

<p>Strengths DNA activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Makes activity reporting explicit - Makes people aware that Source and Activity level exist (and should not be confused) - Difficult questions are addressed by experts instead of lawyers - Helps scientists answering questions from the defence/judge in a scientific way - Addressing more relevant questions that can help the investigation further - Better assistance of the courts and better informed decisions - Shows limitation of source level conclusions - Absence of evidence can also be evaluated - Scientifically supported <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Optimal use of the scientific evidence, put in the right perspective o Science is developing fast - Existing Framework for evaluation (ENFSI) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o balanced reports o provides the scientist with a tool to stay within the limits of his/her knowledge o addresses both pros and defense alternatives - Existing Case Assessment & Interpretation (former FSS model for a structured approach of case assessment) - Allows a weight to be assigned to the finding then the truth of 2 propositions - convergence of opinions/ consistency in approach 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of structured data for many cases - Sharing of research data - Lack of trained experts - Complexity of interpretation - Communication with lawyers/court <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o doesn't understand language used in evidence/reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ adequate training (both legal/experts!) - distinction of levels is sometimes hard to do - demand is unquantifiable - lack of knowledge does not stop some "experts" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o be clear on lack thereof o consistency in approach - requires an alternative proposition - difficult to transpose data from literature, even if it does exist in specific casework - lack of transparency (reporters should write all relevant findings in the reports also when or why a conclusion cannot be drawn) - lack of specific info on details of scenario's <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o implicit assumptions - poor connection to crime scene investigation (CSI) - lack of resources (budget) because activity reporting takes time
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - international cooperation - quality improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o reporting standards o brings results closer to considerations of the court o prevent misinterpretation o prevent miscarriages of justice - initiate more training and awareness of CJS partners - right person doing the activity work - It makes it easier to combine evidence - Stimulate research and development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Drive the collection of the needed, relevant data o Knowledge base o International collaboration to acquire the data - Quality assurance based on review of cases/reports/verdicts - Raising the general level of understanding of the report - Public confidence - Victim assurance - Train CSI and detectives on gathering specific info on timing/sequence of events 	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demand v supply - Illusion of exactness - Judge can't judge experts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Poor work may induce loss of trust o if the court doesn't understand the role of the scientist there will be confusion or misinterpretation - Experts too passive to ask for case circumstances - Shift of focus (bias) on 'soft' evidence - Leaves more space for different interpretation of the results - Risk of contextual bias - lack of awareness of crime scene people Investigate the wrong activity – - If we claim too much too early it might be inadmissible (rejected) - Adequate training - Lack of funding for R&D