

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Evison, Martin and Mallett, Xanthé (2017) Critical Issues in the Historical and Contemporary Development of Forensic Anthropology in Australia: An international comparison. *Forensic Science International*, 275. 314.e1-314.e8. ISSN 0379-0738

Published by: Elsevier

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2017.03.019>
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2017.03.019>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/30313/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

www.northumbria.ac.uk/nrl



Mallett, X.D.G. and Evison, M.P. Critical Issues in the Historical and Contemporary Development of Forensic Anthropology in Australia: An International Comparison. *Forensic Science International* **ISSN: 0379-0738** *In press 2017*

This text is the **Accepted Manuscript**. The journal article can be found [here](#).

Critical Issues in the Historical and Contemporary Development of Forensic Anthropology in Australia: An international comparison

Mallett, X.D.G.^{1,3} and Evison, M.P.^{2,3}

¹School of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Newcastle, Australia

²Northumbria University Centre for Forensic Science, Northumbria University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 8ST, United Kingdom

³School of Behavioural, Cognitive, and Social Sciences, University of New England, New South Wales, Australia

Abstract

The aim of this brief critical qualitative analysis is to examine the development of forensic anthropology in Australia, at a time of significant change in the discipline. It will briefly summarise its historical establishment, making comparative reference to other regions—particularly the United Kingdom and United States, and the influence of the Bali Bombings of 2002, Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami of 2004 and Black Saturday Bushfires of 2009. The analysis goes on to consider key factors in research in forensic anthropology in the United States, and the development of standards and regulation in the US and UK. The significance of research in post-mortem diagenesis in Brazil—a country sharing aspects of climate, soil types and demography with Australia—is also considered, as well as the significance of patterns of casework encountered in Australia compared with those of other jurisdictions. While forensic anthropology as a discipline has grown remarkably in recent years, this analysis suggests that research and training tailored to the specific pattern of casework encountered in Australia is now essential to support the development of national standards in science, education, and professional regulation. The significance of the establishment of the first taphonomy research facility outside of the US—the Australian Facility for Taphonomic Experimental Research—is briefly considered with reference to what this facility may offer to the development of forensic anthropology in Australia.

Keywords: Forensic anthropology; forensic human identification; forensic science; taphonomy; human decomposition; time since death interval

Introduction

Forensic anthropology (FA) is open to a range of definitions [1-5]. While forensic anthropology could—in the broadest sense—encompass the application of all anthropological knowledge in the interests of the courts [1], it refers in practice to the application of physical anthropology, either generally to ‘problems of medico-legal significance’ [2, 3] or specifically to ‘the analysis of human remains to legally establish identity’ [4]—or, more frequently in contemporary practice, to provide investigative evidence leading to identification legally established by other means—such as DNA profiling [1, 5].

While both the European and American roots of forensic anthropology have been widely acknowledged [2, 3], attention given to other regions and smaller jurisdictions has been relatively sparse and sporadic [6-9]. The aim of this analysis is to very briefly describe the historical development of forensic anthropology in Australia, with reference to European and American influences, and to undertake a brief qualitative assessment of critical issues affecting development in Australia by comparison with the UK and US, and also with Brazil; a country which shares similarities in size and climate—and, to a relative extent, population density—with Australia. The analysis concludes with some cautious recommendations for future priorities in education and training, research, and professional practice.

Historical Development of Forensic Anthropology in Australia

Donlon’s reviews [10, 11] of forensic anthropology and casework in Australia provide many insights into the origins of the discipline. Practice has essentially grown out anatomy and archaeology—as it has in the UK [4, 12]—with most practitioners reaching the destination of forensic anthropology having first studied one or both of these disciplines. It was anatomists who, originally, were called upon by police when—typically—skeletal remains presented that required the expertise of someone with extensive osteological knowledge. These early anatomists then trained others, some of whom broadened their areas of research and training to include soft tissue, trauma analysis and time since death estimation, and began working more regularly with the police as experts in forensic human identification rather than as anatomical scientists [10]. The first true international acknowledgement of forensic anthropology in Australia as a discipline in its own right came through a presentation by two American forensic anthropologists, Bill Bass—of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville Forensic Anthropology Centre—and Diane France—a world-renowned forensic anthropologist with a sub-speciality in differentiating human from non-human material [13-16], who gave the joint keynote address at a conference held by the Australian and New Zealand Forensic Science Society in Sydney in 1996. As Donlon [10] notes, the development of forensic anthropology in Australia could be seen as being held back relative to that of the United States as, prior to the Vietnam War, it was not the Australian practice to repatriate—and hence identify—war dead as it was in the US. After this event, however, development advanced rapidly as individuals and groups working at different Universities and forensic centres continued to develop research and casework activities—which grew noticeably in

number after 1996 [10]. In the 2000s, however, a whole series of events of national and international significance were to influence the development of Australian forensic anthropology: These included terrorist attacks on tourist areas in Bali in 2002 and on the Australian Embassy in Jakarta in 2004 [17]. The latter incident led to nine fatalities and the former to 202—of whom 88 were Australian. Boxing Day 2004 saw the biggest natural disaster of recent times, the Indian Ocean earthquake and subsequent tsunami led to the deaths of 226,000—including 26 Australians [18]. The ever-present problem of bushfires during the hotter months due to Australia's hot, dry climate precipitated a fire in February 2009, an event that has become known as Black Saturday. This fire caused the deaths of 169 people, all of whom were identified via the Disaster Victim Identification (DVI) process [19].

Although much was learnt from each of these incidents, research and subsequent academic publications regarding the establishment of time death interval to help identify deceased individuals had to rely on case-based evidence to develop Australian standards, as until 2016 there was no forensic facility that allowed the systematic study of human decomposition under controlled conditions in an Australian context.

Contemporary Development of Forensic Anthropology in Australia

Taken together, these events have led cumulatively to a range of developments in forensic anthropology and in the allied disciplines of forensic archaeology, pathology and odontology, each of which have contributed to the investigations concerned [19-22]. The events have also led to a clear recognition of the role of forensic anthropology in mass atrocity and mass disaster victim identification—as they have in other regions [9, 23-25]—as well as in routine casework. Thus, a number of core functions of the forensic anthropologist are now recognised that allow the discipline to aid the judicial process. These include the identification of human remains—both in single death cases as well as mass fatality incidents—and search and recovery of human remains with understanding of the mechanism of disposal, in association with allied disciplines such as forensic ecology¹ [26] and forensic archaeology, and the estimation of time since death, again in collaboration with other disciplines, notably forensic entomology.

Over the past five years research, training, and teaching in forensic anthropology have advanced considerably in Australia—in ways that both mirror and differ from developments elsewhere. In Australia, the terrorist attacks in Bali in 2002 and 2004 Boxing Day tsunami increased awareness amongst forensic practitioners and police forces of the need for the greater inclusion of medical sciences (including forensic anthropology) in the DVI process. Similarly, following the Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami in 2004, forensic practitioners

¹ Or 'forensic botany' as it is also known, can be defined as the examination of plants and plant matter to determine species and origin. In some cases suspects or victims may leave behind plant parts, spores, seeds or pollen that have adhered to their clothing, skin, hair, etc., or weapons or other items of interest. If the plant species in question is found only in limited areas, its presence may indicate where an item or individual has been, or where a suspect/victim lives. Forensic botanists also analyze stomach contents, wheel arches of cars, etc., to collect botanical evidence that may be relevant in linking suspects, victims, and scenes.

and police in the UK realised that Britain too did not have enough trained police officers to manage such a large and complex recovery effort and to identify and repatriate British citizens as quickly as possible [27, 28]. A representation was made to the British Government, led by forensic anthropologist Professor Sue Black of the Centre for Anatomy and Human Identification, University of Dundee, Scotland, which initiated momentum for a national training program in DVI [29]. As a consequence, the Home Office funded training for 500 police officers in all aspects of mass fatality management and emergency mortuary procedures, including basic forensic practices, to ensure each officer understood the requirements of all the disciplines involved in the process, and to ensure that when—not, sadly, if—another mass fatality involving British citizens occurred, Britain would be ready to respond to the highest standards [30].

In Australia there are a number of centres producing the bulk of forensic anthropology research, and as a result of the size of the country, it makes sense to discuss these on a State-by-State basis (although the discussion here offers examples only, and is not intended to summarise all of the research currently taking place in Australia). In the west, the University of Western Australia has a Forensic Anthropology Group, whose research focuses on the development of morphometric tools and standards for application to Australian remains, and the development of a 'Human Identification Package' for use in Australian casework and DVI deployments, which includes the formulation of population-specific anthropological standards [31]. The majority of recent research undertaken has focussed on living individuals, using advanced technologies to improve our understanding of age and sex estimation [32-36].

In Victoria, the Victorian Institute of Forensic Medicine (VIFM) [37] is one of the leading forensic medicine facilities in Australia, if not worldwide. As with many forensic disciplines, the casework tends to dictate the research priorities, and estimation of time since death is always a key factor when trying to identify unknown human remains, or interpret a crime scene and unravel the order of events that have taken place surrounding a fatality. The VIFM employs two forensic anthropologists, who have in the past 10 years published research on the requirements for missing persons' data, and the specific problems associated the Australian context—including the fact that each of Australia's states and territories operates its own Missing Persons Unit, with distinct state and territory legislation [38]. More recently, research published by the VIFM has focused on DVI, a specialized area of forensic anthropology that requires highly skilled forensic practitioners able to distinguish and identify admixed, fragmented, or highly decomposed individuals from some of the most complex forensic scenes. Case-based research has examined the use of advanced imaging techniques and their application to identification in multiple fatality incidents [21, 39], and the forensic anthropologist's role in identifying burnt remains using the 2009 Black Saturday bushfires in the state of Victoria as a case study [24].

New South Wales has a number of individuals undertaking research, teaching, and casework, with the University of Sydney, the University of Western Sydney, the University of

Wollongong, and the University of New England all undertaking work in the field of forensic anthropology. The University of Sydney, for example, offers a forensic anthropology consultancy service, as well as research supervision [40], and a research focus on improving methods of discriminating between human versus non-human bone [41] and sexual dimorphism in the dentitions of Australian populations [42]. Research at the University of Western Sydney focuses on improving methods of estimating time since death [43], and the University of Wollongong produces facial reconstructions when an unknown skeleton is found [44, 45] (facial anthropology being a sub-speciality of forensic anthropology).

At the Australian National University, researchers are investigating time since death [46, 47], and have been using animal proxy's for this research for some time [48-50], as well as reanalysing sex classification methods [51]. In South Australia, researchers at the University of Adelaide publish research and casework focussing on the utilisation of prostheses for human identification [52] and improving methods of craniofacial identification [53-55], as well as improving methods of age estimation for juveniles [56-59].

Further north, the University of Queensland hosts the Laboratory for Human Craniofacial and Skeletal Identification (HuCS-ID Lab), a newly-established forensic bioanthropology laboratory that lists human anatomy, quantitative shape analysis, statistical computing, photography, robotics, and medical imaging as skills utilized within the facility to improve and quantify human identification methods [60]. The laboratory is intensively research active, and much of the published work focuses on facial identification [53-55, 61-66] and the development of a computerized clavicle identification system designed principally to resolve the identities of unknown individuals based on the comparison of ante-mortem chest radiographs and 3D scans of clavicles [67, 68]. Practitioners at the Queensland University of Technology undertake research that largely focuses on the morphometric analysis of specific skeletal elements to improve understanding of sexual dimorphism [57] and evaluating established ageing methods [56, 58, 59] on Australian populations.

In addition to the work being undertaken to improve methods to locate, recover, and identify human remains, research is also directed at identification of living individuals in forensic cases—an important emerging issue in forensic anthropology [69-71].

Courses in Forensic Anthropology

One measure of the degree of acceptance of a scientific discipline is the extent of its establishment in the academy. A search for courses in forensic anthropology in a particular region illustrates how forensic anthropology is viewed more widely and if it is recognised as a discipline in its own right. If a plethora of courses exist at both undergraduate and graduate level, it can be argued that the science has reached a critical mass of practitioners and has attained a level of professionalism whereby its relevance and importance has been recognised at an institutional level. In the UK, for example, specific forensic anthropology undergraduate courses have existed since 2006, and a search today would reveal numerous options available for those wishing to study this fascinating field of science in Britain. Such an

assessment may be weakened however, by the critical assertion that forensic science is used cynically by many Universities in order to drive up admissions [72], without any particular concern for wider issues (such as employability of graduates).

A second measure of acceptance may be the level of professionalism indicated by evidence of accreditation and certification. Using the UK as an example once more, in 2011 the British Association for Forensic Anthropology (BAFA) was formed, with the Royal Anthropological Institute as the professional governing body. A three-level certification process is a core aspect of accreditation with BAFA, the aim of which is professionalization of the discipline, allowing end users (the police and legal professionals) to determine who is suitably qualified and experienced to undertake casework, as well as providing a career pathway for future practitioners [28, 73].

In the United States, various courses are available for students to study forensic anthropology at both undergraduate and postgraduate level, and nine are listed by the science's accreditation body—the American Board of Forensic Anthropology [74], which provides information to students on where they can study under the guidance of a certified forensic anthropologist; thereby ensuring a consistent standard of teaching across programmes. That the science has its own board—established in 1977—with a list of accredited practitioners is again evidence of the professionalism of the discipline in the US.

A similar search for 'forensic anthropology courses Australia' as a measure of acceptance in the academy reveals few options. The Australian National University offers forensic anthropology as a minor component, but not within a Bachelor of Science program, but rather as part of a Bachelor of Arts [75]. Many other Universities offer single units in forensic anthropology, or include forensic anthropology in general units about forensic science. It seems no single, science-based forensic anthropology undergraduate course can be sourced in Australia. A search for Masters courses provides a similar picture: forensic anthropology can be taken as a subject with a forensic science module or as a minor component, but only two postgraduate courses listed, a Masters in Forensic Anthropology (by coursework and dissertation) at the University of Western Australia, available from 2017, and a Master of Forensic Medicine with a number of streams and modes (research and taught), depending on the student's requirements at Monash University from 2017. Importantly, the Monash degree specifically notes "Students can choose to complete a research stream that will provide a pathway to a higher degree by research."² and forensic anthropology is covered in this degree, although only as a single unit rather than a stream in itself.

The question must therefore be asked; where are Australia's prospective forensic anthropologists studying, and how is the discipline to move forward in Australia with so few suitable courses being available? It could be argued that with a limited number of positions available as practitioner forensic anthropologists, perhaps this explains the dearth of dedicated forensic courses in Australia. However, the UK is in the same position as Australia, in that there are few positions available for trained FAs, yet there are significantly more

² For more information see <https://www.monash.edu.au/pubs/handbooks/courses/M6009.html>

courses and avenues for professional development and recognition. Australia could certainly benefit from having more forensic anthropologists, with some police forces still not fully embracing the benefits of consulting a FA when bones are found that require identification, as the discipline is still not widely acknowledged as a core forensic competency. In a country where remains (human or otherwise) often fully skeletonise very quickly as a result of environmental conditions, this would seem a imitation of current forensic investigative practice.

Turning to the United States again for comparison, we see that the US has a stronger history of forensic anthropological training and large-scale focused research, potentially as a result of the fact the US has a much larger population and high crime levels, leading to a corresponding increase in the need for forensic anthropologists to undertake casework. The first outdoor forensic anthropology research facility was established at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in 1981 after forensic anthropologist Bill Bass recognised the need for systematic studies to support the forensic casework he was undertaking. The site in Knoxville was an excellent start and remained the only site of its kind for 25 years. However, five others have since opened across the US—Western Carolina University in 2006, Texas State University in 2008, Sam Houston State University in 2010, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale in 2012, and Colorado Mesa University in 2013. Three other sites are planned in Florida, Wisconsin and Pennsylvania to study the science of decomposition. Having so many sites spread across the country with such variations in climate, altitude, latitude, scavenger species, etc., provides unrivalled potential for research in forensic anthropology, helping forensic anthropologists to offer more reliable information to police about core aspects of forensic casework involving deceased individuals—including, amongst other things, time since death—based on empirical evidence gained from the Forensic Anthropology Data Bank [76, 77], a database comprising information on nearly 3,400 cases from all over the US at the time of writing [78].

Accreditation for Forensic Anthropologists

The second indicator of acceptance and professionalism is evidenced by an accrediting board providing certification to qualified experienced forensic anthropologists; also lacking in Australia, as no such accrediting body exists (although accreditation is currently being discussed by the Forensic Anthropology Scientific Working Group³ [79], approved by the Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency and the National Institute of Forensic Science – see <http://www.anzpaa.org.au/forensic-science/nifs-home>). This means anyone can claim to be a forensic anthropologist and the end user—largely the police—have few ways to check the suitability of that person to practice and provide evidence in forensic cases.

In forensic anthropology, academic work, professional practice and professional standards are clearly interdependent. It would seem pertinent, then, that we learn the lessons from the

³ The Forensic Anthropology Scientific Working Group (SWG) in Australia is part of the Medical Sciences Specialist Advisory Group (MSSAG). For more information see Blau *et al.* 2012 [79].

UK and US, where the forensic world has been rocked in recent years by reports evaluating the standard and quality of forensic science in these jurisdictions. In 2009, the National Academy of Science (NAS) in the US published its report '*Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A path forward*' [80], which was critical of reliability and training programs:

Too often they [forensic science facilities] have inadequate educational programs, and they typically lack mandatory and enforceable standards, founded on rigorous research and testing, certification requirements, and accreditation programs. Additionally, forensic science and forensic pathology research, education, and training lack strong ties to our research universities and national science assets. [80: pp. s10]

In the UK, the Home Office published the UK's equivalent report '*Research and Development in Forensic Science: A review*' [81]. Among a number of key recommendations, the report states:

Forensic science researchers, providers and users should all pay particular attention to appropriate communication within the research landscape, especially in view of the multifaceted nature of research and development in forensic science. [81: pp. 3]

Both of these comments could be said to apply to forensic anthropology in Australia, and indeed forensic science provision across the world [82]. In 2012, Professor Alistair Ross (who was until 2015 Director of the National Institute of Forensic Science in Australia) applied these two reports' findings to the Australian landscape, with a view to strengthening the field of forensic science going forward [82]. What Professor Ross made clear is that the field of forensic science as a whole is well placed in Australia, which has a National Institute of Forensic Science, Specialist Advisory Groups (eight in total: biology, chemical criminalistics, document examination, electronic evidence, field and identification sciences; illicit drugs, medical sciences, and toxicology) established within the Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency (ANZPAA) and several Scientific Working Groups (one of which is medical sciences, which includes anthropology). There is also an ANZPAA Disaster Victim Identification Committee (ADVIC), which falls within the Agency's National Institute of Forensic Science (ANZPAA-NIFS) directorate [83]. An anthropology representative is included in this group, along with other forensic disciplines, and a DVI Commander from each policing jurisdiction in Australia and New Zealand. Forensic standards have been published, together with discipline standards for DNA analysis (AS 5388.1 Forensic Analysis Part 1: Recognition, recording, recovery, transport and storage of material [84]; AS 5388.2 Forensic Analysis Part 2: Analysis and examination of material [85]; AS 5388.3 Forensic Analysis Part 3: Interpretation [86]; AS 5388.4 Forensic Analysis Part 4: Reporting [87], and AS 5481 Minimizing the risk of contamination in products used to collect and analyze biological material for forensic DNA purposes [88]). However, the question remains of how well these

standards relate to the recovery and identification of human remains by forensic anthropologists specifically.

Here and 'AFTER'

This brief qualitative analysis suggests key issues can be critically identified that affected or continue to affect the development of forensic anthropology in Australia. An important stimulus in the US lacking in Australia was the need to repatriate war dead—although this may now be changing with the news in mid-2016 that 33 Australians buried in cemeteries in Malaysia and Singapore were repatriated following historical conflicts; one of the largest military repatriations in Australian history [89]. This could indicate a shift in military thinking towards Australian military personnel buried overseas after international conflict, and which would in turn require additional forensic anthropological services going forward to assist with future repatriations, thereby further stimulating the development of the discipline.

Following dissemination of US experience in Australia, forensic anthropology grew steadily, and expanded greatly in response to the Bali Bombings of 2002, the Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami of 2004 and the Black Saturday bushfires of 2009. Buck and Briggs [17], for example, note the establishment of fully trained DVI teams in most Australian States and Territories post-Bali, and the recognition of the key role of the forensic anthropologist in investigation and communication. The contribution of Australian forensic anthropologists to the investigation of humanitarian abuses in East Timor [90] and elsewhere is also of critical importance—in producing empirical evidence of identification and of events, and as participants in the transitional justice process [90].

Casework is currently is being undertaken by a number of practitioners and academics, and the importance of standardization of procedure and reporting is widely recognized across forensic science disciplines. Undergraduate and postgraduate educational provision is inconsistent, however. There is an over-riding body to represent forensic anthropologists (the ANZPAA-NIFS approved SWG) although not all FAs contribute to this group, and no accreditation process currently exists to assist in career development for new forensic anthropologists in training or to assist the police in determining which individual's services to employ. As a result, the definition, role, and regulation of forensic anthropology remains the subject of discussion and debate (Evison et al. 2012, p. 99-100).

Dedicated undergraduate and postgraduate taught courses in the discipline and an accreditation programme are required to ensure students—the future practitioners of forensic anthropology in Australia—receive consistent suitable guidance as to the standards and professional expectations required of them by the criminal justice system.

A number of authors have offered opinions regarding the possible future development of forensic anthropology from a variety of perspectives [69, 70, 91]). Işcan [69, 91] emphasises a need for population standards and research on trauma, taphonomy, the estimation of time since death, and craniofacial identification. Cattaneo [70] also highlights the need for

professionalization and training, species identification, and research in post-mortem interval determination.

In Australia, a significant new development was the opening of a facility in Sydney in 2016 that has the potential to revolutionise forensic anthropology by providing the opportunity to study human decomposition in an Australian context for the first time. The Australian Facility for Taphonomic Experimental Research (shortened to 'AFTER') is a 12-acre (~5 hectare) site located in bushland on the western outskirts of Sydney, near the Blue Mountains, in New South Wales. The project to establish the facility was supported by a multidisciplinary team of forensic science practitioners and police forces, and was part-funded by the Australian Research Council [92] in association with the project partners. Forensic anthropologists are leading research projects at the facility examining a range of anthropological factors, including all basic data collection relating to time since death and decomposition rates in a bushland environment on the outskirts of Sydney. The research being undertaken at AFTER will offer invaluable information to help identify long-term unidentified deceased persons in Australia, helping to reduce the number of unidentified persons buried in numbered graves around the country.

This is a very important development for forensic science in Australia as, according to the Australian Federal Police, over 35,000 people (or 170 per 100,000 in the general population) are reported missing annually. Whilst 98% are found, mostly alive and unharmed, 3,330 are currently listed as 'long-term' missing (based on the total number of missing persons reports 2008-2015 where the person is not yet located), meaning they have been missing for more than 6 months. Between 0.1-3.3% may never be found [93], others may be deceased and their remains may be in various stages of decomposition when discovered.

All identifications rely on the ante-mortem and post-mortem matching (via dental or fingerprint comparisons, a DNA match, or a evaluation of a unique medical condition), the only process that can confirm an identity to the required legal standard. Consequently, even after human remains are found, individuals may remain unidentified if no missing person's report has been made that a biological profile of the deceased can be compared against, or if the decedent's ante-mortem information is not stored on a forensic database that can be accessed—most commonly DNA or fingerprint databases. This is why so many unidentified deceased individuals remain in morgues and unmarked graves around the country, as no information is available to facilitate identification.

This situation has been exacerbated in Australia due to the extreme environmental conditions together with the large size of the country. The generally hot, sometimes humid, sometimes dry climate can lead to expedited or retarded decomposition, and the size of outback areas means that even natural deaths can go undetected for many weeks, if not months or years. It could be suggested that the strength of the sun is also likely to leach all of the organic component out of bone more quickly than in cooler climates, and therefore osteological elements may become weaker and disintegrate more quickly in Australia compared to areas of the US, for example, from where we have some data as a result of the research of

taphonomy facilities already established across the United States. In Australia, however, lack of data from representative contexts when attempting to provide investigative information, including time since death—a fundamental factor that needs to be established at the very beginning of an investigation into the death of an unknown person—means forensic anthropologists have had to resort to providing very large approximations in terms of timescales, which in some cases do not help narrow down the interval in any meaningful way. This is not a criticism of the forensic anthropologist, but rather a statement about the lack of information available to help them provide meaningful estimates. Improving estimates of time death interval will therefore be very useful in death investigations in Australia, increasing the speed at which identifications can be made.

An illustrative case in point is that of 'Angel', whose remains were found in August 2010. A group of trail bike riders discovered the skeletonised remains of a young woman in bushland in Belanglo State Forest, off the Hume Highway between Sydney and Canberra, in New South Wales. The majority of the female's remains were recovered, which included a skull and pelvis, together with all long bones. In addition, blonde hair of three distinct lengths was found which belonged to the victim, who died a violent death, and a t-shirt was also found in association with the remains—the only item of the female's clothing recovered—with a distinctive motif including the word 'Angelic'. Thus, she was dubbed 'Angel' by the popular press. A biological profile was provided by anthropologists from the Department of Forensic Medicine, Sydney. The victim was determined to be of Caucasian ancestry, and aged between 15-25 years at the time of her death. The time since death interval was estimated to be between 6 months and 10 years, based on the fact the remains were fully skeletonised, as well as other contextual information. A facial reconstruction was undertaken [44], and the image of what the female may have looked like in life was publicised. The police were received a number of potential leads, but for many years none proved fruitful in identifying the victim. The police exhausted every potential avenue to try to identify this young woman [94], including using the media and academic publications to try to generate further information [44]. This case was problematic for a number of reasons; one of which being that it was not possible to narrow down the time since death window through analysis of the skeletal remains. Six months to ten years is a very significant time span, and, as no missing persons report matched the deceased between those times, the young woman remained unidentified. As a result, the police had to use the origins of clothing found with the remains to narrow down when the clothing could have been bought and distributed, in an attempt to estimate time since death more accurately to help their search for potential identities. It was not until 2015, when a caller to *CrimeStoppers* (an Australia-wide anonymous police tip-line) gave investigators a lead to the victim's identity that the remains were finally identified by a DNA comparison between the remains and an ante-mortem blood sample [94]—further permitting a comparison of the original facial reconstruction with ante-mortem photographs of the victim [44, 95]. A period of just under two years had elapsed between the victim last being seen

alive and her remains being discovered, and a further five years elapsed prior to her identification.

Brazil: A comparative territory

Problems encountered in human identification from skeletal remains in tropical climates akin to those of Australia have been the inevitable subject of research and professional practice in Brazil, a country of approximately similar size, where sparsity of population outside of urban centres means that bodies are often not quickly discovered, and where climatic and soil conditions cause skeletonisation and biomolecular diagenesis to advance rapidly post-mortem, frequently confounding attempts at DNA profiling using protocols developed in temperate climatic zones. In Brazil, collaborative research has specifically focused on advancing understanding of post-mortem histological changes in human bone interred in tropical soils [96-99] and combination of forensic anthropology with DNA recovery [100]—as has been attempted in the US [101, 102]. A further problem recognised in Brazil [103] and elsewhere [69, 70, 91]—and as Donlon has noted regarding Australia [10]—is an absence of representative reference skeletal collections, which can be used in the development of pertinent standards, given the highly admixed population. In an international comparison examining the utility of forensic anthropology in criminal and civil investigations, Evison and colleagues [104-106] found that the patterns encountered in caseloads between centres were remarkably consistent internationally, chiefly varying according to the local homicide rate and use of firearms, and the extent to which the local environment fosters concealment and advances skeletonisation. Patterns of skeletonisation encountered in Brazil and Australia are similar [10, 105], for example, but differ from the UK where opportunities for concealment and skeletonisation are minimal by comparison. The number of cases of burned bone so far reported in Australia appear small relative to both the UK and Brazil. Whilst it is recognised that not all cases will be published for various reasons, given the frequency of bushfires in the Australian natural environment, this lack of published case histories may reflect a sampling effect attributable to the large proportion of prehistoric Aboriginal remains included. Evison *et al.* used an attrition model [105] to examine impediments to case advancement. On the basis of their findings in relation to attrition and with reference to other studies, they propose that education and research could be better tailored to casework, suggesting the following topics could be targeted:

- Positive identification of faunal remains
- Understanding the significance of case provenance and the extent of preservation
- Estimation of time since death (including distinguishing archaeological cases)
- Distinguishing peri- and post-mortem trauma
- Identifying and understanding the significance of burning
- Identifying and understanding the significance of gunshot trauma
- Identifying and understanding the significance of surgery

- General and local knowledge of the provenance and pattern of forensic anthropology cases
- Collaborative use of forensic odontology and forensic DNA analysis
- Improving the effectiveness of forensic facial reconstruction

The science of forensic anthropology has in some ways developed in both a parallel manner, as well as separately, from the discipline in other parts of the world, largely led by the researchers working in the field and the individual needs of each country in terms of what types of cases require the services of a forensic anthropologist. The history of a science will inevitably influence its current standing and future direction, and as a result of the fact that forensic anthropology is a fairly new discipline in Australia, it could be argued that the science is in some ways not as advanced as in the UK or US, at least in terms of courses available at tertiary level or accreditation and professional development.

Conclusions

In her 2008 review, Australian forensic anthropologist Denise Donlon stated that forensic anthropology in Australia was “on the cusp of being recognised as a discipline in its own right” [10]. For reasons that Donlon discusses, this situation contrasts somewhat with the discipline’s position in the UK and—most clearly—the US, and highlights the need for further education and research, and development of professional standards.

Forensic anthropology in Australia has moved beyond its foundations as a subsidiary activity of anatomists and archaeologists. Expansion occurring from the late 1990s was further stimulated by the unfortunate events of the Bali Bombings of 2002, the Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami of 2004 and the Black Saturday bushfires of 2009, as well as by contributions to the humanitarian investigations in East Timor and elsewhere. In order to develop to a further stage of academic and professional independence—as exemplified by the US, in particular—forensic anthropology in Australia will benefit from the establishment of a governing body, of which all FAs are members and with associated accreditation and certification processes, and development of high quality specialist undergraduate and postgraduate education and training tailored to accreditation. New research—including unique studies facilitated by the establishment of the Australian Facility for Taphonomic Experimental Research—addressing post-mortem process and establishment of reference databases targeted to patterns of casework encountered in Australia—will greatly advance knowledge in the discipline.

References

1. Evison, M.P., *Forensic Anthropology and Human Identification from the Skeleton*, in *Handbook of Forensic Science*, J. Fraser and R. Williams, Editors. 2009, Willan: Portland, OR. p. 84-112.
2. Byers, S.N., *Introduction to Forensic Anthropology*. 4th ed. 2010, Boston, MA: Pearson.
3. Ubelaker, D.H., *Introduction to Forensic Anthropology*, in *Forensic Anthropology and Medicine: Complementary Sciences from Recovery to Cause of Death*, A. Schmitt, E. Cunha, and J. Pinheiro, Editors. 2006, Humana Press: Totowa, NJ. p. 3-12.
4. Randolph-Quinney, P., X. Mallett, and S.M. Black, *Forensic Anthropology*, in *Wiley Encyclopedia of Forensic Science*, A. Jamieson and A. Moenssens, Editors. 2009, John Wiley and Son Ltd.: London. p. 152-178.
5. Mallett, X. and M. Sutisno, *Anthropology: An overview*, in *Encyclopedia of Forensic and Legal Medicine 2nd edition*, J. Payne-James and R. Byard, Editors. 2016, Elsevier: pp. 196-206: Oxford.
6. Gulec, E.S. and M.Y. İşcan, *Forensic Anthropology in Turkey*. *Forensic Science International*, 1994. **66**(1): p. 61-8.
7. İşcan, M.Y. and H.E.S. Olivera, *Forensic Anthropology in Latin America*. *Forensic Science International*, 2000. **109**(1): p. 15-30.
8. Blau, S. and D.H. Ubelaker, *Handbook of Forensic Anthropology and Archaeology*. World Archaeological Congress Research Handbooks in Archaeology. 2009, Walnut Creek, Calif.: Left Coast Press. 534 p.
9. Brickley, M.B. and R. Ferlini, eds. *Forensic Anthropology: Case Studies from Europe*. 2007, Charles C. Thomas: Springfield, IL.
10. Donlon, D., *Forensic Anthropology in Australia: A Brief History and Review of Casework in Forensic Approaches to Death, Disaster and Abuse*, M. Oxenham, Editor. 2008, Australian Academic Press: pp 97-110: Bowen Hills, Qld.
11. Donlon, D., *The Development and Current State of Forensic Anthropology: An Australian perspective*, in *Handbook of forensic anthropology and archaeology*, S. Blau and D.H. Ubelaker, Editors. 2009, Left Coast Press: Walnut Creek, CA.
12. Thompson, T.J.U. and M.P. Evison, *Forensic Anthropology in the United Kingdom - Current trends, problems and concerns*. *Science & Justice*, 2003. **43**(4): p. 181-182.
13. France, D.L., *Human and Nonhuman Bone Identification: A color atlas 1st Edition*. 2008, Boca Raton: CRC Press.
14. France, D.L., *Comparative Bone Identification: Human subadult to nonhuman 1st Edition*. In press, Boca Raton: CRC Press.
15. France, D.L., *Human and Nonhuman Bone Identification: A Concise Field Guide*. 2010, Boca Raton: CRC Press.
16. France, D.L., *Distinguishing Human from Non-human Bone*, in *Advances in Forensic Human Identification*, X. Mallett, T. Blythe, and R. Berry, Editors. 2014, CRC Press: pp 81-126: Boca Raton, US.
17. Buck, A.M. and C.A. Briggs, *The Role of the Anthropologist in Disaster Victim Identification: Case studies from the 2002 and 2004 terrorist attacks in Bali, Indonesia*, in *Handbook of Forensic Anthropology and Archaeology, 2nd Ed.*, S. Blau and D. Ubelaker, Editors. 2016, Routledge: pp. 520-531: London.
18. Black, S., *Disaster Anthropology: The 2004 Asian tsunami*, in *Handbook of Forensic Anthropology and Archaeology, 2nd Ed.*, S. Blau and D. Ubelaker, Editors. 2016, Routledge: pp, 507-519: London.
19. Drummer, O.H. and S.M. Cordner, *Forensic Medical Response to the 2009 Victorian Bushfires Disaster Preface*. *Forensic Science International*, 2011. **205**(1-3): p. 1-1.
20. Morgan, O.W., et al., *Mass Fatality Management following the South Asian Tsunami Disaster: Case studies in Thailand, Indonesia, and Sri Lanka*. *PLoS Med* 3(6): e195. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0030195, 2006.
21. O'Donnell, C., et al., *Contribution of Postmortem Multidetector CT Scanning to Identification of the Deceased in a Mass Disaster: Experience gained from the 2009 Victorian bushfires*. *Forensic Science International*, 2011. **205**: p. 1-3,. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.une.edu.au/docview/856824783?accountid=17227>.

22. Blau, S. and M. Skinner, *The use of Forensic Archaeology in the Investigation of Human Rights Abuse: Unearthing the Past in East Timor*. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 2005. **9**(4): p. 449-463.
23. Cattaneo, C., D. De Angelis, and M. Grandi, *Introduction to Forensic Anthropology*, in *Mass Disasters*, A. Schmitt, E. Cunha, and J. Pinheiro, Editors. 2006, Humana Press: Totowa, NJ. p. 431-443.
24. Blau, S. and C.A. Briggs, *The Role of Forensic Anthropology in Disaster Victim Identification (DVI)*. *Forensic Science International*, 2011. **205**: p. 29-35.
25. Mundorff, A.Z., et al., *Disaster Victim Management - the Role of the Anthropologist*, in *Encyclopedia of Forensic and Legal Medicine, 2nd Ed.*, J. Payne-James and R. Byard, Editors. 2015, Elsevier: p. 288-304: Oxford.
26. Marquez-Grant, N. and J. Roberts, eds. *Forensic Ecology Handbook: From crime scene to court*. 2012, John Wiley & Sons: London.
27. London Resilience Partnership, *London Mass Fatality Plan, Version 4.0*. 2012, UK Government. Available from: <https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/archives/london-prepared-London-Mass-Fatality-Plan-v4.pdf> Access date 02/09/2015.
28. RAI, *Forensic Anthropology*. n.d., Royal Anthropological Institute. Available from: <https://www.therai.org.uk/forensic-anthropology> Site accessed 24/06/2016.
29. Centre for Anatomy and Human Identification, *Disaster Victim Identification* n.d., Available from: <http://cahid.dundee.ac.uk/research/research-impact/other-projects> Site accessed 02/09/2015.
30. Black, S., et al., *Disaster Victim Identification: The Practitioner's Guide*. 2010, UK: Dundee University Press, Ltd.
31. Univeristy of Western Australia, *Centre for Forensic Science: Forensic Anthropology Group*. n.d., Available from: <http://www.forensicscience.uwa.edu.au/research/anthropology> Site accessed 03/09/2015.
32. Kuliukas, A., et al., *Female Pelvic Shape: Distinct types or nebulous cloud?* *British Journal of Midwifery*, 2015. **23**(4): p. 490-496.
33. Franklin, D. and A. Flavel, *CT Evaluation of Timing for Ossification of the Medial Clavicular Epiphysis in a Contemporary Western Australian Population*. *International Journal of Legal Medicine*, 2015. **129**: p. 583-594.
34. Franklin, D., et al., *Morphometric Analysis of Pelvic Sexual Dimorphism in a Contemporary Western Australian Population*. *International Journal of Legal Medicine*, 2014. **128**: p. 861-872.
35. DeSilva, R., A. Flavel, and D. Franklin, *Estimation of Sex from the Metric Assessment of Digital Hand Radiographs in a Western Australian Population*. *Forensic Science International*, 2014. **244**: p. pp. 314.e1-314.e7.
36. Franklin, D., et al., *The Application of Traditional and Geometric Morphometric Analyses for Forensic Quantification of Sexual Dimorphism: Preliminary investigations in a Western Australian population*. *Journal of Legal Medicine*, 2012. **126**: p. 549-558.
37. VIFM, *Forensic Anthropology*. n.d., Victoria Institute of Forensic Medicine. Available from: <http://www.vifm.org/our-services/forensic-services/medico-legal-death-investigation/centre-for-human-identification/forensic-anthropology/> Site accessed 28/11/2016.
38. Blau, S., et al., *Missing Persons–Missing Data: The need to collect antemortem dental records of missing Persons*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2006. **51**: p. 386-389.
39. Blau, S., S. Robertson, and M. Johnstone, *Disaster Victim Identification: New applications for postmortem computed tomography*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2008. **53**: p. 956-961.
40. Sydney, U.o., *Anthropology Service & Consultancy*. n.d., Available from: <http://sydney.edu.au/medicine/forensic/services-consultancy/anthropology/index.php> Site accessed 90/09/2015.
41. Croker, S., W. Reed, and D. Donlon, *The Endosteal Region of Long Bone Shafts: A potential area of difference between human and non-human bones*. *HOMO: Journal of comparative human biology*, 2013. **64**: p. 146-146.

42. Adler, C. and D. Donlon, *Sexual Dimorphism in Deciduous Crown Traits of a European Derived Australian Sample*. *Forensic Science International*, 2010. **199**: p. 29-37.
43. Marhoff, S.J., et al., *Estimating Post-mortem Interval using Accumulated Degree-Days and a Degree of Decomposition Index in Australia: A validation study*. *Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2016. **48**: p. 24-36.
44. Hayes, S., *Facial Approximation of 'Angel': Case specific methodological review*. *Forensic Science International*, 2014. **237**: p. e30-e41.
45. Hayes, S., *3D Facial Approximation: An Introductory Lab Manual AME1.0*. 2012, Woollongong, NSW: Uniprint.
46. Hayman, J. and M.F. Oxenham, *Human Body Decomposition*. 2016, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
47. Hayman, J. and M. Oxenham, *Peri-mortem Disease Treatment: A little known cause of error in the estimation of the time since death in decomposing human remains*. *Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2015. **48**: p. 171-185.
48. Hayman, J. and M. Oxenham, *Estimation of the Time Since Death in Decomposed Bodies found in Australian Conditions*. *Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2016. **48**: p. 1-14.
49. Bertrand, J. and M. Oxenham, *Low-temperature-induced Bone Shrinkage: A controlled study using kangaroo femora*. *Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2015. **47**: p. 173-181.
50. Cameron, A. and M. Oxenham, *Disarticulation Sequences and Scattering Patterns in Temperate Southeastern Australia*. *Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2012. **44**: p. 197-211.
51. McFadden, C. and M. Oxenham, *Revisiting the Phenice technique sex classification results reported by MacLaughlin and Bruce (1990)*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 2016. **159**: p. 182-183.
52. Berketa, J.W., et al., *The Utilization of Incinerated Hip and Knee Prostheses for Identification*. *Forensic Science, Medicine, and Pathology*, 2015. **11**: p. 432-437.
53. Stephan, C.N. and E.K. Simpson, *Facial Soft Tissue Depths in Craniofacial Identification (part II): An analytical review of the published sub-adult data*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2008. **53**: p. 1273-1279.
54. Stephan, C.N., E.K. Simpson, and J.E. Byrd, *Facial Soft Tissue Depth Statistics and Enhanced Point Estimators for Craniofacial Identification: The debut of the shorth and the 75-shormax*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2013. **58**: p. 1439-1457.
55. Stephan, C.N. and E.K. Simpson, *Facial Soft Tissue Depths in Craniofacial Identification (Part I): An analytical review of the published adult data*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2008. **53**: p. 1257-1272.
56. Lottering, N., et al., *Evaluation of the Suchey-Brooks Method of Age Estimation in an Australian Subpopulation using Computed Tomography of the Pubic Symphyseal Surface*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 2013. **150**: p. 386 - 399.
57. Lottering, N., et al., *Morphometric Modelling of Ageing in the Human Pubic Symphysis: Sexual dimorphism in an Australian population*. *Forensic Science International*, 2014. **236**: p. 195-.
58. Lottering, N., et al., *Apophyseal Ossification of the Iliac Crest in Forensic Age Estimation: Computed tomography standards for modern Australian subadults*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2016. **Nov 25**. doi: [10.1111/1556-4029.13285](https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.13285). [Epub ahead of print].
59. Lottering, N., et al., *Introducing Computed Tomography Standards for Age Estimation of Modern Australian Subadults Using Postnatal Ossification Timings of Select Cranial and Cervical Sites*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2016. **61**: p. Suppl. 1: S39-52.
60. The University of Queensland, *Laboratory for Human Craniofacial and Skeletal Identification*. n.d., available from: <http://www.hucs-id.com> Site accessed 09/09/2015.
61. Stephan, C.N., *Accuracies of Facial Soft Tissue Depth Means for Estimating Ground Truth Skin Surfaces in Forensic Craniofacial Identification*. *International Journal of Legal Medicine*, 2014. **129**: p. 877-888.
62. Stephan, C.N., *The Application of the Central Limit Theorem and the Law of Large Numbers to Facial Soft Tissue Depths: T-Table robustness and trends since 2008*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2014. **59**: p. 454-462.

63. Guyomarc'h, P. and C.N. Stephan, *The Validity of Ear Prediction Guidelines used in Facial Approximation*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2012. **57**: p. 1427-1441.
64. Stephan, C.N. and M. Devine, *The Superficial Temporal Fat Pad and its Ramifications for Temporalis Muscle Construction in Facial Approximation*. *Forensic Science International*, 2009. **191**: p. 70-79.
65. Sephan, C.N., et al., *Turning the Tables of Sex Distinction in Craniofacial Identification: Why females possess thicker facial soft tissues than males, not vice versa*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 2016. **161**: p. 283-295.
66. Stephan, C.N., R.M. Norris, and M. Henneberg, *Does Sexual Dimorphism in Facial Soft Tissue Depths Justify Sex Distinction in Craniofacial Identification?* *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2005. **50**: p. 513-518.
67. Stephan, C.N., et al., *Morphometric Comparison of Clavicle Outlines from 3D Bone Scans and 2D Chest Radiographs: A shortlisting tool to assist radiographic identification of human skeletons*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2014. **59**: p. 306-313.
68. Stephan, C.N. and P. Guyomarc'h, *Quantification of Perspective-induced Shape Change of Clavicles at Radiography and 3D Scanning to Assist Human Identification*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2014. **59**: p. 447-452.
69. Işcan, M.Y., *Progress in Forensic Anthropology: The 20th century*. *Forensic Science International*, 1998. **98**(1-2): p. 1-8.
70. Cattaneo, C., *Forensic Anthropology: Developments of a classical discipline in the new millennium*. *Forensic Science International*, 2007. **165**(2-3): p. 185-193.
71. Mallett, X. and M.P. Evison, *Forensic Facial Comparison: Issues of admissibility in the development of novel analytical technique*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2013. **58**(4): p. 859-65.
72. Baty, P., *Forensic Body to Dissect Provision*. 2015, Available from: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/forensic-body-to-dissect-provision/201244.article> Site accessed 28/11/2016.
73. Gamble, C. and G. MacKinnon, *Professional Standards and Accreditation of Forensic Anthropology in the United Kingdom*. *Science & Justice*, 2014. **54**: p. 182.
74. The American Board of Forensic Anthropology, *Homepage*. n.d., Available from: <http://www.theabfa.org> Site accessed 03/09/2015.
75. Australian National University, *Bachelor of Arts: Minor*. n.d., Available from: http://programsandcourses.anu.edu.au/2016/program/BARTS_-_minors Site accessed 03/09/2015.
76. Spradley, M.K. and R.L. Jantz, *Sex Estimation in Forensic Anthropology: Skull versus postcranial elements*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2011. **56**: p. 289-296.
77. Shirley, N.R. and R.L. Jantz, *Spheno-Occipital Synchondrosis Fusion in Modern Americans*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 2011. **56**: p. 580-585.
78. University of Tennessee Knoxville, *Forensic ANthropology Data Bank (FDB)*. n.d., Available from: <https://fac.utk.edu/background/> Site accessed 28/11/2016.
79. Blau, S., et al., *Forensic Anthropology in Australia: Working towards improved practice*. 2012, Australian New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency and the National Institute of Forensic Science. Available from: https://www.google.com.au/search?client=safari&rls=en&q=Ellie+Simpson&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&gfe_rd=cr&ei=eMc3WNKblcLr8Aejy6SoBg Site accessed 25/11/2016.
80. NAS, *Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A path forward*. 2009, National Academy of Science. Available from: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/228091.pdf> Site accessed 22/09/2015.
81. Silverman, B., *Research and Development in Forensic Science: A review*. 2011, Home Office, UK. Available from: <https://connect.innovateuk.org/documents/3144739/3824746/forensic-science-review-report.pdf/f782aabc-e559-454b-8425-fda1bdf47f0c> site accessed 22/09/2015.
82. Ross, A., *Contemporary Comments - Forensic Science in Australia: Where does Australia sit in relation to trends and issues in the international context?* 2012, Available from: <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/CICrimJust/2012/23.pdf> Site accessed 22/09/2015.
83. ANZPAA, *ADVIC Committee*. n.d, Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency. Available from: <https://www.anzpaa.org.au/resources-and-links/disaster-victim-identification/advic-committee> Site accessed 22/09/2015.

84. ANZPAA/NIFS, AS 5388.1-2012 *Forensic Analysis - Recognition, recording, recovery, transport and storage of material*. 2012, Available from: <http://infostore.saiglobal.com/store/Details.aspx?ProductID=1529904> Site accessed 22/09/2015.
85. ANZPAA/NIFS, AS 5388.2-2012 *Forensic Analysis - Analysis and examination of material*. 2012, Available from: <http://infostore.saiglobal.com/store/Details.aspx?productID=1529720> Site accessed 22/09/2015.
86. ANZPAA/NIFS, AS 5388.3-2013 *Forensic Analysis - Interpretation*. 2013, Available from: <http://infostore.saiglobal.com/store/Details.aspx?ProductID=1621661> Site accessed 22/09/2015.
87. ANZPAA/NIFS, AS 5388.4-2013 *Forensic Analysis - Reporting*. 2013, Available from: <http://infostore.saiglobal.com/store/Details.aspx?ProductID=1621662> Site accessed 22/09/2015.
88. ANZPAA/NIFS, AS 5483-2012 *Minimizing the Risk of Contamination in Products used to Collect and Analyse Biological Material for Forensic DNA Purposes*. 2012, Available from: <http://infostore.saiglobal.com/store/Details.aspx?ProductID=1530544> Site accessed 22/09/2015.
89. ABC News, *Remains of Australians Buried in Overseas Military Cemeteries Arrive in Sydney*. 2016, Available from: <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-06-02/repatriation-ceremony-vietnam-malaysia-service-personnel/7469362> Site accessed 23/06/2016.
90. Blau, S. and L. Fondebrider, *Dying for Independence: Proactive investigations into the 12 November 1991 Santa Cruz massacre, Timor Leste*. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 2010. **15**: p. 1249-1274.
91. Işcan, M.Y., *Global Forensic Anthropology in the 21st Century*. *Forensic Science International*, 2001. **117**(1-2): p. 1-6.
92. UTS, *Research Facility will Help Solve Murder Investigations*. 2014, University Technology Sydney. Available from: <http://newsroom.uts.edu.au/news/2014/11/research-facility-will-help-solve-murder-investigations> Site accessed 22/09/2015.
93. AFP, *Missing Persons*. n.d., Australian Federal Police. Available from: <http://www.missingpersons.gov.au/missing-persons/overview> Site accessed 21/09/2015.
94. Scopelianos, S. *How the Discovery of the Bodies of 'Angel' and her Little Girl Unfolded*. ABC News 2015; Available from: <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-10-21/khandalyce-kiara-pearce-bones-found-near-wynarka/6873340>.
95. ABC News, *Detectives Link Wynarka Girl's Bones in Suitcase to 'Angel' Bones in Belanglo*. 2015, Available from: <http://www.news.com.au/national/crime/detectives-link-wynarka-girls-bones-in-suitcase-to-angel-bones-in-belanglo/news-story/229f7787e0441d12a4fb2a7f91c26ab4> Site accessed 28/11/2016.
96. Iwamura, E.S.M., et al., *A Qualitative Study of Compact Bone Microstructure and Nuclear Short Tandem Repeat Obtained from Femur of Human Remains found on the Ground and Exhumed 3 Years After Death*. *American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology*, 2005. **26**(1): p. 33-44.
97. Alves, M.T.S., et al., *Histopathological Analysis as an Auxiliary Method for Molecular Human Identification in Study of Bones from Skeletal Remains*. *Histopathology*, 2012. **61**: p. 159-159.
98. Iwamura, E., et al., *Tissue Microarray in Exhumed Human Bones: Histological sections with reduced sample loss*. *Virchows Archiv*, 2014. **465**: p. S246-S246.
99. Astolpho, R., et al., *Qualitative Histopathological Analysis of Compact Bones Exhumed in Tropical Climate for Forensic Purposes*. *Virchows Archiv*, 2014. **465**: p. S291-S291.
100. Guimarães, M.A., et al., *A Standard Procedure for Accommodating Forensic Anthropological and Genetic Analysis of Decomposing Human Remains from Tropical Climates*. *Forensic Science International: Genetics Supplement Series* 2009. **2**(1): p. 165-166.
101. Mundorff, A.Z. and J.M. Davoren, *Examination of DNA Yield Rates for Different Skeletal Elements at Increasing Post Mortem Intervals*. *Forensic Science International: Genetics*, 2014(8).

102. Mundorff, A.Z., et al., *Marrying Anthropology and DNA: Essential for solving complex commingling problems in cases of extreme fragmentation*, in *Commingled Human Remains: Methods in recovery, analysis, and identification*, B. Adams and J. Byrd, Editors. 2014, Elsevier: New York.
103. Francisco, R.A., *Analysis of Skeletons Exhumed with a Known Bioanthropological Profile for Establishing the Best Anthropological Parameters to be Applied to the Brazilian Population in Forensic Anthropological Examinations*. 2015, University of São Paulo: São Paulo.
104. Evison, M.P., *Genetics, Ethics and Archaeology*. *Antiquity*, 1996. **70**(269): p. 512-514.
105. Evison, M.P., R.A. Francisco, and M.A. Guimarães, *Approaching Utility in Forensic Anthropology*. *Forensic Science Policy & Management: An International Journal*, 2012. **3**(2): p. 85-104.
106. Evison, M.P., R.A. Francisco, and M.A. Guimarães, *Utility in Forensic Anthropology: Findings contributing to case conversion*. *Forensic Science Policy & Management: An International Journal*, 2012. **3**(2): p. 113-125.