

Information Bulletin for Shoeprint/Toolmark Examiners

Vol. 11, No.1, April 2005

The Information Bulletin for Shoeprint/Toolmark Examiners is published by the Marks Working Group of the European Network of Forensic Science Institutes (ENFSI).

<http://www.poliisi.fi/wgm/>

Editor:

ANJA YTTI
B.Sc., Forensic Examiner

National Bureau of Investigation
P.O. Box 285
01301 Vantaa
Finland
tel. +358-9-8388-6383
fax +358-9-8388-6303
e-mail: anja.ytti@krp.poliisi.fi

Co-editor:

GERRIT VOLCKERYCK
Commissaris

Federal Police
Directorate Forensic Science, Central Unit
Notelaarstraat 211
1000 Brussels
Belgium
tel. +32 2 743 72 68
fax. +32 2 743 76 07
mobile: +32 475 44 55 62
e-mail: gerrit.volckeryck@scarlet.be
<http://gallery.uunet.be/gerrit.volckeryck/index.htm>

Printed in the National Bureau of Investigation, Finland

ISSN 1455-4194

Index

<u>INDEX</u>	4
FOREWORD	5
<u>ANNUAL REPORT 2004 (ENFSI WG MARKS)</u>	7
<u>GENERAL</u>	7
<u>1. MEMBERSHIP</u>	8
<u>2. Steering Committee</u>	8
<u>3. Terms of Reference</u>	9
<u>4. and 5. Statement of objectives & plan incl.</u>	10
<u>FRAMEWORK FOR EXPERT WORKING GROUPS</u>	29
<u>CASTING SNOW PRINTS WITH “QUIKRETE” FAST SETTING CONCRETE:</u>	
<u>AN ALTERNATIVE TO AEROSOL WAX PRODUCTS</u>	34
<u>THE 5TH MEETING FOR SHOEPRINT/TOOLMARK EXAMINERS</u>	41
<u>REGISTRATION FORM FOR THE SPTM 2005 MEETING</u>	44
<u>REPORT OF THE ENFSI MWG STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING</u>	51
<u>UPCOMING CONFERENCES</u>	54

The photograph in the front page is taken at the Steering Committee and Scale Committee meeting of the MWG in Linköping, Sweden, January 2005.

FOREWORD

Dear readers,

At the moment there is less than two months to our next SPTM meeting. I will use here the opportunity to remind you all about the deadline, 15th of April, for the registration of the 5th SPTM meeting in Stavern, Norway, 24th -27th of May. I hope you have already marked these important dates in your calendar. You will find the registration form and the address of the contact person, Steinar Eriksen, on the web site <http://www.kripos.no> and also in this IBSTE issue on page 44. Please, follow the information available on the web page about the registration, preliminary program etc. Visit the web page also to take a look at the beautiful surroundings of Stavern. According to MWG statute the SPTM meetings should be arranged every other year but because of the 3rd EAFS meeting in Istanbul 2003 it has already gone four years from the previous SPTM meeting in Berlin. Let's hope many of you can participate this coming meeting in Stavern.

In this IBSTE you can find the Annual Report 2004 of the Enfsi Marks Working Group written by the chairman of MWG, Horst Katterwe. The Annual Report is one of the assignments of all the Expert Working Groups of Enfsi. You can familiarise yourself to the general assignments of all the Working Groups by reading also the Framework for Expert Working Groups (BRD-FWK-003) approved by the Enfsi Board in 2004. You can find this document and also all the other published documents of the Enfsi on web site <http://www.enfsi.org>. The Report of the MWG's Steering Committee Meeting held in January in Linköping, Sweden, is also included in this issue.

As the editor I want to thank Mr. Thomas W. Adair from Westminster, Colorado, for sending us an article titled "Casting Snow Prints with "Quikrete" Fast Setting Concrete: An alternative to Aerosol Wax products." This type of article is always very welcomed

and very informative to our readers. Those of our colleagues who live in countries which have snow during winter time will certainly know how difficult it can be to make good castings of shoe impressions in snow. The snow as material can really be different type in different times depending for example on its age, temperature etc. So all the tests and tips to help to cast the snow impressions well are very valuable.

Now on the last day of March we still have snow here in the north, at least in Finland, but the sun is already shining very brightly and the spring will come very soon.

Looking forward to meet many of you in Stavern in May.

Sincerely yours,

Anja Ytti

ANNUAL REPORT 2004 (ENFSI WG Marks)

Chairman Dr. Horst Katterwe

GENERAL

The Marks Working Group is one of the forensic science working groups of the European Network of Forensic Science Institutes (ENFSI). This working group covers examinations in a wide range of disciplines including tool marks, lock and key examinations, manufacturing marks, restoration of erased numbers, footwear marks, tyre marks, glove marks, bare feet and other related topics (but not fingerprint).

The general aims of the Marks Working Group are

- to raise the level of expertise in marks examiners
- to promote best Quality Assurance practises in the fields of expertise covered by the Working Group.

These aims are to be achieved by

- ensuring that there is an interchange of information between examiners in different organisations through scientific meetings, personal contacts and a regular Information Bulletin.
- promoting research covering the various types of examination conducted by members of the working group.
- establishing good contacts between the Marks Working Group and other relevant groups (either other ENFSI working groups or external organisations such as IAI and AFTE).
- considering collaborative exercises with a view to standardising the levels of conclusion reached in different organisations.

1. MEMBERSHIP

At the end of 2004 the Group had 42 full members; the members represented 35 different countries. As the work of mark examiners not only covers toolmarks and shoeprints but also a wide array of other types of examinations, the Group prefers to keep the guest membership „very open“, thus gaining benefit from the experiences of a big number of experts, especially during the so called SPTM conferences. Of course in a SPTM conference the „WG Business Meeting“ is incorporated but it doesn't take up too much of the time.

2. STEERING COMMITTEE (since EAFS Meeting, Istanbul, Turkey, Sept. 2003)

Chairman: Dr. Horst Katterwe
Bundeskriminalamt
Kriminaltechnisches Institut
Werkstofftechnik
D-65173 Wiesbaden / Germany
tel.: +49-(0)611-5512683
fax: +49-(0)611-5513603
e-mail: Horst.Katterwe@bka.bund.de

members:

Dave Baldwin
Forensic Science Service
Metropolitan Laboratory
109 Lambeth Road
London SE1 7LP / United Kingdom
tel.: +44-207-230-6377
fax: +44-207-230-6316
e-mail: DavidBaldwin@fss.pnn.police.uk

Marcel van Beest
Netherlands Forensic Institute
Laan van Ypenburg 6
NL-2497 GB The Hague (Den Haag) / Netherlands
tel.: +31-(0)708886106

fax: +31-(0)708886550
e-mail: m.van.beest@nfi.minjus.nl

Lennart Jonasson
National Laboratory of Forensic Science
S-58194 Linköping / Sweden
tel.: +46-13-241-408
fax: +46-13-145-715
e-mail: fingerprint.marks@skl.police.se

Silvia Ramsl
Ministry of Interior
National Crime Laboratory
Josef Holaubek Platz 1
A-1090 Vienna / Austria
tel.: +43-1-2483685662
fax: +43-1-2483685690
e-mail: Silvia.ramsl@bmi.gv.at

Anja Ytti
National Bureau of Investigation
P. O. Box 285
01301 Vantaa / Finland
tel.: +358-9-8388-6383
fax: +358-9-8388-6303
e-mail: anja.ytti@krp.poliisi.fi

3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

WG newsletter

Again, like in the four past years, several issues of the publication 'Information Bulletin for SP/TM Examiners' (IBSTE) were published (in 2004: 2 issues). At the end of 2004, the print of the Bulletin was about 250 copies which were delivered to 36 countries. The editor is Anja Ytti / Finland (see also: <http://www.poliisi.fi/wgm/>).

WG www site

Updating the information on the www site of the MWG has mainly involved adding the latest Information Bulletins and new requests for help on the Wanted Page. The WG www site is updated by Sirkka Mikkonen and Anja Ytti (both from Finland): <http://www.poliisi.fi/wgm/>; and www.enfsi.org.

Contacts to other WG'S

The ENFSI Marks WG has contact to other WGs:

- WG Quality and Competence Committee (Anja Ytti)
- Conclusion Scale Group "Firearm" (Horst Katterwe)

There are good contacts to the IAI (International Association for Identification) and to the AFTE (Association of Toolmark and Firearm Examiners).

4. AND 5. STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES & PLAN INCL.

Achievements against plan (issues solved; outstanding issues)

4-5.1 Scale Committee

Members: Horst Katterwe, BKA Wiesbaden, Germany (Chairman)

Dave Baldwin, FSS London, UK

Charles Belzer, Kantonspolizei Zürich, Switzerland

Marcel van Beest, NFI Den Haag, Netherlands

John Birkett, FSS London, UK

Alexandre Girod, Police Cantonale Vaudoise Lausanne, Switzerland

Isaac Keereweer, NFI Den Haag, Netherland

Michel Moes, Federal Police Laboratory Eupen, Belgium

Yaron Shor, Israel Police Headquarters Jerusalem, Israel

Gerrit Volckeryck, Laboratorium voor Technische en Wetenschappelijke Politie
Brussels, Belgium

Anja Ytti, NBI Vantaa, Finland

a) Comments and Objections

Both the comments by those who are in favour of the L.R. approach as well as the ideas of the more traditional „probability scale“, which are in favour of the „full Bayes‘ rule“ were discussed. Chairman Horst Katterwe had prepared a summary of the main objections for the use of „probability scales“ made by the FSS and the Lausanne University. In another paper Horst Katterwe has commented on these objections and reproaches (see IBSTE Vol. 8, No.1,2,3, 2002). The main issues to be remembered from this discussion (also reported during the Business Meeting of the ENFSI WG Marks in Istanbul, EAFS, Sept. 2003 with F. Taroni (special guest)):

- most of the traditional mark examiners are already using Bayes‘ rule implicitly, without realising.
- some of the mark examiners are using Bayes‘ rule explicitly. They are making conclusions, using a „probability“ wording, including an estimation of prior odds: based on the inherent assumption that no two tools, shoesoles are exactly alike. The population of the working surface of a tool, shoesole is one {the premise [=postulate] of the „one-sample-population“}.
- using „transparent prior odds“ would also make it possible to transform a „probability scale“ into a „support (likelihood) scale“ and vice versa. An acceptable starting point for the estimation of unbiased prior odds is the application of the **„Principle of Maximum Entropy“ (PME)**. However, if we have additionally reliable and authentic information (**„Constraints“**) about the „case system“, then we ought to be able to find a probability distribution that is better in the sense that it has less uncertainty.
- the goal of the committee is to find a way to harmonise the conclusion scales, so that different examiners would draw the same conclusions when examining the same case and one would be able to compare the conclusions drawn in

different labs in different countries even though they don't use the same wordings.

Christophe Champod's and Graham Jackson's letter in response of Horst Katterwe's point of view certainly was a breakthrough in the discussion. A compromise had been reached. As an aside: the differences between the ideas of traditionalists (the „Old Europeans“) and Bayes' adepts aren't too big anyway. From this moment, the committee could go on with the „real work“.

It had already been discussed at the Wiesbaden meeting (March 2000) how many steps would be needed to differentiate between different levels of resemblance, without becoming too complicated to be handled by experts and laymen. A six-level scale got the support from all the members of the scale committee:

The committee believes that two „absolute“ conclusions are necessary: one positive and one negative („categorical conclusions“). One inconclusive level is added in between („possible yes / possible not“). Since, most of the time, it is easier to exclude an object as the possible source of a mark than to include it, it was decided to add one negative and two positive „non-absolute“ conclusion levels („asymmetrical scale“).

b) Six-Level-Conclusion-Scale of the ENFSI WG Marks

b-a) Introduction

The six-level-conclusion-scale of the ENFSI WG Marks is a conclusion scale for interpreting science evidence in marks cases. The forensic expert makes the interpretation of evidence in most cases for a „single piece of scientific evidence“. An

interpretation of the „criminal case as a whole“ is not for the forensic expert. This is the task of the judge or jury.

The six-level-conclusion-scale of the ENFSI WG Marks is based on the **Bayes Rule** and used interpretations of this **Rule by the Principle of Causality and the Principle of Maximum Entropy** (sometimes with Constraints). Interpretations with words like „the prosecution and the defense hypotheses“ and „presumption of innocence“ or „adjudicative fact-finder“ are not in favour of the WG Marks Conclusion Scale. The interpretation of the Bayes Rule with the help of words like prosecution, defense, presumption of innocence, adjudicative fact-finder are for the judges and jury members and not for the forensic scientists.

The table below shows the conclusion scale of the ENFSI WG Marks. There are 3 columns and 6 steps. Experts, who are in favour with the „Likelihood Ratio Approach“, shall look at first to the middle column [„Likelihood Ratio“ (partial Bayes‘ rule)]. Experts, who are in favour with the „full Bayesian Approach“ shall look at first to the right column [„Probability“ (full Bayes‘ rule)]. In doing so the „full Bayesian Approach Experts“ shall in addition explicitly mention in the expert’s report the assumed values of the prior probabilities („transparent prior odds“). The values of the prior probabilities in the table below are $p(A) = p(\oplus) = 0.5$. After the „first look“ both expert groups shall look to the „level column“ on the left [„Level“]. The „level number“ of this „virtual scale“ in the corresponding row is the result of the forensic scientific experiment regardless of whether you are in favour of the „LR-Approach“ or in favour of the „full Bayesian-Approach“.

There are some references of the „**Principle of Maximum Entropy (PME)**“:

Shannon C E, Weaver W: Mathematical Theory of Communication 1949, reprinted 1975;

Katterwe H: The Scale Committee of the ENFSI Marks Working group and the Range of Conclusions including PME, in Proceedings SPTM Berlin 2001, 185-193, ISBN 3-00-009338-9.

Jaynes E T: Information Theory and Statistical Mechanics (PME), Physical Review 106, 620-630, 1957.

Egerton R F: Electron-energy-loss spectroscopy including Bayesian methods of deconvolution (maximum-entropy-method: PME), Micron 34, 127-139 (2003).

Level	Likelihood Ratio (partial Bayes' rule)	Probability (full Bayes' rule)
1	Identification	<i>Identification</i>
2	- Very strong support for proposition A - Strong support for proposition A	<i>Very probably</i>
3	- Moderately strong support for proposition A - Moderate support for proposition A - Limited support for proposition A	<i>Probably</i>
4	Inconclusive	Inconclusive (possible yes / possible no)
5	- Limited support for proposition \oplus ($\oplus =$ Non A) - Moderate support for proposition \oplus - Moderately strong support for proposition \oplus - Strong support for proposition \oplus - Very strong support for proposition \oplus	<i>Likely not</i>
6	Elimination	<i>Elimination</i>

b-b) Example:

Hypothesis A: the questioned shoesole produced the print.

Alternative-Hypothesis \oplus : the questioned shoesole did not produce the print.

Assuming that we do not know and cannot know all the information with regards to the hypotheses with certainty. Thus we use probability as a means of coping with our lack of complete knowledge. Our uncertainty is expressed quantitatively by the information which we do not have about the actual state the system is in. *The PME is used to discover a probability distribution which leads to the highest value for this uncertainty, thereby assuring that no biased information is inadvertently assumed.* You will get the maximum of the Entropy S (the maximum lack of information) when the mathematical derivative $dS/dp = 0$. In this „two hypotheses case without constraints“ the probabilities of the two hypotheses are equally likely [$p(A) = p(\oplus) = 0.5$].

Why do we make estimations about the prior odds?

In many countries practice in court is, that the judges and jury members will get an answer to the question like „What is the probability, that the questioned shoesole produced the print?“ So, the jury will get an answer for a given effect (intersection of test and evidence print) retrogradely to the cause (questioned shoesole): retro-causal probability (or a posteriori probability). This is an answer of a line of reasoning against the causal direction and that is also termed a „diagnostic result“. So, often the jury ask the forensic expert for an estimation of the prior odds of the special forensic science experiment, because the interest of the court ultimately lies in the posterior odds in each scientific experiment. If an expert would make a report merely with the Likelihood Ratio, then judges and jury members would make in most cases a fatal error, known as „transposing the conditional“. This error can be avoided, when the focus of the forensic expert is on the posterior odds instead of LR. An estimation of

prior odds can be done with the help of PME and/or (when having reliable and authentic information, often called „constraints“) by reporting a table relating prior odds to posterior odds.

Since the expert in most cases does not consider any other evidence, such as witness testimony or findings obtained by other experts [= forensic scientific cases without constraints], in determining the prior probabilities with the help of the PME, the hypotheses are assigned equal probability values in keeping with the indifference principle. In terms of probability theory, the expert acts in accordance with the indifference principle, which is applied in cases in which information that would tend to support the one or the other hypothesis more strongly is not available or may not be taken into consideration. So, by distributing the prior probabilities equally (= prior even odds), the expert meets the requirements of neutrality and unbiased assessment.

It must be mentioned, that the equal distribution of prior probabilities is an *arbitrary assignment of value* which, although grounded in logic, does not ordinarily reflect the actual state of investigation precisely. An „overhang“ of investigative information must not be lost, however. It is therefore absolutely necessary that the expert refer explicitly in his report to the fact that he has given equal weight to the prior probabilities of the hypotheses proposed in answer to the question, in order to ensure that the judge can, on the basis of his assessment of other evidence, modify the posterior probabilities proposed by the expert in forming his own opinion.

The estimation of values to prior probabilities is incontestable only if it is explicitly mentioned in the expert's report. The assignment of value is a pre-requisite and a condition that affects the conclusions (posterior probabilities), which the judge is free to change on the basis of his assessment of other evidence. Thus the arbitrary assignment of prior probabilities is placed on a precise foundation in that it is

emphasized as pre-requisite and condition for the statements contained in the expert opinion.

Experience has shown that most judges intuitively respond appropriately in their use of expert opinions. They raise the posterior probability of, say, a „very probably“ to an even higher degree of probability if other evidence points in the same direction. On the other hand, they respond with considerable caution and perhaps with scepticism to a degree of probability proposed by the expert whenever other evidence points in the opposite direction. However, this does not absolve the expert from the responsibility to cite the prior probabilities as the pre-requisite for the expert opinion in order to protect himself.

If the hypotheses implied in a question are rated equally, the posterior probabilities in the two-hypothesis case depend only on the likelihoods, i.e. the assessments of findings. The same applies when an expert restricts himself from the outset to establishing the likelihood ratio and speaks only of „support“ for a given hypothesis. Thus in the two-hypotheses case, there is a relationship of equivalence between the likelihood ratio and the posterior probability distribution. The idea of equivalence is the bridge between the two approaches of restriction to the likelihood ratio, on the one hand, and the formulation of posterior probabilities, on the other.

References:

Köller, N., Nissen, K., Rieß, M. Sadorf, E.

Probability Conclusions in Expert Opinions on Handwriting

Bundeskriminalamt Wiesbaden / Luchterhand Verlag 2004

ISBN: 3-472-05857-9

Vordermayer, H., von Heintschel-Heinegg, B.

Handbuch für den Staatsanwalt, darin insbesondere Schmitter, H.

Interpretation von DNA-Untersuchungen („prior even odds“)

Luchterhand Verlag 2000

ISBN 3-472-03654-0

BGH, Urt. v. 12.8.1992 – 5 StR 239/92 (LG Hannover)

Beweiswert der DNA-Analyse

NWJ 1992, Heft 46, 2976-2977

DNA-analysis and prior probability of 50% (prior even odds):

The Supreme Court said: “The expert is permitted and allowed to start from this (neutral) prior probability“.

Remarks: This example is also mentioned in Robertson, Vignaux „Interpreting Evidence“, J. Wiley 1997, p. 26. However, the translation is not correct (ambiguous) and incomplete, and the interpretation is subjective in the sense of the aim-contents of the book, that only the Likelihood Ratio is for the forensic scientist. But this is in contradiction to the contents of this DNA-judgement of the German Federal Supreme Court (BGH = BundesGerichtsHof) and in contradiction to the expert-practice in court (see also b-d: cooperation with judges of Superior Court, Berlin 2003).

b-c) Guideline

As each member gave his/her argumentation for each of the six levels, different points of view arised. Isaac Keereweer from the Dutch NFI explained how shoeprint examiners evaluate acquired features on shoe outsoles in his country. The value given to the feature depends on its complexity and size, following strict guidelines. This system, which had already been presented at the Stockholm SPTM meeting 1999, has proved to be successful in the Netherlands to get a harmonisation of the conclusions being drawn. Some members of the committee criticised the system as being too strict and too severe, since a great number of very many acquired features are needed to conclude to „identification“. Besides these points of criticism, everyone agreed that this

type of system is ideal to get everyone in line and that the principle to assign values to each acquired feature, depending on size and complexity, is a good one.

b-d) Cooperation with judges of Superior Courts:

During the German Marks Conference in May 2003 in Berlin there was an important paper of Dr. Sander, Supreme judge of the Superior Court Berlin about Interpreting Evidence. The judge emphasised the importance of a harmonized conclusion scale and gave the following references:

F. W. Rösing, Standards für die anthropologische Identifikation lebender Personen auf Grund von Bilddokumenten, Zeitschrift für Strafrecht, 230-232, 1999;

R. Knußmann, Zur Wahrscheinlichkeitsaussage im morphologischen Identitätsgutachten, Zeitschrift für Strafrecht, 175-177, 1991.

In these publications there are examples about a conclusion scale („probability scale“) and the Bayes rule.

Furthermore it was explained, that it is desirable that an expert makes estimations about the scientific prior odds. The assumptions, which have been built into the prior odds, should be mentioned.

b-e) „Development-Test“:

Shoeprint-Collaborative-Test concerning, if „prior odds = 1“ are a „practicable estimation“!

Each member of the conclusion scale committee made a collaborative test by redoing the shoeprint comparisons which have been distributed by the NBI/Finland for the SPTM meetings in 1995 and 1997. Conclusions from these comparisons had been made and explained, using the proposed six steps scale (full Bayes‘ and / or Likelihood Ratio) and

- i. the proposal of the NFI/Netherlands (strict scheme to define the value of accidental characteristics),
- ii. the current procedure that is being applied in the lab of the member

Result: the participant reached the same level (acceptable „error rate“ of about „1 step“), independent of each other when using LR (especially the participant from the FSS) and / or the „Probability Scale“.

Sum it up: Prior odds = 1 (based on the scientific background „principle of maximum entropy“) is a good estimation, because this estimation is proved in practice work.

b-f) Models and Estimation Calculations of the Likelihood Ratio

In the following references you can find examples for „Likelihood Ratio estimations“ in toolmark and fracture matching cases. In addition it is useful to mention that the interpretation of the LR $[LR = P(E/A) / P(E/\oplus)]$ of the WG Marks is not in favour of the following interpretation „the LR is defined as the ratio of the probability of the evidence if the „hypothesis of the prosecution“ is true, and the probability of the evidence if the „hypothesis of the defense“ is true“. The interpretation of the LR of the WG Marks is in favour of the following definition „the LR is defined as the ratio of the probability of the evidence if the „hypothesis of the forensic expert“ is true, and the probability of the evidence if the „alternative hypothesis of the forensic expert“ is true. Now, LR-calculations were made with the help of probability theory models. These are models for the accidental occurrence of toolmarks, striation marks of tools and on bullets, impression marks on cartridges and fracture matching patterns are based on the interpretation of the denominator $P(E/\oplus)$ of the LR, i.e. the probability of the evidence if the „alternative hypothesis of the forensic expert“ is true. These models are also described as „obtaining a match by chance“ and -as mentioned- are based on the interpretation of the denominator of the likelihood ratio.

Deinet, W.: Studies of models of striated marks generated by random processes; Journ. of For. Sci. 26, 35, 1981.

Katterwe, H., Deinet W.: Probability models and applications in toolmark cases; Archiv für Kriminologie 171, 78, 1983.

Deinet, W., Katterwe, H.: Application of probability theory models on the comparison of striations; Proceedings „Second Scandinavian Conference on Forensic Science“, Linköping 1983.

Katterwe, H.: Fysikalisk-tekniska och teoretiska metoder vid jämförande undersökningar av metallbrott; Nordiskt Forensiskt Möte, Linköping 1985.

Katterwe, H.: Modern Approaches for the Examination of Toolmarks and Other Surface Marks; Forensic Science Review 8, 45, 1996.

Katterwe, H.: European Marks Examiner Wording, the Bayes' Rule and a Causality Model for Interpreting Evidence; in

- a) Association of Firearm and Tool Mark Examiners (AFTE), Newport Beach, 2001.
- b) International Association for Identification (IAI), Education Conference, Las Vegas, 2002.
- c) SKL Linköping: Harmonizing the Conclusion Scales at SKL, Linköping, May 2002.
- d) SKL-Kriminalteknik 4,23-2002, Linköping: Provskala (utlåtandeskala och bevisvärdering).

4-5.2 Automatic Comparison of Marks

The automatic comparison of marks is still a problem which must be solved to effectively support the toolmark examiner's work. Nowadays powerful tools in the field of image processing and pattern recognition in combination with increasing performance of the computer technology are available to achieve this aim.

At the request of the Forensic Science Institute of the Bundeskriminalamt (BKA) the Fraunhofer Institute for Production Systems and Design Technology (Fraunhofer IPK) in Berlin in cooperation with the Engineer's Office of Intelligence Technologies (INBITEC) also in Berlin carried out a feasibility study to test suitable analytical methods for computerized comparison of toolmarks.

For this purpose, toolmarks were produced under different conditions at the Forensic Science Institute Berlin. The surface profiles of the marks were measured with a laser surface scanner, with a 'MicroCad system' (three-dimensional imaging device based on the principle of structured light), and attained as gray value images by light microscopy photography, respectively.

A report of the first part of the project - a feasibility study - was given in Stockholm 1999, the second part was a development of a prototype applicable in forensic science examinations in the BKA Wiesbaden and in the PTU Berlin. The third part of the project "development of a commercial system for the use in European forensic labs" will be the next step: are there EU funds?

In addition to these methods the BKA asked the "Institut für Mess- und Regelungstechnik, Universität Karlsruhe/Germany" for cooperation in the field of image processing strategy. The Institute in Karlsruhe developed a new image processing method (enhanced image obtained by fusion methods) and a new image processing strategy that enables an automatic extraction of signatures from striation patterns.

References:

Katterwe, H., Braune, M., Ahlhorn, T., Grimmer, W.
Image Processing Strategy and Automatic Comparison of Marks
Proceedings SPTM Berlin 2001, ISBN 3-00-009338-9
Editors: Katterwe, Körschgen, Ahlhorn

4-5.3 Restoration of erased numbers

Project of the BKA/KT22 (leader: H. Katterwe): Restoration of erased numbers in polymers and metals: new methods of markings: which restoration method?

References:

H. Katterwe: Restoration of erased numbers in plastics using clove powder;
Practical Metallography 41, 286, 2004

4-5.4 Fracture Matching and Validation Studies

Fracture matching of metals, glass, polymers. Repetitive experiments: static impact experiments, bending tests, dynamic impact experiments, tensile tests; scientific interpretation based on micro fracture mechanics.

References:

Katterwe, H.: Modern Approaches for the Examination of Toolmarks and Other Surface Marks; Forensic Science Review 8, 45, 1996.

Katterwe, H.: Fracture Matching and Validation Studies
AFTE Conference, Vancouver 2004.

4-5.5 Collaborative Exercises

The members of the Group participate in collaborative exercises. Shoeprint and toolmark proficiency tests are being arranged in the USA: CTS – Crime Laboratory Proficiency Testing Program.

4-5.6 Certification program in Footwear Identification

The International Association for Identification (IAI) has established a Footwear Certification Program for shoeprint examiners. The only possibility to participate in the written part of the exam has been offered in the annual IAI Training Conferences which are held in the USA.

The Marks Working Group suggested to the IAI that it would be taken into consideration whether the MWG could be authorised to give the written exams for FW Certification in Europe. At the end of 1999, the proposal was accepted. At the EAFS 2000 meeting in Cracow the written part was offered for the first time and at the 4th SPTM-meeting in Berlin 2001 for the second time. Up to that time six European shoeprint examiners (from Sweden, Norway, Finland and Belgium) have been certified according to the requirements and testing set by the IAI Footwear Certification Board.

There are two IAI-documents, which give a description of the Certification process: "Requirements for Footwear Certification and Application" and "Footwear Re-certification Policy and Procedures".

4-5.7 CAP subproject

CAP: Competence Assurance Project. Development of Standards for Reporting Scientists in the fields of Documents and Marks examination, and developing assessment strategies for the translated standards in these areas (created during the ENFSI Annual Meeting in Linköping in May 2002). The Cap subproject has members from four laboratories and for each laboratory it is the meaning that there should be one document person and one mark person. Initially the members want to especially look for what should be common knowledge and understanding to the two specialities. The members want to avoid that every working group has to invent the wheel. In due time the working group will get involved, but the members need to do some work before. At the present the following marks-laboratories are involved: SKL, NFI, FSS.

4-5.8 Meetings

Steering Committee Meeting, Zürich, January 30 – 31, 2004

Agenda: EAFS 2003, SPTM 2005, Projects: conclusion scale, best practice manual, collaborative exercises, CAP; activities 2003, strategic plan 2004-2005, yearbook 2003, EWGC Joint Meeting Dublin, 2003, next steering committee meeting: Linköping, Jan. 2005.

Conclusion Scale Committee, Zürich, Jan. 29-30, 2004

Agenda: Retrospective views: Wien 2003, EAFS Istanbul 2003; the six steps conclusion scale of the ENFSI WG Marks: theoretical argumentations for each step,

experimental step-standards and their photographic documentations to help verify that the results of the examination are properly; next meeting in Linköping (Jan. 2005).

Future meetings

- 1) Steering committee meeting in Linköping, January 2005.
- 2) Conclusion scale committee meeting in Linköping, January 2005.
- 3) SPTM 2005 in Stavem/Norway, May 24-27 [www.kripos.no/sptm2005/aktiviteter].
- 4) EAFS 2006 in Helsinki, June 14-16 [www.EAFS2006.com].

6. Plan for the next years (2005 – 2007)

(see enclosure Strategic Plan EWG Marks (2005 – 2007))

Marks Working Group – Summary 2004

Acting Chair	Steering Committee	Members	Meetings 2004	Web	EU- Proj.	Results achieved Objectives 2004
Horst Katterwe BKA Wiesbaden Kriminalt. Institut Postfach 1820 D-65193 Wiesbaden/ Germany	Horst Katterwe BKA Dave Baldwin FSS Marcel van Beest NFI Silvia Ramsl BK Austria Lennart Jonasson SKL Anja Ytti NBI FIN	42 (full)	Zürich 2004	Inform. Bulletin Library Meetings Proceeding Forum (Wanted)		Scale committee with regular meetings Projects: automatic comparison of marks; Restoration of erased numbers in metals and polymers Fracture matching CAP subproject Newsletter Certification program for footwear identification (cooperation with IAI)

Strategic Plan EWG Marks (2005 – 2007)

Strategic Goal	Objectives (in order of priorities)	Actions (in order of priorities/action)	Initiative (Responsibility for action)	Time rame (Deadline to achieve)
Research & Development (New Methods, Validation, etc)	Conclusion scale including the full Bayes' rule and the principle of maximum entropy	Meetings of the WG Marks Scale Committee	Chairman Dr. H. Katterwe, BKA and steering committee	2005
	Automatic comparison of marks	Experimental studies in the BKA Wiesbaden, PTU Berlin	Dr. H. Katterwe, BKA	2006
	Restoration of erased numbers in polymers with the help of spices (cloves)	Experimental and theoretical studies in the BKA	Dr. H. Katterwe, BKA	2006
Education & Training (Guidelines, Workshops, etc)	Certification of marks examiners in different countries	IAI-Certifications during SPTM conferences	A. Ytti, NBI Finland	ongoing
	CAP subproject	Development of standards for reporting scientists	Quality Assurance Group	ongoing
	Best Practice guidelines for marks examiners	Begin to develop best practice areas identified as this WG's responsibility	Steering committee	ongoing
	Multilingual of Marks	Complete the multilingual project	Steering committee	ongoing
Quality Assurance (Manuals, Collaborative Ex.)	Collaborative exercises in shoeprint, toolmarks cases	Tests in all ENFSI-Institutes, including the CTS-tests	all ENFSI-Institutes	ongoing
	QM-methods : marks	Special methods in marks examinations	Steering committee	2006

Communication (Feedback, Newsletter, etc)	Promote the activities of the WG	- www site	S. Mikkonen, A. Ytti, NBI Finland	ongoing
		- newsletters (IBSTE)	A. Ytti, NBI Finland; G. Volckeryck, Brussels	ongoing
		- contacts to other WG's and Associations	Steering committee	ongoing
Funding	Funding for WG activities including R&D projects and conferences	- identifying the proper funding - filing a bid	Steering committee	ongoing
Others (Databases, Joint/combined Ex. With other Networks, etc.)	Shoeprint databases	Experimental studies	Different marks labs	ongoing
	Cooperation with academic institutes and with the industry	Devise common R&D programs	Steering committee	ongoing
	Cooperation with judges of Superior Courts	Interpreting evidence including conclusion scale and Bayes rule	Chairman Dr. H. Katterwe	ongoing



FRAMEWORK FOR EXPERT WORKING GROUPS			
DOCUMENT TYPE : POLICY	REF. CODE: BRD-FWK-003	ISSUE NO: 003	ISSUE DATE: 07 JUNE 2004

1. Introduction

Against the background of rapid technological innovation, which creates the need to continually improve and develop the methods, techniques and procedures of forensic science, and given the complexity and scope of this science, the need to exchange information and to ensure cooperation among experts, the following framework for Expert Working Groups (EWG) defines their roles and operations.

2. Definition

An Expert Working Group consists of experts in a particular scientific area.

3. Aim

An Expert Working Group shall support the European development of its particular area of forensic science by any or all of the following activities:

- Exchanging information and expertise through meetings.
- Promoting quality assurance (eg by Collaborative Testing) and the development of professional standards.
- Harmonising methods.
- Combining research activities.

- Providing education and training within the particular area .
- Establishing international access to data collections.
- Producing a best practice manual according to the ENFSI template for those areas of work for which the Expert Working Group is responsible.

4. Operation

The Expert Working Group shall establish and maintain:

- Terms of reference including aims and objectives.
- Details of the organisational structure of the Group and the organisation of its meetings.
- A rolling strategic plan.
- Individual project plans for major tasks.
- A membership list.

The Expert Working Group shall nominate a representative for membership in the Quality Assurance Liaison Group (QALG).

5. Membership

Three types of membership are distinguished within Expert Working Groups: Member, Associate Member and Guests.

5.1 Member:

- An Expert Working Group shall be open to representation from all Institutes whose director is an ENFSI Member (ENFSI Institutes) and which are active in the area of the Group.
- The Director of the Institute may nominate one representative of the Institute per Expert Working Group. This representative functions between the Expert Working Group and the Institute.
-

5.2 Associate Member:

- An Expert Working Group may decide by a simple majority vote amongst its Members whether it wishes to admit as Associate Members other European or non-European forensic scientists, academics or other experts in its field according to the aims and objectives of the Group.
- Associate Members do not have the right to vote.

5.3 Guest:

- Guests may be admitted to Expert Working Group meetings at the discretion of the Chair of the relevant EWG.
- The number of Associate Members and Guests in an Expert Working Group meeting may be limited. Any decision to limit the numbers shall be supported by at least half of the members of the Group.

6. Meetings

- Expert Working Groups should have an Annual Meeting (AM) devoted to Working Group business and/or scientific issues. It should normally not exceed two days duration, one of the days preferably being a Saturday, and shall be financed by a registration fee.
- All meetings shall be open to the members of the Expert Working Group and may at the discretion of the Chair of the relevant EWG be open to other experts from the ENFSI Institutes and to guests.
- The results of each meeting shall be documented in a written report to be sent to the participants, to ENFSI Members and to EWGC.
- The venue shall be changed on a voluntary basis within Europe, with different Institutes acting as hosts.

- At the triennial European Academy of Forensic Science (EAFS) Meetings, each Expert Working Group shall be responsible for the conference seminar in its expert area after consultation with the Conference Organising Committee.
- Planning of open scientific meetings by Expert Working Groups should be such as to support the cycle of EAFS Meetings.

7. Organisation of Expert Working Groups

- The Expert Working Groups shall nominate a joint Representative (Chairman) who shall be a member of the Expert Working Group Committee (EWGC).
- Each Expert Working Group shall elect a Steering Committee from the members, responsible for strategic planning and monitoring of progress. This Steering Committee shall meet at least once per year.

8. Annual Reports

- An Annual Report from each Expert Working Group shall be given to the EWGC not later than three months before the ENFSI Annual Meeting.
- The Chairperson of the Group, or his/her nominated substitute, may be invited to attend the ENFSI Annual Meeting to take part in the discussion on his/her expert area.

The Annual Report shall cover all activities of the Group, using the following format:

- Membership (changes, composition, meetings)
- Steering Committee (contact details)
- Changes in the Terms of Reference
- Strategic Plan (statements of objectives & plan, update)
- Achievement against plan (issues solved/outstanding, progress)
- Summary of the plan for next year
- Changes in aims and organisation

9. Establishment and Annulment

The decision on the establishment of an Expert Working Group shall be made by the ENFSI Board, who may seek all Members' views either in writing or at the next full meeting of the Membership.

An application shall be addressed to the ENFSI Board and shall include:

- The Terms of Reference of the proposed Expert Working Group with a clear statement of its objectives.
- A list of founding members, together with signed letters of support from each individual's ENFSI Member
- Internal rules on Membership and election of a Chairperson.
- Frequency and duration of meetings.
- Any other issues considered to be important to the internal organisation of the Group.

- If an ENFSI Member has any concerns about the work or management of an Expert Working Group, the matter should be raised in writing with the Chair of the Group. The Chair should seek to resolve the issue by reference to the ENFSI Constitution and supporting documents. If this does not resolve the issue, the advice of the EWGC should be sought on the matter. The matter should only be brought to the attention of the ENFSI Board when the process has been exhausted and no agreement reached.

- An Expert Working Group, which shows no useful outcome, may be annulled at an ENFSI Annual Meeting.

###

Casting Snow Prints with “Quikrete” Fast Setting Concrete: An Alternative to Aerosol Wax Products

By: Thomas W. Adair (1), Shelli Hisey (2), and Richard Tewes (3)

(1) Senior Criminalist
Westminster Police Department
9110 Yates Street
Westminster, CO 80031

(2) Criminalist
Boulder Police Department
Boulder, CO

(3) Senior Criminalist
Lakewood Police Department
Lakewood, CO

Introduction:

Shoe and tire impressions deposited in snow can pose several challenges to the criminalist in regards to casting. Since water is typically the main component of snow prints, any increase in temperature can have detrimental effects on the quality of the subsequent cast. Traditionally, snow prints have been cast using various brands of aerosol spray wax, paraffin, or sulfur [1-2] following traditional photography methods. Samen [2] proposed a method in which dry powder layers were used to build a protective “base” prior to the application of plaster. In this technique a protective base was built up on the impression using alternating layers of talc and aerosol lacquer. Powder form plaster was then sifted onto the impression with alternating layers of water spray. Aerosol waxes, such as “Snow Print WaxTM”, are more commonly used to form a protective layer between the snow impression and subsequent dental stone backing. An exothermic reaction occurs during the curing process of dental stone so

the wax layer helps to reduce the effect of melting temperatures created during set up. We report on a different method of casting shoe and tire impressions in snow using “Quikrete” fast setting concrete powder in conjunction with dental stone casting material.

Materials and Application Methods:

The authors used the “Quikrete” #1004 fast setting concrete mix for all test impressions examined in this study. This product is commonly sold to set fence posts without the need of pre-mixing with water. The mix was purchased in a 50lb. bag quantity and was available at several well known home improvement retailers. Since a significant portion of the mix consisted of aggregate (stone pebbles of various sizes) a screening process was required to separate the powder. The mix was screened through sheets of fine window screen with a 2mm spacing. The powder was then applied with a commercial sifter such as those used in pastry baking (fig.1). It should be noted that snow conditions are not universal and those unfamiliar with various snow types may not recognize snow characteristics which may affect the application process. While there is no universally accepted terminology for various snow types, snow characteristics can vary between loose “dry” powder, heavy wet compacted, slush, granular, windswept, and ice to name a few. If the impression appears somewhat “dry” or icy it may be advantageous to spray the impression with a fine misting of cold water. The misting bottle of water was placed in the snow for at least 15-30 minutes to achieve a relatively cold temperature prior to application. Care should be exercised in water application so the impression does not deteriorate in quality. The authors have found that the pre-application of water to the impression will aid in powder set-up. Wet or slushy snow impressions may not require a pre-application of water. Adequate practice of this casting method on non-evidentiary impressions will greatly aid the analyst in determining the need for, and degree of, pre-application of water to the snow impression. Following traditional photography methods for three dimensional

impressions, the powder mix was sifted over the impression area to a depth ranging from 1/32" to 1/8". Once the impression area is sufficiently covered additional photographs may be taken if desired. The gray color of the powder mix provides additional contrast for impression detail in some cases. Once the powder is sifted onto the impression lightly spray the top with water. Be careful not to spray a stream of water onto the impression as this may damage some fine detail. Water should be misted over the impression until moistened. Adjacent impressions were simultaneously treated with both the "Quikrete" method and snow print wax (fig 2.). No discernable difference in quality could be seen between the impressions.

Discussion:

The authors are not suggesting the elimination or replacement of the aerosol wax technique from consideration when casting shoe or tire snow prints. Aerosol waxes can produce very acceptable results when used as directed by the manufacturer. The use of "Quikrete" is offered merely as an alternative method to use should the conditions of the moment require another option. The "Quikrete" method did produce good representations of the outsole elements (fig.3) and recorded some fine detail from the manufacturer's logo located in the arch (fig.4). One disadvantage is that small voids can be formed where the powder material had not fully set. In some instances this may appear to be small defects in the outsole. Examiners should evaluate the overall condition of the cast, looking for similar areas of concern, before giving any weight to these artifacts. A similar phenomenon commonly occurs with soil casts where small rocks may become dislodged from the cast during cleaning or transportation, or may simply mask underlying artifacts of damage to the outsole. Typically the interior surfaces of these defects will be clean and free of soil. As always the examiner must rely on artifacts that are clearly present and identifiable in an impression to make a determination about the value of the impression for comparison and identification analyses. Photographs taken prior to casting processes may help to answer some

questions regarding the origin of these artifacts. The “Quikrete” method does offer some advantages over the employment of either aerosol waxes or sulfur, however. First, the method of application is very simple. Second, in powder form, there are no temperature storage or use thresholds as there are with aerosol waxes. Third, long term storage of cured casts appears unaffected by these same temperature thresholds. Cost is also another significant difference between these methods. The authors have founds that, generally, aerosol waxes can cost over \$15.00(US) for a 6.5 oz. can which covers approximately 7-10 prints depending on size. In contrast, a 50lb. bag of “Quikrete” can be purchased in the Denver Metro area (Colorado, USA) for less than \$10.00(US) which can be used to cast hundreds of impressions. Lastly, the authors have experienced numerous occasions when cans of aerosol wax have quickly clogged up during application making the casting process difficult, or at times, impossible. Typically this occurs when the cans have been exposed to cold temperatures for extended periods of time (such as being stored in a crime scene vehicle or on scene outdoors for several hours). When this occurs there is an increased chance that the cans will produce a “spitting” of wax. When this occurs, large clumps of wax will be deposited in the impression resulting in uneven coverage and possibly loss of detail due to the uneven nature of wax coverage. The use of “Quikrete” powder offers a simple, low-cost method of casting shoe and tire impressions found in snow. While the authors have presented this set-up procedure as a simple application process, we recommend practicing this technique prior to any application to crime scene impressions.

References Cited

1. Bodziak, W.J. Footwear Impression Evidence, 1st ed. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL. 1995. pp. 87-100.
2. Cassidy, M.J. Footwear Identification, 1st ed. Lightning Powder Company, Salem, OR. 1995. pp. 27-40.
3. Semen, C. Major Crime Scene Investigation: Casting Shoe and Tire Impressions. *Law and Order Magazine*. 1972. pp.52-57.



Figure 1



Figure 2



Figure 3



Figure 4

THE 5th MEETING FOR SHOEPRINT/TOOLMARK EXAMINERS

(THE TEXT IS COPIED FROM THE WEB PAGE, www.kripos.no)

The 5th Meeting of the ENFSI Working Group Marks (SPTM) will be arranged in Stavern, Norway from May 24th to May 27th 2005.

In here you will find some general information about Stavern and the Meeting, how to get there, the preliminary program and how to register.

The organising committee invites interested parties to submit abstracts for oral or poster presentation as soon as possible.

REGISTRATION

A Registration Form is attached. Fill out this form and return it to steinar.eriksen@politiet.no.

It can also be faxed (+ 47 23 20 83 80) or mailed to:

Steinar Eriksen

National Criminal Investigation Service

PO Box 8163 Dep

N-0034 Oslo

Norway

Deadline for registration is 15 April 2005.

CONFERENCE FEE

The fee is EUR 450 when paid before 15 March 2005. After that date the fee is EUR 500. Fee for accompanying persons is the same as for participants.

This includes attendance, a single hotel room for three nights (Tuesday-Friday), and the following meals:

Tuesday: Lunch and Dinner

Wednesday: Breakfast, Lunch and Dinner

Thursday: Breakfast, Lunch and Dinner

Friday: Breakfast

The conference fee is a package based on a special agreement between the organising committee and the Stavern Conference Centre for a three-day stay. Participants attending only parts of the conference will not be allowed any reduction.

For participants that would like to arrive before Tuesday 24 May or stay after Friday 27 May, the organisers can assist with booking of accommodation. As Stavern is a very popular holiday resort during summer, and public lodging is limited, a reduced price can not be guaranteed.

The fee can be prepaid to the following bank:

Domestic payment:

DnBNOR, PO Box 1172 Sentrum, N-0107 Oslo, Norway. Account no. 7694.05.07932.

Foreign payment:

DnB NOR Bank ASA, N-0021 Oslo

SWIFT: DNBANOKK

IBAN no: NO20 7694 0507 932

The fee (EUR 500) can also be paid cash upon registration. No credit cards, checks or money orders will be accepted. Only Euro will be accepted.

SPEAKERS

Participants who would like to give a presentation to the meeting must present this to the organising committee in a digital form no later than 1 May 2005. Presentations received after that date will not be accepted.

PROCEEDINGS

The proceedings from the meeting will be on CD-ROM. The proceedings are included in the fee and will be sent to all participants after the meeting.

POSTER SESSION

Participants are invited to present posters. The poster session will take place adjacent to the meeting facilities.

EXHIBITORS

Companies are invited to present their products during the meeting. As the meeting facilities are limited, the organiser reserve the right to limit the number of exhibitors and to choose those who are most relevant for the topic of the meeting. Exhibitors will have to pay the same Conference Fee as ordinary participants and an additional 250 EURO to cover the necessary arrangements.

REGISTRATION FORM
FOR THE ENFSI EWG SPTM 2005 MEETING
Stavern, Norway, 24. – 27 May 2005

Send it by fax +47 23 20 83 80 or by e-mail to steinar.eriksen@politiet.no or by mail to Steinar Eriksen, National Criminal Investigation Service, P.O. Box 8163 Dep, N-0034 Oslo, Norway

NAME	Last		
	Given		
ORGANISATION	Name		
	Address		
	Country		
	Tlf		
	Faks		
	E-mail		
ACCOMPANIED BY	Last name		
	Given name		
ARRIVAL	Date/time		
	To		
DEPARTURE	Date/time		
	From		
ACCOMMODATION	No of rooms	No of nights	
	Type of room	Single	Double
PRESENTATION	Title	Time needed	AV form
PAYMENT	Amount		
	Bank	Cash	
SIGNATURE		Date	

The preliminary program 31.3.2005

Tuesday 24.5		
0800	1500	Registration
1000	1200	Steering committee meeting
1200	1300	Lunch
1300	1330	OPENING
1330	1500	<i>Conclusions committee</i>
		Introduction
		H. Katterwe
		Finnish and Israelian shoeprint test
		A.Ytti / Y. Shor
		Conclusions Scale of Different Lab`s
		C. Belzer / D. Baldwin
		A new and improved conclusion scale in use in Sweden
		L. Jonasson
		Working with the Dutch Guideline
		I. Keereweer / M.van Beest
		Experiences with the Guideline
		G. Volckeryck / M. Moes
		Special Cases
		Shor/Baldwin/Birkett/Girod
		Explanations for the Likelihood Ratio Scale
		D. Baldwin
		Explanations for the Probability Scale
		H. Katterwe
		Summary, conclusion and preview
		H. Katterwe
1500	1530	<i>Coffee break</i>
1530	1700	CONCLUSIONS COMMITTEE SESSION CONTINUE WITH QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION
1900		<i>Dinner</i>

WEDNESDAY 25.5			
0730	0900	<i>Breakfast</i>	
0900	0930	New software for tire and Car identification.	Dr. F. H. Lux
0930	1000	Methods for improving challenging footwear prints	Y. Shor
1000	1030	Tool marks in illegally moulded CD`s.	M. van Beest
1030	1100	<i>Coffee break</i>	
1100	1200	Interesting cases and new methods from Sweden	K. Carlsson
1200	1300	<i>Lunch</i>	
1300	1325	The use of Forensic & Alternate light sources in the detection of evidence.	C. Schumacher
1325	1350	Statistical approach for the efficient use of shoemarks in crime analysis	A. Girod
1350	1415	The modification of blank firing pistols and other firearms.	J. Birkett
1415	1500	Bloody shoeprint on dark smooth surfaces.	P. Krat
1500	1530	<i>Coffee break</i>	
1530	1700	Business meeting	
1800		Departure to Citadell Island	
1900		Dinner at Citadell Island	

THURSDAY 26.5			
0730	0900	<i>Breakfast</i>	
0900	0930	Model-Based segmentation of striation marks.	M. Heizman
0930	1000	Model-Based segmentation of impression marks.	C. Brein
1000	1030	Image processing based strategy for comparison of marks (remarks to the poster).	M. Braune
1030	1100	<i>Coffee break</i>	
1100	1130	Variaton in the foot morphology of siblings.	J. Birkett
1130	1200	Identification of clothing through picture comparison.	W. Kolhof
1200	1300	<i>Lunch</i>	
1300	1330	Presentation of an interesting case.	G. Hansen
1330	1415	Systematic production of marks with a robot.	B. Weimar
1415	1500	Variation of dimensions in test prints – a study.	D. Baldwin
1500	1530	<i>Coffee break</i>	
1530	1600	CLOSING	
1900		<i>Dinner</i>	

FRIDAY 27.5			
0730			
1000			
Breakfast & Departure			

PRIORITIES

According to the Framework for Expert Working Groups (EWGs) the EWG Meetings are primarily open to representatives from organisations in Europe which are members of ENFSI (European Network of Forensic Science Institutes), and to persons accepted

by the EWG as Associate Members. In addition Guests can be invited at the discretion of the EWG Chair.

Since the capacity of this meeting is limited, other participants will be accepted on a first register - first serve basis

REGION

Stavern is a charming little village with around 2600 inhabitants, situated on the west coast of The Oslo Fiord, approximately 140 km (90 Us miles) south of Oslo.

It has a history that goes back several hundred years. Originally a harbour for local fishermen, it was established as a Royal Harbour for pilots on merchant vessels on their way in and out of the fjord in 1200.

A small island at the entrance to the harbour (The Citadell Island) was later established as a point of support for the Dano/Norwegian navy.

The main base for the Royal Navy was moved to Stavern in 1750 under the name of Fredriksvern, named after the Danish/Norwegian king Fredrik.

Many of the buildings and infrastructure from that time is still to be seen. As a matter of fact, the conference will take place on the premises of the old Fredriksvern Wharf, and the participants will stay in original barracks that have all been refurbished.

TRANSPORT

Stavern is situated approximately 110 km south of Oslo. There are two airports in the district.

Torp Airport is 30 kms north of Stavern. It is a small regional airport served by several international airlines with direct flights to some main hubs in Europe (Amsterdam/Frankfurt Hahn/London Stansted/Glasgow/Alicante/Copenhagen/Stockholm).

From Torp Airport there is bus service to the town of Larvik, which is 8 km from Stavern. From Larvik there is bus service to Stavern.

Torp Airport is served by several Car Rental Companies.

More information can be found on www.torp.no

Oslo Airport Gardermoen is Norway's main airport. It is situated 45 km north of Oslo (155 km north of Stavern) and is served by most international airlines.

From Gardermoen airport you can either take a train or a bus to Larvik via Oslo.

Gardermoen is served by several Car Rental Companies.

More information can be found on www.osl.no

There will be organised transport from Torp Airport and from Larvik Railway Station to Stavern on Monday afternoon and Tuesday morning, and from Stavern to Larvik Railway Station and Torp Airport on Friday Morning.



WG Marks

CHAIRMAN DR. HORST KATTERWE

2005/03/03

Stavern, Marks WG: Business Meeting May 25, 2005

DRAFT AGENDA

Wednesday, May 25, 2005, 15:30 – 17:00

1. Welcome
2. Agenda
3. Relevant activities 2004
4. Voting SPTM 2005 (new chair, new steering committee members)
5. Change-over of the chair („ex- and in-auguration“)
6. Wwwsite WG Marks; ENFSI; IBSTE
7. New projects: Best Practice Manual (shoeprints); Collaborative Exercises; CAP subproject; EU-fundings)
8. Next steering committee meeting
9. EAFS 2006 Helsinki
10. SPTM 2007 ?
11. AOB
12. Closing the meeting, Wednesday, May 25, 2005, 17:00.

REPORT of the ENFSI MWG STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

held in Linköping, Sweden 19-20.1.2005

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Agenda
3. SPTM May 2005 (Stavern/Norway): plans.
4. Voting SPTM 2005 (new chairperson)
5. www sites: WG Marks, Enfsi and the IBSTE
6. Projects: AGIS-projects?, Conclusion scale (final report), Best Practise Manual (shoeprints), Collaborative Exercises, CAP subproject
7. Yearbook 2003
8. EWGC Joint Meeting in Cracow, Poland, Nov. 2004
9. Activities 2004 of WG Marks
10. Strategic plan
11. Yearbook 2004
12. Next Steering Committee Meeting
13. EAFS 2006 in Helsinki, Finland
14. AOB
15. Closing the meeting

The Steering Committee had invited Steinar Eriksen and Terje Kjeldsen from Oslo, Norway, to attend the meeting to explain about the arrangements concerning the next SPTM meeting in Stavern, Norway. The preliminary program and the schedule for the presentations, posters, time for exhibition and possible vendors were also discussed.

Dr. Horst Katterwe has been the Chair of the Marks Working Group since 1999 and he informed the committee members that he would like to give up the chairmanship but would still like to continue as a member of the Steering Committee. So a new chairperson for the MWG should be chosen in the Business Meeting of the SPTM Meeting in Stavern. A new member to the Steering Committee should also be chosen because Silvia Ramsel, Austria, told in the meeting that because working alone in marks section at the moment, she don't have time to committee work anymore. Also it was discussed if the amount of members (now six) for the Steering Committee is enough or should we have more members. That would be discussed in the Business Meeting.

Publishing the Information Bulletin for Shoeprint/Toolmark Examiners will be continued and Anja Ytti, NBI, promised to continue as its editor. Gerrit Volckeryck, Belgium, also agreed to continue as the co-editor. Sirkka Mikkonen, NBI, will update the web page of Marks WG: (<http://www.poliisi.fi/wgm>) On the official web page of the Enfsi (<http://www.enfsi.org>) there will be a link to this web site of MWG. Based on the idea of Gerrit Volckeryck, mark examiners have had in use a closed discussion list in the internet for questions and discussions but because there doesn't seem to be need for such discussions it was decided that Gerrit will close it.

MWG doesn't have any AGIS-projects at the moment. Marcel van Beest, NFI, will try to find out if there could be a chance in the future to get money for some of our planned projects. The scale committee will give its final report in Stavern. The CAP-subproject is still continuing. Dave Baldwin and Lennart Jonasson are working in the project. The next project for MWG will be writing the Best Practise Manual. It was decided to start the BPM first for shoeprint examinations and after that a different one for toolmark examinations. Steering Committee members would like to get also new volunteer mark examiners to work in the subcommittee for writing the BPM. One new

project in the near future will also be arranging collaborative/proficiency tests about shoeprint and toolmark examinations.

The Enfsi Board has approved the document Framework for Expert Working Groups (BRD-FVK-003) in May 2004. In the point 4. (Operation) of the document it is mentioned that the Expert Working Group shall establish and maintain for example: Terms of reference including aims and objectives, details of the organisational structure of the Group etc. This means that the MWG has to change the existing Statute of the MWG to Terms of Reference. The details about possible changes will be discussed in the Steering Committee.

The chairman told about the EWGC Joint Meeting in Cracow where he had presented the activities of the MWG and the Strategic Plan for 2005-2007. The chairman also told about some things related to the EAFS Meeting 2006 in Finland. Because there wasn't at that moment much information available about the program of the EAFS 2006 the committee left open for example if the MWG Steering Committee Meeting 2006 will be arranged in Helsinki. That will also be discussed more in the next Steering Committee meeting in Stavern.

Anja Ytti

Steering Committee member of MWG

UPCOMING CONFERENCES

5th Meeting for Shoeprint and Toolmark Examiners (SP/TM)

May 24-27, 2005

Stavern, Norway

<http://www.kripos.no>

IAI Annual Educational Conference (International Association for Identification)

August 7-13, 2005

Dallas, Texas, USA

www.theiai.org

AFTE Meeting (Association of Firearm and Tool Mark Examiners)

June 19-24, 2005

Indianapolis, USA

www.afte.org

IAFS 2005, 17th Meeting of the International Association of Forensic Sciences

August 21-26, 2005

Hong Kong, China

www.iafs2005.com

EAFS 2006, 4th European Academy of Forensic Science Meeting

June 14-16, 2006

Helsinki, Finland

www.EAFS2006.com

ISSN 1455-4194