



**Study on Obstacles to Cooperation and Information-sharing  
among Forensic Science Laboratories and other Relevant  
Bodies of Different Member States and between these and  
Counterparts in Third Countries**

*Contract JLS/D1/2007/025*

**FINAL REPORT**

*December 2008*

*Version 1.0*

**Dr Richard Gill**



*This Work was Financed by the European Commission  
DG Justice, Freedom and Security*



*Supported by the European Network of Forensic Science Institutes (ENFSI)*



*Supported by EUROJUST*

<b>1</b>	<b>Table of Contents</b>	
2	List of Tables.....	5
3	List of Figures.....	5
4	Executive Summary .....	6
5	Members of the Study Team.....	8
6	Acknowledgements.....	9
7	List of Report Recommendations (In Numerical Order) .....	10
8	List of Report Recommendations (In Priority Order) .....	16
9	Introduction and Scope .....	22
10	European/International Forensic Cooperation Model.....	23
10.1	Significance of the Model in the Present Study.....	23
10.2	Initial Concepts.....	24
10.3	Fundamental Concepts.....	24
10.4	The Basic National Model.....	26
10.5	Fitness for Purpose and Oversight.....	27
10.6	The Basic International Model.....	29
10.7	Further Development of the International Model.....	31
10.8	Application of the Model to the Study Work Plan.....	33
11	Evidence Collection and Methodology (Overview).....	40
11.1	Questions to Directors of ENFSI Institutes.....	41
11.2	Questions to ENFSI Expert Working Group (EWG) Chairs .....	42
11.3	Questions to National Correspondents for Terrorist Matters.....	43
11.4	Questions to Countries Outside of Europe .....	43
11.5	Structured Interviews with Personal Contacts of the Study Team.....	44
11.6	Interactions with Europol & Interpol.....	45
11.7	Detailed Work Programme (Study Timeline) .....	46
12	Forensic Cooperation - Facilitating Organisations.....	48
12.1	European Union (EU).....	48
12.2	Europol.....	50
12.3	Eurojust .....	54
12.4	Interpol .....	56
12.5	G8.....	59
12.6	United Nations (UN).....	60
12.7	ENFSI.....	63
12.8	Other Regional Forensic Networks.....	67
12.9	CEPOL.....	70
13	Forensic Cooperation - Current Initiatives.....	72
13.1	EU Initiatives (The Schengen Information System).....	72
13.2	EU Initiatives (The Prüm Treaty Incorporated into EU Legislation).....	74
13.3	FORJUST.....	75
13.4	Examples of Bilateral Agreements.....	76

13.5	ENFSI Website for Methods and Technology for Crime Scene Investigation .....	77
13.6	ENFSI Multilingua Project.....	79
<b>14</b>	<b>Quality Standards in Forensic Science .....</b>	<b>81</b>
14.1	Introduction (Quality in Forensic Science) .....	81
14.2	Forensic Cooperation Linked to Quality and Standardisation .....	81
14.3	What does 'Quality' Mean in Forensic Science? .....	82
14.4	Organisations & Procedures (Quality Standards in Forensic Institutes) .....	82
14.5	People (Quality Standards Applied to Individuals) .....	86
14.6	Methods (Quality Standards Applied to Scientific Procedures) .....	87
14.7	Standards for Formulating Forensic Expert Opinion .....	88
14.8	Training in Forensic Statistics (FORSTAT) .....	88
14.9	ENFSI European Mentorship for Forensic Accreditation (EMFA).....	89
<b>15</b>	<b>Forensic Databases and Sharing Forensic Information .....</b>	<b>91</b>
15.1	Forensic Databases and Physical Collections.....	91
15.2	Local Forensic Databases.....	92
15.3	Sharing Forensic Database Information (Getting Ready to Share) .....	92
15.4	Sharing Forensic Database Information (Principles and Regulations).....	93
15.5	Sharing Forensic Database Information (Mechanisms) .....	94
15.6	International Forensic Databases.....	95
15.7	Surveys of Forensic Databases.....	96
<b>16</b>	<b>Evaluation of Survey Responses from Different Groups .....</b>	<b>97</b>
16.1	Introduction .....	97
16.2	Responses from ENFSI Directors (Preparedness) .....	98
16.3	Responses from EWG Chairs (Preparedness).....	105
16.4	Responses from National Correspondents for Terrorism Matters (NCTs) .....	110
16.5	Responses from Europol Liaison Bureaus .....	114
16.6	Responses from Outside of Europe.....	119
<b>17</b>	<b>Overview - Preparedness of European Forensic Institutes .....</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>18</b>	<b>Overview – Forensic Cooperation .....</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>19</b>	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>127</b>
19.1	Study Outcomes (Overview) .....	127
19.2	Study Recommendations.....	128
19.3	The Way Ahead .....	128
19.4	Preparedness .....	130
19.5	Fitness for Purpose & Oversight .....	132
19.6	Communication Between European Forensic Institutes .....	133
19.7	Quality, Standardisation and Harmonisation .....	134
19.8	Physical Forensic Collections and Forensic Databases .....	137
19.9	Language Issues .....	138
19.10	Secondments and Exchanges for ENFSI Staff .....	139
19.11	Working with Legal Systems in Other Countries .....	140
19.12	Interactions (The Forensic and the Law Enforcement Communities) .....	141
19.13	Interactions (Within the Law Enforcement Community).....	142
19.14	The Role of ENFSI .....	144

19.15	Miscellaneous .....	145
19.16	Further Testing of the Current Study Outcomes .....	146
20	Abbreviations .....	147
21	Bibliography .....	149
22	APPENDIX ONE Questionnaire to the Directors of ENFSI Forensic Science Institutes .....	2
23	APPENDIX TWO Questionnaire to Chairs of ENFSI Expert Working Groups .....	14
24	APPENDIX THREE Questionnaire to National Correspondents for Terrorism Matters .....	21
25	APPENDIX FOUR Questions for Countries Outside of Europe & International Forensic Bodies .....	24
26	APPENDIX FIVE Initial Questioning Themes with Europol & Interpol .....	31
27	APPENDIX SIX Meetings Attended by Study Team Members .....	33
28	APPENDIX SEVEN Forensic Science in the EU Legal Framework .....	36
29	APPENDIX EIGHT Results Summary (ENFSI Director Questionnaires) .....	41
30	APPENDIX NINE Results Summary (ENFSI Expert Working Group Questionnaires) .....	47
31	APPENDIX TEN Forensic Cooperation - Categorised Responses from the Forensic Community .....	50

## 2 List of Tables

		Page
Table 1	List of ENFSI Institutes (ENFSI Director Survey – May 2008)	150
Table 2	Chairs of ENFSI Expert Working Groups (Survey – February 2008)	151
Table 3	Work Programme used for Information Gathering and Data Evaluation	152
Table 4	Overview of Sixteen ENFSI Expert Working Groups (2007)	153

## 3 List of Figures

		Page
<b>The Forensic Cooperation Model</b>		
Figure 1	Fundamental Concepts (forensic modelling)	34
Figure 2	The National Model	35
Figure 3	Fitness for Purpose	36
Figure 4	The National Model (showing international cooperation)	37
Figure 5	The International Model	38
Figure 6	Overview of Study Methodology	39
<b>Responses from the ENFSI Directors</b>		
Figure 7	Does Your Institute Have Experience of Responding to Terrorist or Non-Terrorist Bomb Incidents?	100
Figure 8	Does Your Institute Have Experience of Responding to Bomb Incidents?	100
Figure 9	Who Directs Forensic Investigations at the Scene? Who Decides What Forensic Investigations Take Place?	101
Figure 10	What Dedicated Teams and Capabilities Could Your Institute Deploy at the Scene?	101
Figure 11	What is Included in Major Incident Plans for Scene Attendance and Laboratory Work?	102
Figure 12	Does Your Institute Have Procedures for Urgent Handling of Large Numbers of Exhibits? How have these been Tested?	102
Figure 13	In the Event of a Terrorist Event are you Confident that you have ..... ?	103
Figure 14	Participation in Counter-Terrorist Exercises.	103
<b>Responses from the ENFSI EWG Chairs</b>		
Figure 15	Do you Consider Your Area of Forensic Science Relevant to Counter-Terrorism? What Level of importance?	107
Figure 16	Level of Preparedness	107
Figure 17	What Proportion of ENFSI Institutes Have Adequate Levels of Preparedness?	108
Figure 18	In Your Area of Forensic Science, which of the Following Need Significant Improvement?	108
<b>Forensic Cooperation in the Future</b>		
Figure 19	Would you Consider Cooperation with Another Institute in the Future?	126

## 4 Executive Summary

Forensic science is playing an ever increasing role in the investigation and prosecution of crime. Furthermore, with the rising tide of global crime (terrorism, organised crime etc.) it is essential that effective measures are in place to support and encourage forensic cooperation across international borders.

This one-year study has taken a broad look at the current environment for forensic cooperation across Europe. Further, it has done so from the viewpoint that forensic cooperation does not stop at Europe's borders but needs to be seen in the context of international forensic cooperation around the world. The study has identified a wide range of obstacles to achieving effective forensic cooperation and has formulated recommendations to help address these issues.

In the early stages of the work, the study team has developed a *Forensic Cooperation Model*. The model describes the flows of forensic information and knowledge both inside a given country and also across its international borders. The model has been an effective framework used throughout the study. As a representation of the current national and international situation, the model has provided insights into the interactions between the stakeholders (the forensic and the law enforcement communities). Further, it has also provided a clear distinction between forensic data and forensic expert opinion. Overall, it has helped to identify the wide diversity of international forensic cooperation including:

- the mutual support of forensic institutes to achieve appropriate levels of preparedness to deliver forensic casework (training, designing and building facilities, sharing methodologies, supporting the achievement of quality accreditation etc.),
- the mutual support of forensic institutes at times of need (after a major incident or a terrorist attack) when local capacity is exceeded and practical measures are required to handle the excess casework,
- the sharing of forensic information (e.g. that held in databases) between different countries or between different forensic institutes,
- the transfer of forensic expert opinion between law enforcement teams in different countries to support criminal investigations,
- the transfer of forensic expert opinion between appropriate judicial authorities in different countries to support prosecutions,
- the delivery of expert testimony by an expert witness in a court in a different country.

A deeper understanding of the current environment for forensic cooperation in Europe has been achieved by examining the contributions from the various international stakeholders engaged in this area. These reviews have included the European Union (EU), Europol, Eurojust, Interpol, G8, the United Nations (UN), the European Network of Forensic Science Institutes (ENFSI), other Regional Forensic Networks and the European Police College (CEPOL). The large number of players involved (a point also emphasised by the very complexity of the *Forensic Cooperation Model*) has raised questions about the existing opportunities for effective strategic discussions about forensic science to take place between the forensic community and the law enforcement community.

In addition, the study team has identified and reviewed several current initiatives underway within Europe that are impacting upon forensic cooperation (or have the potential to do so in the future). These initiatives include the Schengen Information System (SIS), the Prüm Treaty incorporated into EU legislation, a web-based ENFSI crime scene website supported by Europol, the ENFSI Multilingua language translation glossary and the ENFSI FORJUST project facilitating the delivery of forensic training within the judicial community.

A key output from the study has been the reaffirmation that forensic quality standards play a central role in the achievement of effective international cooperation. The exchange of forensic information relies upon both the provider and the recipient sharing the same common high standards. To this end, a comprehensive review has been undertaken of the numerous

initiatives underway in the area of European forensic quality and accreditation. Much good work is being done but it is clear that any desire to further increase the speed of progress or to take on yet more initiatives will lead to a significant strain on current resources.

Consideration has also been given to the importance of sharing national forensic database information. There are several European and worldwide initiatives underway in this specific area, mainly relating to DNA and fingerprints. The study does not make any specific recommendations in this area as many of the existing initiatives have yet to reach full implementation. However, there may be opportunities for the sharing of other types of forensic database information and to that end an up to date survey of European databases would provide a good foundation for considering those opportunities.

Questionnaire surveys and structured interviews have been used to obtain views about forensic cooperation from a wide range of stakeholder groups across Europe including representatives from both the forensic communities and the law enforcement communities. These have included the directors of the ENFSI institutes, the chairs of the ENFSI Expert Working Groups (EWGs), the Eurojust National Correspondents for Terrorist Matters (NCTs) and the Europol Liaison Bureaus. Respondents were asked to base their answers on their personal experiences of forensic cooperation. In addition to questions relating to forensic cooperation, the questionnaires have also provided an overview of preparedness across ENFSI institutes from the viewpoint of their abilities to deliver forensic services after a major bomb incident.

Following a detailed evaluation, the obstacles to forensic cooperation arising from the questionnaires have provided the basis for the 36 recommendations put forward in this final report. The information about the current environment for forensic cooperation in Europe has also been a major source leading to the recommendations. At a final stage, the recommendations have been ranked to provide guidance on their relative importance and priority for implementation. Although the full set of recommendations covers a wide range of topics, those with top priority cluster under four general themes:

- To work with the EC to find ways to share this report and the report recommendations with both the forensic community and the law enforcement community, to gain wide acceptance for the ideas and to formulate the way ahead towards more effective forensic cooperation. Through this process to seek to identify the key players to be involved in the future implementation of specific elements. (Recommendations 1, 2, and 3)
- To seek ways to create new forums where the forensic community and the law enforcement community can engage in strategic discussions about forensic science. This might include joint training initiatives between the communities. A positive outcome would be the engagement of the forensic community in national major incident planning and participation in national exercises designed to simulate emergency events. (Recommendations 26, 27 and 28)
- To encourage and promote the broad range of quality initiatives being undertaken within ENFSI involving the Quality and Competence Committee (QCC) and the EWGs. The QCC and the EWGs, supported by the ENFSI Board, remain the focus for future work activity to push forward progress in Europe such that every institute quickly achieves ISO17025 accreditation as a first major milestone. Critical factors for long-term success will be centred on the future availability of resources (particularly the availability of people to deliver the work) and the governance (objectives, roles, responsibilities) provided by the ENFSI Board. (Recommendations 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17 and 19)
- To draw upon the experience already gained in some parts of Europe with the delivery of forensic services in the aftermath of a major bombing incident to produce a European *Best Practice Guide* for achieving preparedness for such an event. Further, in the interests of preparedness ENFSI institutes should be encouraged to draft formal agreements with other institutes to facilitate the rapid initiation of forensic support between those institutes at a time of great need, e.g. after a major incident. (Recommendations 4 and 5)

## 5 Members of the Study Team

<i>Peter de Bruyn</i>	<i>Netherlands Forensic Institute</i>	<i>The Netherlands</i>
<i>Dr Helmut Demmelmeier</i>	<i>Bundeskriminalamt Kriminaltechnisches Institut</i>	<i>Germany</i>
<i>Sean Doyle</i>	<i>The Forensic Explosives Laboratory Dstl</i>	<i>UK</i>
<i>Dr Richard Gill (Project Lead)</i>	<i>The Forensic Science Service</i>	<i>UK</i>
<i>Phil Hicks</i>	<i>Eurojust (The Hague)</i>	<i>EU</i>
<i>Dominique Saint-Dizier</i>	<i>Direction Centrale de la Police Judiciaire</i>	<i>France</i>
<i>Ercan Seyhan</i>	<i>Gendermarie General Command Forensics Department</i>	<i>Turkey</i>
<i>José Miguel Otero Soriano</i>	<i>Comisaria General De Policia Cientifica</i>	<i>Spain</i>
<i>Liselotte Nielsen Sundberg</i>	<i>Swedish National Laboratory of Forensic Science</i>	<i>Sweden</i>



## 6 Acknowledgements

Many individuals and organisations have assisted the study team during the course of this one-year study. Nevertheless, two particular individuals stand out as having been major contributors to the work and have become regarded within the study team as "associate study team members". They are **Dr Christa Dern** from the Bundeskriminalamt Kriminaltechnisches Institut, Wiesbaden, Germany and **Dr Pierre van Renterghem** from Europol Headquarters in The Hague, Netherlands. We wish to record our sincere thanks to these two individuals for their enthusiastic hard work and their very productive inputs into the study.

We also wish to express our thanks to the **ENFSI Board** for giving their strong support to this project and their encouragement of all the ENFSI institutes to contribute. Particular thanks are due to the ENFSI directors of the home institutes of the study team members, who have given their support for their staff members to be directly involved with the project as part of team. We are also very pleased to offer our thanks to **Mr Wim Neuteboom** and Mrs **Judy van Overveld** at the ENFSI Secretariat located within the Netherlands Forensic Institute, The Hague. The ENFSI Secretariat has undertaken many tasks on behalf of the study team over the course of the year including the distribution of questionnaires to ENFSI institutes.

The management of **Eurojust** and **The Forensic Explosives Laboratory Dstl** are gratefully acknowledged for releasing Mr Phil Hicks and Mr Sean Doyle, respectively to participate as members of the study team.

With reference to our enquiries about international forensic cooperation, thanks are due to:

**Dr Vincent Otieno Alego** (Team Leader, Chemical Criminalistics, AFP)

**Gregory Carl** (Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, Explosives, Unit, FBI Laboratory Division, USA)

**Herman Metz** (Manager Forensic & Data Centres Business Support, Forensic & Data Centres, AFP)

**Stephanie Reilander** (Deputy Director, Centre of Forensic Sciences, Ontario, Canada and the President of ASCLD)

**Dr Barbara Remberg** (Laboratory and Scientific Section, UNODC, Vienna, Austria)

**Dr James Robertson** (National Manager Forensic & Technical, Australian Federal Police, AFP)

**Alastair Ross** (the Director of the Victoria Police Forensic Science Department and the Chairman of SMANZFL)

**Alexander Theus** (Europol Headquarters in The Hague, Netherlands).

**Werner Schuller** (Interpol Assistant Director, Forensic Support and Specialised Technical Databases Sub-Directorate)

As always, the production of a finished study report benefits greatly from several people in the background who are involved with the final publication process. We want to thank **Dr Reinoud Stoel** (NFI, The Hague) for his support in the processing of numerical data from the questionnaires and **Alan Baxter** (The Forensic Science Service, Birmingham, UK) for his work in preparing the final document ready for printing and binding. In particular, we want to thank **Dr Alison Gill** for proof reading the final manuscript. Nevertheless, any errors that remain in the document are the sole responsibility of the author and his team.

## 7 List of Report Recommendations (In Numerical Order)

The following Table contains a complete list of the recommendations arising from the study listed in the order that they are introduced within the final report.

The study recommendations have been judged by the study team using a scale where three stars (★★★) represent those with the highest priority, whilst those with two stars (★★) and one star (★) have decreasing priorities. Nevertheless, it must be emphasised that every single recommendation (below) is being proposed as having the potential to impact upon overall forensic cooperation (see Chapter 18 for further details).

The abbreviations used within this summary table are defined within the main text of the report as they arise and, for easy reference, they are also listed in Chapter 20.

	Priority
<p><b>Recommendation 1</b></p> <p>For the study team to work with the EC to agree routes by which this final report can receive widespread circulation amongst the European forensic and law enforcement communities. This recognises that these two communities have a common interest in the flows of forensic information both inside and between countries. The purpose of such dissemination would be to promote knowledge and understanding of forensic cooperation amongst all stakeholders and, thereby, to prepare the ground for further debate and for the implementation of the report recommendations.</p>	★★★
<p><b>Recommendation 2</b></p> <p>For an appropriate sensitisation event (workshop, seminar or conference) to be organised to involve a mix of delegates drawn from both the forensic and the law enforcement communities. The purpose of the event would be to facilitate meaningful detailed discussions about the current study outcomes with further opportunities to challenge and re-prioritise the recommendations. Further, the event could play an important role in planning the way ahead, with discussions relating to the practical aspects of implementing the recommendations. The staging of such an event would probably best sit under the banner of the EC to emphasise the wide engagement of both the forensic and the law enforcement communities.</p>	★★★
<p><b>Recommendation 3</b></p> <p>To carefully explore with forensic and law-enforcement stakeholders the range of organisations that will need to be involved when implementing each recommendation arising from the current study. The complexity of the <i>forensic cooperation model</i> has clearly highlighted the importance of multiple stakeholder engagement to facilitate success when tackling the obstacles to forensic cooperation. Implementation that involves the European forensic community will undoubtedly point towards ENFSI or the individual forensic institutes. Implementation that involves the law enforcement community is less easily assigned and the support of the EC will be needed to help identify, engage and motivate the appropriate organisations and agencies across Europe.</p>	★★★
<p><b>Recommendation 4</b></p> <p>To initiate a project using a team drawn from the ENFSI institutes to research and prepare a European <i>Best Practice Guide</i> for achieving preparedness to deal with major explosive incidents within a forensic institute/laboratory. The evidence gathered within the present study will provide a foundation for such work but more detailed information will need to be collected from the ENFSI institutes and other</p>	★★★

<p>organisations outside of ENFSI, in particular from those countries that have already had to face terrorist attacks.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 5</b></p> <p>For ENFSI to encourage the drafting of formal agreements between ENFSI institutes (and other forensic organisations) to facilitate the rapid initiation of forensic support between those institutes at a time of great need (e.g. immediately after a major incident). Such outline agreements negotiated in advance will provide the important framework on which specific forensic services can be implemented and delivered quickly to meet a specific emergency.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 6</b></p> <p>To initiate a project using a team drawn from appropriate European institutes to investigate the current best practice (including forensic recovery) for dealing with wider scope CBRN incidents from a forensic perspective. The work will need to look at all aspects of this activity from the incident scene to the laboratory and will require significant collaboration with those other organisations that have responsibilities in CBRN emergency situations e.g. those organisations charged with the duty of cleaning up after such incidents.</p>	<p>★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 7</b></p> <p>To conduct a detailed survey of all European forensic institutes to help understand the many different external oversight factors and agencies (national and international) that are currently influencing their approaches for achieving 'fitness for purpose' in the delivery of their forensic services.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 8</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to encourage the ENFSI Quality &amp; Competence Committee (QCC) to continue to strengthen its relationship with European Accreditation (EA) and International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC). Further, the ENFSI Board should ensure that resources are made available to the QCC such that the highest priority can be given to working with EA and ILAC in the development of the new common guidance document for both ISO17020 and ISO17025, to cover the whole forensic process, involving both crime scenes and work in the forensic laboratory.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 9</b></p> <p>For all ENFSI institutes to set up a telephone/email point-of-contact to act as a starting place for regular communication between institutes. Such a route would provide an additional line of communication other than the direct communication routes that already exist between the institute directors.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 10</b></p> <p>For ENFSI to explore new approaches and policies for communication between forensic institutes encouraging more direct communication between institute staff at all levels. In particular, to explore routes by which forensic experts can readily engage with each other and thereby call upon a wider pool of knowledge and expertise than available within their own institutes. Such new routes of communication might involve the further exploitation of the ENFSI website with the application of newer software communication tools, to facilitate discussion forums or other communication platforms.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 11</b></p> <p>For ENFSI to examine the current methods of electronic communication between forensic institutes and consider ways by which the security of such communication can be improved for the transfer of sensitive information when</p>	<p>★ ★</p>

<p>necessary (e.g. handling casework information). Consideration should also be given to the compatibility of such secure institute-to-institute communications with sensitive information transfers to the law enforcement community (e.g. police forces).</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 12</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to strongly encourage all ENFSI institutes to move rapidly towards achieving quality accreditation to the international ISO17025 standard in line with the membership criteria contained within the ENFSI "Framework for Membership" (ENFSI BRD-FWK-001).</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 13</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to support &amp; strengthen the current work of the ENFSI Quality &amp; Competence Committee (QCC) in all aspects of its work to design and implement quality standards. In particular, for the QCC to be encouraged to continue its work on the development of detailed quality standards in those areas not adequately covered by the ISO standards (competence assessment, method validation etc.). Further, that the ENFSI Board makes available adequate resources to ensure speedy progress in this important area.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 14</b></p> <p>To achieve wide recognition that the ENFSI EMFA Project (European Mentorship for Forensic Accreditation) and the ENFSI inter-laboratory exercises are two important tools for establishing, maintaining and driving up quality standards in European forensic science. Through this recognition to secure improved resourcing for these activities from the EC and thereby to ensure well-managed and well-directed programmes of work for the future. In this way widespread European quality accreditation to international standards can be achieved more quickly and furthermore those standards can be maintained and enhanced over time.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 15</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to reiterate the importance of the ENFSI Expert Working Groups (EWGs) as the key foundation for the identification of best practice, the setting of common standards and for promoting method harmonisation for their own forensic disciplines across all ENFSI institutes. Such strengthening of the EWG role will require clear governance (objectives, roles, responsibilities) from the ENFSI Board and the full commitment of all the EWGs to align with the ENFSI objectives. Equally important, the strengthening of the EWG role will require the full support of all ENFSI directors who provide the staff to resource the EWGs. The manpower resource required to achieve effective progress in this area should not be underestimated and the ENFSI Board may need to achieve significant external funding to help facilitate the release of such manpower resource from individual ENFSI institutes.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 16</b></p> <p>For ENFSI and the European Commission (EC) to seek constructive dialogue with the legal community to jointly explore ways to safeguard the continued collection of forensic quality data (e.g. the results of inter-laboratory exercises) recognising that such information can be used in negative ways during trials and tribunals.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 17</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to encourage the ENFSI Quality &amp; Competence Committee (QCC) to work with European Accreditation (EA) and International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) to develop and implement common European/International standards for forensic interpretation.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 18</b></p> <p>For ENFSI to prepare a central list of forensic databases and physical forensic collections that are currently held by individual ENFSI institutes with a view to the potential future sharing of such forensic information. Further, to consider the adequacy of such existing databases and to identify those databases with potential for further development.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 19</b></p> <p>For ENFSI to work towards harmonising and adopting common standards for the exchange of forensic information (databases etc.) for those areas where such standards have not yet been developed and where there are significant benefits for sharing such data across international borders.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 20</b></p> <p>To raise the awareness amongst European forensic practitioners of the ENFSI Multilingua project and thereby encourage wider use of the tool and its further development to include more languages and more areas of forensic expertise.</p>	<p>★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 21</b></p> <p>To investigate the potential application of ever improving modern software translation tools in the area of technical translation and thereby explore their application in the field of forensic science.</p>	<p>★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 22</b></p> <p>To set up a mechanism for the creation and regular maintenance of a European list/register of technically and judicially competent language translators available to support courts and tribunals when reviewing forensic information (written or verbal) presented in a foreign language. The ownership and access point to such a list/register will be an important element of this work, as will be the measures of competence for inclusion on the list.</p>	<p>★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 23</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to encourage and support forensic practitioners to take part in secondments and exchanges involving ENFSI institutes. Such experiences are seen as valuable ways to build relationships, forge links between institutes, facilitate the exchange of information and encourage the sharing of good practice. They also provide good opportunities for forensic scientists to practice and improve their language skills. Overall secondments and exchanges can make effective contributions towards many of the key factors that will influence long-term European forensic cooperation.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 24</b></p> <p>To raise awareness across the forensic community that the legal barriers to forensic cooperation are far less problematic than generally perceived.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 25</b></p> <p>To create an area on the ENFSI website that provides general guidance on the Investigative processes and tribunal procedures that pertain to each European country. Such guidance would provide an initial introduction for any forensic expert required to engage with a different country. Procedural guidance for courtroom appearances would be an important part of this information.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 26</b></p> <p>For the European Commission (EC) to seek opportunities to create new forums by which the law enforcement community and the forensic community can engage together in regular and ongoing discussions about the better use of forensic science for the investigation of crime and the prosecution of criminals. The current lack of such a common forum at the present time leads to many misunderstandings on both sides. The engagement of both communities in such strategic discussions about forensic science would have enormous benefits for all. The <i>forensic cooperation model</i> would provide a common platform for building a common awareness and understanding.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 27</b></p> <p>For the European Commission (EC) to support ENFSI in exploring opportunities for developing a long-term forensic training programme with a defined curriculum for delivery to both the law enforcement community and the forensic community. The curriculum could be centred on the <i>forensic cooperation model</i> and the training elements would provide a detailed account of the numerous processes involved in the movement of forensic information.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 28</b></p> <p>To strengthen the engagement of the forensic community with the national organisations (police, military, civil authorities etc.) that plan for major crisis incidents (e.g. a terrorist bomb attack). Through this engagement to promote further understanding of the potential impact of such an incident on forensic services (from the incident scene to the laboratory). Further, such engagement to promote the further participation of the forensic community in the national planning discussions and the practical participation of forensic institutes in national exercises designed to simulate emergency events.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 29</b></p> <p>As part of a future study, further consideration should be given to whether forensic information in terrorism-related investigations and prosecutions should be forwarded to Eurojust as a matter of course (alongside other information required by Council Decision 2005/671/JAI). If so, further work is required to establish the role of Eurojust when it receives such information in order to make it widely available to the Member States. Further, associated data protection issues would also need to be considered and resolved.</p>	<p>★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 30</b></p> <p>To alert the EC to the comments received from the law enforcement community highlighting the real benefits for general information sharing that might be achieved through the more widespread national co-location of the access points for the various existing communication channels used for international law-enforcement cooperation (Europol, Interpol, Schengen / Sirene etc.).</p>	<p>★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 31</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to consider the inclusion of explicit aims within the ENFSI Mission Statements that refer to cooperation between member institutes and the exchange of information. The purpose of this change would be to emphasise the importance of forensic cooperation at the centre of the ENFSI strategy.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 32</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to support &amp; strengthen the current work of the European Academy of Forensic Science, EAFS (an ENFSI Standing Committee) in its work to draft an updated ENFSI Research &amp; Development (R&amp;D) Strategy. This updated strategy should aim to promote opportunities for European forensic institutes to work together and to overcome the practical difficulties associated with such collaborative work. Further, ENFSI should continue to actively seek all opportunities for external funding to facilitate larger scale, long-term R&amp;D areas.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 33</b></p> <p>For the EC to explore potential relaxations in the regulations (European &amp; international) relating to the transfer/transport of hazardous substances (e.g. explosives, chemical agents), from one country to another, in situations when such movements involve only minute quantities required for scientific/analytical purposes. The current legislation imposes severe administrative burdens, well out of proportion to the risks involved and thereby creates a practical obstacle for the sharing of common chemical standards and the distribution of samples for quality assurance trials.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 34</b></p> <p>To undertake further consultation with the organisations that already play important roles in the facilitation of forensic cooperation throughout Europe (Europol, Interpol, Eurojust, ENFSI, European Commission) to further test the validity of the <i>forensic cooperation model</i> and the recommendations that arise from the current study.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 35</b></p> <p>To undertake further consultation with organisations outside of Europe that are key stakeholders in promoting forensic cooperation throughout the world to help further test the validity of the <i>forensic cooperation model</i> and the recommendations that arise from the current study. Such organisations to include the regional networks of forensic science laboratories (ASCLD, SMANZFL, AICEF).</p>	<p>★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 36</b></p> <p>Through further consultation with stakeholders from both the forensic community and the law enforcement community to explore ways in which the <i>forensic cooperation model</i> can be improved and adapted, and thereby used as the basis for further understanding the processes by which forensic knowledge and information is shared. Through this developing understanding, provided with the aid of the model, to further understand the obstacles to such cooperation and thereby seek long-term solutions.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>

## 8 List of Report Recommendations (In Priority Order)

The following Table contains a complete list of the recommendations arising from the study grouped together according to their priority.

The study recommendations have been judged by the study team using a scale where three stars (★★★) represent those with the highest priority, whilst those with two stars (★★) and one star (★) have decreasing priorities. Nevertheless, it must be emphasised that every single recommendation (below) is being proposed as having the potential to impact upon overall forensic cooperation (see Chapter 18 for further details).

The abbreviations used within this summary table are defined within the main text of the report as they arise and, for easy reference, they are also listed in Chapter 20.

	Priority
★★★	
<p><b>Recommendation 1</b></p> <p>For the study team to work with the EC to agree routes by which this final report can receive widespread circulation amongst the European forensic and law enforcement communities. This recognises that these two communities have a common interest in the flows of forensic information both inside and between countries. The purpose of such dissemination would be to promote knowledge and understanding of forensic cooperation amongst all stakeholders and, thereby, to prepare the ground for further debate and for the implementation of the report recommendations.</p>	★★★
<p><b>Recommendation 2</b></p> <p>For an appropriate sensitisation event (workshop, seminar or conference) to be organised to involve a mix of delegates drawn from both the forensic and the law enforcement communities. The purpose of the event would be to facilitate meaningful detailed discussions about the current study outcomes with further opportunities to challenge and re-prioritise the recommendations. Further, the event could play an important role in planning the way ahead, with discussions relating to the practical aspects of implementing the recommendations. The staging of such an event would probably best sit under the banner of the EC to emphasise the wide engagement of both the forensic and the law enforcement communities.</p>	★★★
<p><b>Recommendation 3</b></p> <p>To carefully explore with forensic and law-enforcement stakeholders the range of organisations that will need to be involved when implementing each recommendation arising from the current study. The complexity of the <i>forensic cooperation model</i> has clearly highlighted the importance of multiple stakeholder engagement to facilitate success when tackling the obstacles to forensic cooperation. Implementation that involves the European forensic community will undoubtedly point towards ENFSI or the individual forensic institutes. Implementation that involves the law enforcement community is less easily assigned and the support of the EC will be needed to help identify, engage and motivate the appropriate organisations and agencies across Europe.</p>	★★★
<p><b>Recommendation 4</b></p> <p>To initiate a project using a team drawn from the ENFSI institutes to research and prepare a European <i>Best Practice Guide</i> for achieving preparedness to deal with</p>	★★★



<p>major explosive incidents within a forensic institute/laboratory. The evidence gathered within the present study will provide a foundation for such work but more detailed information will need to be collected from the ENFSI institutes and other organisations outside of ENFSI, in particular from those countries that have already had to face terrorist attacks.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 5</b></p> <p>For ENFSI to encourage the drafting of formal agreements between ENFSI institutes (and other forensic organisations) to facilitate the rapid initiation of forensic support between those institutes at a time of great need (e.g. immediately after a major incident). Such outline agreements negotiated in advance will provide the important framework on which specific forensic services can be implemented and delivered quickly to meet a specific emergency.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 8</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to encourage the ENFSI Quality &amp; Competence Committee (QCC) to continue to strengthen its relationship with European Accreditation (EA) and International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC). Further, the ENFSI Board should ensure that resources are made available to the QCC such that the highest priority can be given to working with EA and ILAC in the development of the new common guidance document for both ISO17020 and ISO17025, to cover the whole forensic process, involving both crime scenes and work in the forensic laboratory.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 12</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to strongly encourage all ENFSI institutes to move rapidly towards achieving quality accreditation to the international ISO17025 standard in line with the membership criteria contained within the ENFSI "Framework for Membership" (ENFSI BRD-FWK-001).</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 13</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to support &amp; strengthen the current work of the ENFSI Quality &amp; Competence Committee (QCC) in all aspects of its work to design and implement quality standards. In particular, for the QCC to be encouraged to continue its work on the development of detailed quality standards in those areas not adequately covered by the ISO standards (competence assessment, method validation etc.). Further, that the ENFSI Board makes available adequate resources to ensure speedy progress in this important area.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 14</b></p> <p>To achieve wide recognition that the ENFSI EMFA Project (European Mentorship for Forensic Accreditation) and the ENFSI inter-laboratory exercises are two important tools for establishing, maintaining and driving up quality standards in European forensic science. Through this recognition to secure improved resourcing for these activities from the EC and thereby to ensure well-managed and well-directed programmes of work for the future. In this way widespread European quality accreditation to international standards can be achieved more quickly and furthermore those standards can be maintained and enhanced over time.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 15</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to reiterate the importance of the ENFSI Expert Working Groups (EWGs) as the key foundation for the identification of best practice, the setting of common standards and for promoting method harmonisation for their own forensic disciplines across all ENFSI institutes. Such strengthening of the EWG role will require clear governance (objectives, roles, responsibilities) from</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>

<p>the ENFSI Board and the full commitment of all the EWGs to align with the ENFSI objectives. Equally important, the strengthening of the EWG role will require the full support of all ENFSI directors who provide the staff to resource the EWGs. The manpower resource required to achieve effective progress in this area should not be underestimated and the ENFSI Board may need to achieve significant external funding to help facilitate the release of such manpower resource from individual ENFSI institutes.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 17</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to encourage the ENFSI Quality &amp; Competence Committee (QCC) to work with European Accreditation (EA) and International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) to develop and implement common European/International standards for forensic interpretation.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 19</b></p> <p>For ENFSI to work towards harmonising and adopting common standards for the exchange of forensic information (databases etc.) for those areas where such standards have not yet been developed and where there are significant benefits for sharing such data across international borders.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 26</b></p> <p>For the European Commission (EC) to seek opportunities to create new forums by which the law enforcement community and the forensic community can engage together in regular and ongoing discussions about the better use of forensic science for the investigation of crime and the prosecution of criminals. The current lack of such a common forum at the present time leads to many misunderstandings on both sides. The engagement of both communities in such strategic discussions about forensic science would have enormous benefits for all. The <i>forensic cooperation model</i> would provide a common platform for building a common awareness and understanding.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 27</b></p> <p>For the European Commission (EC) to support ENFSI in exploring opportunities for developing a long-term forensic training programme with a defined curriculum for delivery to both the law enforcement community and the forensic community. The curriculum could be centred on the <i>forensic cooperation model</i> and the training elements would provide a detailed account of the numerous processes involved in the movement of forensic information.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 28</b></p> <p>To strengthen the engagement of the forensic community with the national organisations (police, military, civil authorities etc.) that plan for major crisis incidents (e.g. a terrorist bomb attack). Through this engagement to promote further understanding of the potential impact of such an incident on forensic services (from the incident scene to the laboratory). Further, such engagement to promote the further participation of the forensic community in the national planning discussions and the practical participation of forensic institutes in national exercises designed to simulate emergency events.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 31</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to consider the inclusion of explicit aims within the ENFSI Mission Statements that refer to cooperation between member institutes and the exchange of information. The purpose of this change would be to emphasise the importance of forensic cooperation at the centre of the ENFSI strategy.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 36</b></p> <p>Through further consultation with stakeholders from both the forensic community and the law enforcement community to explore ways in which the <i>forensic cooperation model</i> can be improved and adapted, and thereby used as the basis for further understanding the processes by which forensic knowledge and information is shared. Through this developing understanding, provided with the aid of the model, to further understand the obstacles to such cooperation and thereby seek long-term solutions.</p>	<p>★ ★ ★</p>
<p>★ ★</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 7</b></p> <p>To conduct a detailed survey of all European forensic institutes to help understand the many different external oversight factors and agencies (national and international) that are currently influencing their approaches for achieving 'fitness for purpose' in the delivery of their forensic services.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 9</b></p> <p>For all ENFSI institutes to set up a telephone/email point-of-contact to act as a starting place for regular communication between institutes. Such a route would provide an additional line of communication other than the direct communication routes that already exist between the institute directors.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 10</b></p> <p>For ENFSI to explore new approaches and policies for communication between forensic institutes encouraging more direct communication between institute staff at all levels. In particular, to explore routes by which forensic experts can readily engage with each other and thereby call upon a wider pool of knowledge and expertise than available within their own institutes. Such new routes of communication might involve the further exploitation of the ENFSI website with the application of newer software communication tools, to facilitate discussion forums or other communication platforms.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 11</b></p> <p>For ENFSI to examine the current methods of electronic communication between forensic institutes and consider ways by which the security of such communication can be improved for the transfer of sensitive information when necessary (e.g. handling casework information). Consideration should also be given to the compatibility of such secure institute-to-institute communications with sensitive information transfers to the law enforcement community (e.g. police forces).</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 16</b></p> <p>For ENFSI and the European Commission (EC) to seek constructive dialogue with the legal community to jointly explore ways to safeguard the continued collection of forensic quality data (e.g. the results of inter-laboratory exercises) recognising that such information can be used in negative ways during trials and tribunals.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 18</b></p> <p>For ENFSI to prepare a central list of forensic databases and physical forensic collections that are currently held by individual ENFSI institutes with a view to the potential future sharing of such forensic information. Further, to consider the adequacy of such existing databases and to identify those databases with potential for further development.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>

<p><b>Recommendation 23</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to encourage and support forensic practitioners to take part in secondments and exchanges involving ENFSI institutes. Such experiences are seen as valuable ways to build relationships, forge links between institutes, facilitate the exchange of information and encourage the sharing of good practice. They also provide good opportunities for forensic scientists to practice and improve their language skills. Overall secondments and exchanges can make effective contributions towards many of the key factors that will influence long-term European forensic cooperation.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 24</b></p> <p>To raise awareness across the forensic community that the legal barriers to forensic cooperation are far less problematic than generally perceived.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 25</b></p> <p>To create an area on the ENFSI website that provides general guidance on the Investigative processes and tribunal procedures that pertain to each European country. Such guidance would provide an initial introduction for any forensic expert required to engage with a different country. Procedural guidance for courtroom appearances would be an important part of this information.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 32</b></p> <p>For the ENFSI Board to support &amp; strengthen the current work of the European Academy of Forensic Science, EAFS (an ENFSI Standing Committee) in its work to draft an updated ENFSI Research &amp; Development (R&amp;D) Strategy. This updated strategy should aim to promote opportunities for European forensic institutes to work together and to overcome the practical difficulties associated with such collaborative work. Further, ENFSI should continue to actively seek all opportunities for external funding to facilitate larger scale, long-term R&amp;D areas.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 33</b></p> <p>For the EC to explore potential relaxations in the regulations (European &amp; international) relating to the transfer/transport of hazardous substances (e.g. explosives, chemical agents), from one country to another, in situations when such movements involve only minute quantities required for scientific/analytical purposes. The current legislation imposes severe administrative burdens, well out of proportion to the risks involved and thereby creates a practical obstacle for the sharing of common chemical standards and the distribution of samples for quality assurance trials.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 34</b></p> <p>To undertake further consultation with the organisations that already play important roles in the facilitation of forensic cooperation throughout Europe (Europol, Interpol, Eurojust, ENFSI, European Commission) to further test the validity of the <i>forensic cooperation model</i> and the recommendations that arise from the current study.</p>	<p>★ ★</p>
<p>★</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 6</b></p> <p>To initiate a project using a team drawn from appropriate European institutes to investigate the current best practice (including forensic recovery) for dealing with wider scope CBRN incidents from a forensic perspective. The work will need to look at all aspects of this activity from the incident scene to the laboratory and will require significant collaboration with those other organisations that have</p>	<p>★</p>

responsibilities in CBRN emergency situations e.g. those organisations charged with the duty of cleaning up after such incidents.	
<b>Recommendation 20</b> To raise the awareness amongst European forensic practitioners of the ENFSI Multilingua project and thereby encourage wider use of the tool and its further development to include more languages and more areas of forensic expertise.	★
<b>Recommendation 21</b> To investigate the potential application of ever improving modern software translation tools in the area of technical translation and thereby explore their application in the field of forensic science.	★
<b>Recommendation 22</b> To set up a mechanism for the creation and regular maintenance of a European list/register of technically and judicially competent language translators available to support courts and tribunals when reviewing forensic information (written or verbal) presented in a foreign language. The ownership and access point to such a list/register will be an important element of this work, as will be the measures of competence for inclusion on the list.	★
<b>Recommendation 29</b> As part of a future study, further consideration should be given to whether forensic information in terrorism-related investigations and prosecutions should be forwarded to Eurojust as a matter of course (alongside other information required by Council Decision 2005/671/JAI). If so, further work is required to establish the role of Eurojust when it receives such information in order to make it widely available to the Member States. Further, associated data protection issues would also need to be considered and resolved.	★
<b>Recommendation 30</b> To alert the EC to the comments received from the law enforcement community highlighting the real benefits for general information sharing that might be achieved through the more widespread national co-location of the access points for the various existing communication channels used for international law-enforcement cooperation (Europol, Interpol, Schengen / Sirene etc.).	★
<b>Recommendation 35</b> To undertake further consultation with organisations outside of Europe that are key stakeholders in promoting forensic cooperation throughout the world to help further test the validity of the <i>forensic cooperation model</i> and the recommendations that arise from the current study. Such organisations to include the regional networks of forensic science laboratories (ASCLD, SMANZFL, AICEF).	★

## 9 Introduction and Scope

The general objective of the current European Commission (EC) contract (JLS/D1/2007/025) was to provide a comprehensive overview and insight into the obstacles (gaps, limiting factors etc.) that inhibit European forensic laboratories sharing forensic information and working together in support of law enforcement investigations and subsequent prosecutions. The key aims were to identify the obstacles to cooperation that exist nationally and internationally and to recommend ways in which these can be overcome.

From the outset it was recognised by the study team that the EC has a broad interest in European forensic cooperation associated with all areas of activity where forensic science can make a contribution (terrorism, organised crime, major crime, human trafficking, illicit drug supply natural disasters etc.). In view of the relatively short timescale of the study, the approach outlined in the study inception report (January 2008) was to concentrate on terrorist criminality (with a particular emphasis on bomb attacks) as the basis for our evidence collection. The seriousness of such incidents, along with their inevitable international focus, means that forensic cooperation between countries will be pursued with considerable energy in such situations.

Thus, the concentration on evidence gathering in the field of counter-terrorism has been pursued in the work of the study team throughout the project, as planned. Nevertheless, the information collected continued to point towards wider principles that apply across all areas of criminality, not just terrorism.

In the study inception report for the contract, delivered to the EC in January 2008, the detailed aims of the study were documented as follows:

- To complete an inventory of the counter terrorism capabilities of European forensic science institutes.
- To identify the obstacles that prevent or limit the cooperation between European forensic science institutes.
- To prioritise the obstacles identified and make recommendations on how such factors can be minimised or eliminated.

Further, in the study inception report, the study team committed to the evaluation of its findings within the context of a visual model representing a framework for European/International forensic cooperation. It was envisaged from the outset that the findings from the study were likely to be broad and complex and would benefit from such an approach using a visual model.

In the detailed planning stages of the study the anticipated scope and complexity of the findings were reinforced. Thus, an early decision was taken by the study team to utilise significant resources at the beginning of the EC contract to draft an initial working model for international forensic cooperation to help facilitate the follow up stages of the project. The work on this initial model development was described in the study interim report (June 2008) and the further refinements are described in detail later in this final report.