

### Percentage of All Respondents that Locked Away Assets as a Crime Prevention Measure …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Only if away from farm</th>
<th>Only at night</th>
<th>Only if not in use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machinery / Equipment</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Vehicles</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuels and Oils</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fodder</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Chemicals</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvested Crops</td>
<td>5%&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> While 5% of all respondents recorded locking away harvested crops as a crime prevention measure this represents 17% of the respondents that described ‘crops,’ ‘horticulture’ or ‘forestry’ as a sector that describes an activity of their farm. Overall, 30% of respondents recorded ‘crops,’ ‘horticulture’ or ‘forestry’ as a sector that describes the activity of their farm (14% as main activity, 16% as a secondary activity), compared to 99% of respondents recording one or more livestock sector as an activity of their farm.

<sup>b</sup> 10 respondents recorded there was little point in locking away assets because if someone really wanted to steal or cause vandalism or criminal damage to assets they would find a way regardless of whether it was locked away.

**Figure 25:**

Percentage of Respondents that Lock Away Assets as a Crime Prevention Measure between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 by Type of Asset
Securing and/or Monitoring Land or Buildings

Just over four out of five respondents (703 of 861) recorded that they secured and/or monitored land or buildings as a crime prevention measure. Almost two-thirds of the respondents that recorded securing and/or monitoring land or buildings as a crime prevention measure experienced agricultural crime. By comparison over three quarters of the respondents that did not record securing and/or monitoring land or buildings as a crime prevention measure experienced agricultural crime.

**Figure 26:**
Whether Respondents Secured and/or Monitored Land or Buildings as a Crime Prevention Measure and Experienced Agricultural Crime between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16

**Figure 27:**
Percentage of Respondents that Secured or Monitored Land or Buildings as a Crime Prevention Measure between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 by Method of Securing or Monitoring Assets
Almost two thirds of respondents (553 of 861) recorded that they used a unique identifier for assets as a crime prevention measure. In turn, almost two-thirds of the respondents that used a unique identifier for assets as a crime prevention measure experienced agricultural crime. By comparison nearly three quarters of the respondents that did not use a unique identifier for assets as a crime prevention measure experienced agricultural crime.

Figure 28: Whether Respondents Used a Unique Identifier for Assets as a Crime Prevention Measure and Experienced Agricultural Crime between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16

While 1% of all respondents recorded assigning their own method of identification to their crop as a crime prevention measure this represents 5% of the respondents that described 'crops,' ‘horticulture’ or ‘forestry’ as a sector that describes an activity of their farm. Overall, 30% of respondents recorded ‘crops,’ ‘horticulture’ or ‘forestry’ as a sector that describes the activity of their farm (14% as main activity, 16% as a secondary activity), compared to 99% of respondents recording one or more livestock sector as an activity of their farm.

A further 4% of respondents indicated that they intended to assign their own identification to their machinery but never seem to get around to it.

Figure 29: Percentage of Respondents that Used a Unique Identifier for Assets as a Crime Prevention Measure between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 by Method of Identification

-29-
Employing Warnings and/or Deterrents

Four out of five respondents (701 of 861) recorded that they employed warnings and/or deterrents as a crime prevention measure. Three out of five of the respondents that employed warnings and/or deterrents experienced agricultural crime. By comparison, four out of five respondents that did not employ warnings and/or deterrents experienced agricultural crime.

Figure 30:
Whether Respondents Employed a Warning or Deterrent as a Crime Prevention Measure and Experienced Agricultural Crime between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16

Whether Respondents Employed Warnings or Deterrents as a Crime Prevention Measure

- Yes 81%
- No 19%

Whether Respondents Experienced Agricultural Crime

- Yes 82%
- No 18%

- Yes 62%
- No 38%

Percentage of All Respondents that Employed a Warning or Deterrent as a Crime Prevention Measure ...

- Notify someone if leaving the farm and ... not returning on the same day
  - Yes 30%
  - No 14%

- Create a sound in an unoccupied ... farmhouse
  - Yes 20%
  - No 8%

- Leave a light on in an unoccupied ... farmhouse
  - Yes 39%
  - No 25%

- Have a guard / watch dog(s)
  - Yes 52%

- Post 'no illegal rubbish dumping' signs
  - Yes 20%

- Post 'no trespassing' signs
  - Yes 40%

- Engage with a community based crime prevention scheme
  - Yes 25%

- Other
  - Yes 11%

* 6% of respondents recorded that 'notifying someone if leaving the farm' is not applicable as there is always someone remaining at the farm.

* 'Other’ comprised: (i) the use of warning signs (including: 'danger,' ‘danger working farm,’ ‘gun owner or gun club member,’ ‘beware of dog(s),’ ‘beware/dangerous bull,’ ‘dangerous subsidence,’ ‘danger farm machinery,’ ‘keep dogs on lead,’ ‘no hunting,’ ‘CCTV in operation,’ ‘camera symbol or under surveillance,’ ‘member of community watch,’ ‘Bord Bia approved’ and/or ‘enter at own risk’); (ii) using a machine that creates dog barking noises either randomly or when triggered by a sensor; (iii) keeping their bull in a prominent or visible location; and/or (iv) creating the impression of being a gun owner by keeping gun pellets near entrances.

Figure 31:
Percentage of Respondents that Employed Warnings and/or Deterrents as a Crime Prevention Measure between 1.1.14 and 31.5.16 by Warning/Deterrent Method
The extent, nature and cost of agricultural crime in Ireland as well as the reporting rates to Gardaí and crime prevention measures employed by farmers to discourage agricultural crime, has never been the subject of a specific crime survey. This independent national survey of agricultural crime aimed to address this deficit. This research is important because the collection, analysis and dissemination of agricultural crime data are recognised as the first actions in preventing and reducing agricultural crime. It is envisaged that the results of this survey will form the baseline data against which further study of agricultural crime can be conducted and compared. For the purpose of the survey agricultural crime was categorised as any incident of (i) vandalism / criminal damage / trespass (VCDT); (ii) theft; (iii) criminal assault; and (iv) fraud experienced by a farmer carrying out farming activities.

This report is the third and last in a series of reports to disseminate the data collated from this national independent anonymous survey. This third report provides data on the amount of agricultural crimes reported and not reported to Gardaí, reasons why respondents reported or did not report agricultural crime(s) experienced to Gardaí as well as the types of crime prevention measures employed by farmers to protect their agricultural assets during the prescribed period 1 January 2014 to 31 May 2016.

Two-thirds of the respondent farmers experienced agricultural crime. Overall more agricultural crime incidents were reported (55%) to Gardaí than not reported (45%). In the context of the types of agricultural crime, more incidents of theft and criminal assault were reported to Gardaí than not reported. By comparison more incidents of VCDT and fraud were not reported to Gardaí than reported. It should also be noted that some respondents indicated that there was confusion whether rubbish dumping and trespassing were crimes and as to whether threats were criminal assaults. In general, the reasons respondents recorded for reporting or not reporting agricultural crime to Gardaí were the same regardless of the type of agricultural crime experienced. In fact, in some instances the reason for reporting an agricultural crime incident to Gardaí was the same reason for not reporting the incident (for example, the respondent knowing the thief was a reason to report to Gardaí for some respondents and not report for others). Incidents of theft and VCDT were more likely to be reported to Gardaí when the asset was insured. The level of recovery of stolen assets is very low (8%) and respondents recorded less assets were recovered by Gardaí (3%) than by other than Gardaí (5%). Perhaps one of the most significant reasons recorded for not reporting an agricultural crime incident to Gardaí centred on the farmer dealing with the crime him/herself.

Almost nine out of ten respondents employed at least one crime prevention measure ranging from locking away assets, securing and/or monitoring land or buildings, recording a unique identifier for assets and employing warnings or deterrents. The most commonly employed crime prevention measure was locking gates (used by 70% of respondents), followed by 52% of respondents owning a guard/watch dog(s).

Although no questions were asked concerning respondents’ attitude to agricultural crime, the Gardaí, or the criminal justice system, many respondents mentioned the negative impact of agricultural crime feared and/or experienced on quality of life and expressed dissatisfaction with the Gardaí and criminal justice system. While these subjects are outside the scope of this study they do point to areas of further research.
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