

the RUC as an organisation for future investigations, which, in my view was an acknowledgement of the difficulty that would have been encountered to make major changes to the MIR at the time the reviews were conducted.

126. It was not a surprise to me that Mr Port, with the benefit of the 28-day review and the opportunity to view and assess the investigation at first hand opted to retain the existing team.

## **THE FORENSIC ELEMENT OF THE INVESTIGATION**

### **Structure and Management**

127. As I have already described, Mr Kinkaid had asked me to take charge of the forensic examination of the scene and thereafter I liaised with the scientific advisor Dr [REDACTED] in relation to items recovered from the scene. I remained in charge of the forensic element of the investigation for the duration of my time on the MIT.

128. There were many avenues to the forensic line of enquiry in this investigation and apart from my own work I employed other officers to assist. Det. Sgt. [REDACTED] and the Exhibits officer were primarily those who provided assistance on a consistent basis. At other times when searches or arrests were being effected I appointed other officers to assist with the documentation and processing of items seized. All items recovered from the scene, seized during searches or otherwise acquired by the investigation team were properly recorded in the exhibits book in accordance with national standards. The FSANI and PSNI had agreed protocols in place for submission of items to the laboratory. Specific forms were required for submissions and the laboratory would not take items unless the proper documentation was received. The following forms were utilised: -

- NIFSL A – Incident information sheet
- NIFSL B – Items submitted from the Suspect
- NIFSL C – Items submitted from the Injured Party
- NIFSL D – For all items other than from Injured Party or Suspect