NOTE

1. The aim of the annual report based on the Council Resolution on preventing and restraining football hooliganism (8246/97 ENFOPOL 121) is
   • to provide an accurate overview of the current situation throughout the Member States;
   • to identify and rectify any weaknesses in the current system,
   • to increase the levels of international cooperation and mutual assistance between law enforcement agencies.

2. The annual report is composed of a questionnaire which contains statistical information and other data on football hooliganism which occurred in the period June 1998-June 1999 and focuses on competitive games and friendlies played by national football teams (adults and under-21s) in the said period and on competitive games played at European level.
With a view to the preparation of a summary Member States were asked to report to the Presidency by 30.9.1999, on the basis of the questions set out in ENFOPOL 216 (1997), on the current situation as regards football hooliganism in the Member States.

3. In drafting this document use was made of the replies from 14 countries.
4. The Article 36 Committee is requested to submit this report to the Council.
FOOTBALL HOOLIGANISM IN EU MEMBER STATES

QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION POLICE COOPERATION WORKING PARTY

1. Number of matches played in your country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions League</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEFA Cup</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup Winners Cup</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Toto</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matches played by national teams occur on a fixed basis while matches played by club teams fell by 10% overall compared with the previous reporting period. See Annex 1 for details.

2. Number of arrests and/or preventive custody from these matches

For offences Preventive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>Competitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>23273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions League</td>
<td>13557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEFA Cup</td>
<td>49245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup Winners Cup</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Toto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 541</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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N.B. Preventive custody means those taken into custody due to a risk of violence/disorder and released without charge once the risk has subsided.

*NL: not specified, but total number of persons taken into custody for offences was 1 546.

Compared with the previous reporting period the total number of detentions rose from 278 cases to 2 541 cases! The increase may partly be attributed to improved statistics.

The NL share of detentions at both national and club team level is a massive 1 546 persons!

The number of detentions for offences at national team level has risen considerably compared with the previous reporting period (169 → 263). The United Kingdom alone accounts for 155 cases of detention at national team level!

The number of preventive custody cases also rose by about 200% (37 → 114).

Detentions for offences at club team level have remained virtually unchanged compared with the previous reporting period (255 → 230). Preventive detentions have fallen by about 200 cases (577→388).

It may be deduced from the abovementioned figures that the ratio between types of detention shifted towards repressive detentions in the reporting period 1998-1999.

It should be mentioned that no detentions occurred at the 17 matches played in Denmark!

See Annexes 1 and 2 for details.
Offences against property and physical integrity clearly stand out as the main types of offence committed at matches played in England, Germany, France, the Netherlands and Belgium. Those countries’ replies were of course highly detailed clearing owing to the advanced state of crime statistics methods. Often such acts were ascribed to the influence of alcohol or drugs.

Of the forms of disorderly behaviour verbal abuse still appears to be the most common, often leading to assault or brawling. Resisting stewards and the police and malicious damage to property occur in particular at matches played in Austria, Belgium, France, Italy and Germany. The confiscation of largish quantities of various weapons from spectators seems to be a typical occurrence in e.g. Belgium and the Netherlands, while various kinds of fireworks and flares are prevalent particularly in France and the southern European countries. On the other hand, match frequency is high in the above countries. In England a substantial increase in violent disturbances was observed during the reporting period. However, disorderly behaviour displaying racist characteristics had decreased.

Confrontations between supporters are still frequent in some countries, while in some countries clashes inside stadiums have been reduced through successful ticket sales policies and segregating fans into different parts of the stand.

The most typical feature in the northern countries was disorderly behaviour through drunkenness. Also widespread was attempting to gain unlawful entry to matches with forged tickets. On the other hand, there was remarkably little incidence of damage to property and violent behaviour.
2.5 *Were alcohol or drugs contributory factors to criminal offences committed by spectators?*

The replies by Italy, Greece and Ireland stated categorically that alcohol was not found to have influenced the behaviour of those who committed offences. Almost all the other countries' replies to this question took a common line, expressing the view that alcohol had a broadly inhibition-removing effect on people's behaviour. For some spectators alcohol consumption may act as a catalyst for disorderly behaviour, while in others it induces a cheerful party mood without troublesome behaviour. Some countries' replies gave the impression that alcohol consumption was not the main reason for disorderly conduct. In Italy and Austria the consumption of alcohol at international matches is forbidden.

Cultural differences in countries' attitudes to alcohol along with differing statistical methods clearly contributed to the variation in replies on this point.

2.6 *Did alcohol or drugs have any impact on other spectators' behaviour?*

The replies received took a common line in the same way as the answers to the previous question.

Only the replies by Italy, Greece and Ireland stated that alcohol had not been found to have any effect on the behaviour of other spectators
3. **Stadium bans**

3.1. *Does your country have a system of nationwide bans under the following:*

- **civil law**
- **criminal law**

Seven Member States do not have a nationwide stadium ban in force under civil law: A/DK/F/EL/I/IRL/LUX. Seven Member States have imposed such a ban: UK/E/B/D/NL/S/FIN.

Nine Member States do not have a stadium ban in force under criminal law: A/B/D/DK/EL/IRL/LUX/S/FIN. Five Member States do have such a ban: UK/E/F/NL/I.

See Annex 2 for details.

3.2. *If the answer to 3.1. is yes, how many stadium bans were imposed nationwide during the period under review?*

During the reporting period 1 851 stadium bans were imposed under civil law and 1665 under criminal law. A total of 3 516 bans was imposed.

The total number of bans imposed had increased by about 25% compared with the previous reporting period.

See Annex 2 for details.
4. **General description of violence/disorder on the domestic football scene**

4.1. **What is the total number of spectators who regularly travel abroad in support of:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National team</th>
<th>Category B</th>
<th>Category C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Club teams</td>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>Category C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals travelling occasionally:

4.2. **Average age**

NOTE: Category C-Violent or instigators of violence

Category B-Some potential for confrontation or disorder especially alcohol-related

For 4.1.-4.2. see Annex 3.

4.3. **Patterns of behaviour when following abroad:**

The replies clearly show that for the most part supporters are peaceful and enthusiastic football lovers. The group causing disturbances is after all fairly marginal, but the negative effect it represents is considerable and it attracts a disproportionate amount of negative attention.
Generally speaking, national team supporters are peaceful and sports-minded and their behaviour does not cause problems. With club teams the situation is less positive because the supporters identify more personally with the “home team’s” victories and defeats.

The replies to this question were very general and often dealt with in a few words, although a few were quite detailed.

The replies can be interpreted as suggesting that football supporters’ behaviour reveals a strong regional, cultural and even perhaps historical bond. If the reply box was in this respect left empty or the situation described as "normal" or "no change" from the previous reporting period, the reply was thus interpreted as meaning that disorderly behaviour did not occur or occurred so little that no behaviour patterns could be detected.

Below are the accounts of certain Member States who gave substantiated replies to this question:

**National team:**

**Belgium:** No perceptible hooligan-related behaviour amongst national team supporters.

**France:** Supporters mostly enthusiastic, sports-minded and peaceful. Individual cases of disorderly behaviour.

**Ireland:** National team supporters gather in the pubs and bars nearest to the match venue. Supporters may be loud and sing rousing songs, but do not indulge in any other disorderly behaviour let alone hooliganism. National team supporters have recently received the FIFA Fair Play Award for Fans.
**England:** Considerable numbers of English fans travel abroad every year. Both national and club team supporters tend to gather in bars and pubs in the city centre and sing supporters' songs. Supporters do not seek confrontation, but can be provoked. Only a small number of fans' behaviour may be pre-planned and ill-intentioned.

**Germany:** Supporters are usually better than their reputation because that reputation stems from small criminal elements which have attracted disproportionate attention from the media.

The behaviour patterns of national and club team supporters are not generally very different. If a behavioural difference is apparent this is mainly attributable to numbers. Problems are mainly confined to category C supporters who do not necessarily identify themselves as national or club followers. Nationalistic flags etc. may, it is true, be used at international matches.

All supporters use all possible means to obtain tickets for interesting matches or tournaments.

Before the match they assemble, for example, at the station or some other central location from which they set off through the city looking for bars, fast food restaurants and shops. This is also often the first occasion when they test the authorities' preparedness. During the match category C supporters in particular have grown accustomed to being segregated within the stands, but despite this they may attempt in various ways to make contact with like-minded rival fans for purposes of provocation. This situation may typically result in (partially) alcohol-generated security problems.

After the match procedures are often used for keeping both teams' supporters in the stadium. All categories of fans have become accustomed to this practice and accept it. Disturbances can nevertheless occur after the match. Operational/tactical shortcomings on the part of the authorities are all too easily exploited.
**Netherlands:** In general the national team is accompanied by a large number of supporters who emphasise the party atmosphere by dressing in orange and painting their faces in the national colours, but as category A supporters they do not cause disturbances.

**Spain:** The national team supporters generally behave well and take more pleasure in the sporting atmosphere and the travelling, while it is true that, depending on the opposition, supporters can be provoked or even indulge in provocation themselves. Such a risk is most likely to occur after a match and very much depends on the final result.

**Sweden:** Supporters following the national team behave in exemplary fashion and do not generally cause problems. An exception was the England-Sweden European elimination match in the summer of 1999, and then the Swedish supporters mainly fought amongst themselves in central London, away from the match, and did not target opposing supporters or other outsiders.

On the basis of the Member States' replies hooliganism would appear to be less serious in the peripheral areas of the European Union (south: Spain, Italy, Portugal, Greece, and north: Finland, Sweden and Denmark) than in the centre (Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and, least seriously, France). Ireland is also an exception in a positive sense.

**Club teams:**

**Belgium:** Club team supporters tend to riot in their home districts. Supporters of individual teams may also provoke disturbances abroad, especially in the Netherlands.

**France:** The supporters of one club (Olympique de Marseille) can cause problems abroad.
**Ireland**: Only small numbers of supporters travel with club teams and those are generally family groups who do not cause trouble.

**Netherlands**: Club team supporters identify strongly with their "home team" and are thus perhaps more inclined to cause disturbances. Opponents are easily felt to be "the enemy". As a bad example we might take a single instance from the previous football season's away match between Feyenoord and Bayer Leverkusen, at which the German police arrested over a thousand Feyenoord supporters and as a result of which more than 70 people are awaiting trial on hooliganism charges.

**Spain**: Club team supporters identify more with their “home teams”, which makes them more inclined to indulge in disorderly behaviour. All in all disorderly conduct on the part of club team supporters is also rare and unlikely to be normal behaviour.

**Sweden**: Disorderly behaviour on the part of club team supporters is confined to certain groups of supporters of 4-5 teams. These problem fans tend, admittedly in individual cases and generally under the influence of alcohol, to seek confrontation with rival fans, although over the last few years these groups of supporters have not caused trouble at matches played abroad and problems have arisen mainly at home matches.

### 5. **Supporter networks**

5.1. Are you aware of any relationship between your own and foreign supporters which can be described as particularly hostile or friendly?

If yes please describe:

The following Member States focused in their replies on the following particularly friendly or hostile relations between supporters:
National team:

**Austria:** No information

**Belgium:** No information

**France:** No information. Friendliness or hostility depends on the circumstances at any given time.

**England:** No relations.

**Germany:** Hostile:
- Belgium
- England
- Netherlands
- Austria

**Friendly:**
- None

**Spain:**

**Friendly:**
- None

**Hostile:**
- Attitude depends on prevailing circumstances.

**Netherlands:**

**Friendly:**
- Generally most opponents.

**Hostile:**
- Germany, England, Belgium

Club teams:

**Austria:**

**Friendly:**
- Commando Urfahr – Young Boys Bern

**Hostile:**
- No information

**Belgium:** Supporters of 7 club teams out of 13 in the first and second divisions have some links with foreign problem-teams.
Friendly:
ACC Antwerpen – Feyenoord
France: Hostile:
Olympique de Marseille – FC Bologna

England: No links.

Germany: Friendly:
Schalke D4 – Twente Enschede (NL)
Bayer 04 Leverkusen – Standard Liege (B)
Karlsruher SC – Racing Strasbourg (F)
Waldhof Mannheim/1, FC Magdeburg – Basel (CH)
Borussia Dortmund – FC Zürich (CH)
FC St Paul – Glasgow Celtic (GB)
Borussia Mönchengladbach – FC Liverpool (GB)
Alemannia Aachen – Roda Kerkrade (NL)
FC Köln – Arsenal (GB)

Hostile:
In principle all B, UK, NL and A club teams apart from the above.

Netherlands: Friendly:
Twente Enschede – FC Schalke (D)
Feyenoord Rotterdam – Chelsea (GB)
FC Groningen – Werder Bremen (D)
ADO Den Haag – Juventus (I) and Club Brugge (B)
FC Den Bosch – Standard Liège (B)
PSV Eindhoven – Charleroi (B)
Ajax Amsterdam – Manchester United (GB)
NAC Breda – Lokeren (B)
FC Utrecht – Glasgow Rangers (GB)

Hostile:
In principle always a possibility with club teams from Germany, England and Belgium apart from the above.
5.2. **If you are aware of such relationship, how do they normally communicate?**

Nearly all Member States' replies show that communication, where it occurs, is maintained as follows:

in by far the most cases, via the telephone, GSM, via the Internet (Altavista, Yahoo, HotBot, Voila, Belcast) and by post; to a varying extent, it takes the form of spontaneously arising mutual support through team publications, etc., on match days.

5.3. **Are any of these relationships/networks politically influenced (either right or left wing)? If so, please describe:**

Only four member country replies referred to politically influenced relationships, in each case mainly to extreme right wing groups, but said that as regards the international significance of the phenomenon they were minor, and desultory.

6. **Future developments**

6.1. **What developments (if any) do you envisage in the foreseeable future in respect of international football in Europe?**

Both in the organising countries (Belgium and Holland) and in the other countries providing teams, the upcoming Euro 2000 football tournament led to a considerable level of cooperation and information exchange in preparation for the event, designed to ensure that the competition can take place safely without detriment to the sporting climate.
In the longer term, six main lines of development were foreseen:

1. Developing European integration, increased prosperity and freer movement is expected to have an increasing effect on the travel movements of football supporters and also of football hooligans.

2. The increased commercialism of football and the shift in the activity of football clubs towards a more clearly entrepreneurial role may, on the other hand, alienate supporters and drive them away.

3. The number of international matches is on the rise. Among other things, EUFA has increased the number of Champions' Leagues.

4. The number of travelling East European football supporters will continue to rise.

5. A certain generation change is occurring among supporters.

6. Security measures in many countries will be stepped up.

6.2. What impact will these developments have on spectator behaviour, in particular with regard to football-related violence?

Despite the increase in travel and the growing number of international matches, the other member countries have not witnessed a noticeable rise in the level of football hooliganism. This is particularly true of countries in which the phenomenon has never or only rarely occurred. Those countries in which hooliganism is a problem regard increased travel as likely to exacerbate the situation.
At the same time, certain countries saw supporters accompanying East European teams on their travels as constituting an increasing risk. This sense of a growing threat is due mainly to the fact that not enough is yet known about the behaviour of supporters from the countries mentioned.

With the generation change among football supporters, the possibility was seen that younger people than before might commit acts of violence.

Tougher measures to step up security had been introduced in many countries. However, opinion was virtually unanimous that the continuous build-up of police units or ground stewards will not bring about a final solution and may, indeed, threaten the sporting climate generally.

On the other hand, tougher measures at national level may prompt hooligans to seek easier targets abroad or, it was feared, hooliganism might spread to the lower divisions because of the tougher security measures taken for the upper divisions.

6.3. What impact will these developments have on policing and international cooperation in the future?

The matters referred to in 6.1 and 6.2 above will have the effect on developments of heightening the importance of continued international cooperation. Increased stadium bans and supranational harmonisation, segregation of supporters in the stands, a successful ticket sales policy, reducing the black market to a minimum and certain new technical possibilities for controlling hooligans were mentioned as individual means of possible prevention and protection against hooliganism.

With the increasing participation of East European countries, the work of the Council of Europe's Standing Committee on Spectator Violence was perceived as of growing importance.
6.4. Are there any other sports which require the same level of cooperation as football?

In general football was said to be the main sport throughout the world and problems of this level were not seen as developing in the near future in relation to other sports.

In the worst case, some replies considered it possible in the context of ice-hockey and basketball that there might be an emergence of the same kind of problem as in football.

7. **Intelligence and cooperation**

7.1. Do you consider the quantity and quality of intelligence exchange is adequate for the police planning of European matches?

*If your answer is no, please give your reasons:*

In the main, answers were in the affirmative. In some cases shortcomings were experienced in the exchange of information, arising from countries' differing organisational arrangements and practices. This was also a reason why there might be problems of timing in the exchange of information. In some cases the quality of the information also left something to be desired. This may of course derive from national differences with regard to data protection. The exchange of information with East European countries has not always been successful. This was seen to be due chiefly to the inadequacy of these countries' computer systems. Use of the Internet as a transmission medium in particular was difficult with East European countries.

7.2. Do you normally receive intelligence from other Member States in good time to include it in the overall planning process for matches?

Information mostly arrived in time. Differences were of course encountered from country to country, and we refer to the problems mentioned in the previous paragraph.
7.3. Does your country have specialist police officers with the expertise to gather intelligence and travel abroad on request to advise and assist the host police force in the behaviour of your travelling supporters?

All the Member States' police organisations have experts who are able to assist the police of the requesting country in the manner referred to in the question.

7.4. Regarding the exchange of intelligence and mutual cooperation, are there any weaknesses in the current system? If so please describe:

Many countries reported that there were no problems with obtaining information and mutual cooperation. Some countries found information exchange formats ill-matched and in need of harmonisation. Legislation was said to require harmonisation. Some replies requested greater emphasis on the importance of stadium bans. The system of contact persons accompanying supporters was felt to need further development at national level. At the same time national organisation was reported to be deficient in some countries.

7.5. Do you have any suggestions as to how the current system of intelligence exchange and mutual cooperation can be improved?

In general it appeared from the replies that action by society to prevent social inequality and exclusion is of primary importance. To eradicate the phenomenon, legislative frameworks must be effective. International cooperation within the framework of existing structures, and the activity of expert bodies, must be continuous and a watch must constantly be kept on the phenomenon. Supranational regulation was seen as an excellent means of preventing it. Achieving this, however, demanded sustained work and harmonisation of national legislation. The authorities' scope for action had to be preserved in all sectors.
A Common Handbook was one method which was also felt to be a useful tool for developing mutual cooperation. The establishment of national centres in all Member States was considered to be desirable in some replies. It was hoped also that resolutions and recommendations would be implemented more vigorously. On the other hand, it was also understood that football hooliganism was not a problem everywhere. Coordination was also hoped for between the European Union, the Council of Europe and the Schengen countries. There had also been positive experiences with an information system of the European Police Information Centre type, and in general an intelligence-led approach to football hooliganism had proved to be an effective method, e.g. in England.

7.6. Do you consider that the Police Cooperation Working Party should prepare a report annually?

Answers were in general in the affirmative. The annual questionnaire should however be adapted to meet current needs.

7.7. If your answer is YES, should any future report seek the views of others at operational level?

As regards the drafting of the report and its value for comparison, it was thought desirable in some cases to give a summary of operational views.
### Table: Police Cooperation Working Party Questionnaire - Football Season 1998-1999 Annex 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU State</th>
<th>Number of Matches</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>IRL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>FIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td>National Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>DB Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.</td>
<td>UEFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.</td>
<td>Cup Winners' Cup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Number of Offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.</td>
<td>National Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.</td>
<td>Forfeited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NL*: Due to replacement of the computer system it is not possible to distinguish persons arrested for offences.
NL**: Netherlands legislation does not permit preventive arrest of persons, but total of persons arrested for offences was 1,546.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>IRL</th>
<th>L 2</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>FIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.</td>
<td>Local matches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.</td>
<td>Total arrests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preventive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.</td>
<td>Stadium bans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil law</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal law</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.</td>
<td>Bans under civil law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bans under criminal law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annex 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU State</th>
<th>National Teams</th>
<th>Club Teams</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>Category C</td>
<td>Category B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A – Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D – Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK – Denmark</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E – Spain</td>
<td>300 average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F – France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB – United Kingdom</td>
<td>300 average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR – Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I – Italy</td>
<td>300 average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRE – Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>few</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**D**: The division of spectators into categories B and C at matches played by the German national team abroad is theoretical and is needed only in exceptional cases. For high-risk matches the distinction between the categories has no significance in relation to the use of police forces.

**FIN**: Individual travellers on an occasional basis. They do not take part in disturbances.