

Paula Brisotto

From: Cathie Allen
Sent: Thursday, 15 November 2018 9:21 AM
To: Paula Brisotto; Justin Howes
Subject: FW: Removal of the microcon step from P1 workflow.

Importance: High

Hi Paula and Justin

FYI – on latest email from Insp Neville.

Thanks Justin for finding that email for me – really helped me out.

Cheers
 Cathie

**Cathie Allen**

Managing Scientist

Police Services Stream, Forensic & Scientific Services
 Health Support Queensland, Queensland Health

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]



Queensland Health acknowledges the Traditional Owners of the land, and pays respect to Elders past, present and future.

From: Cathie Allen
Sent: Thursday, 15 November 2018 9:20 AM
To: A/Insp Gerard Simpfendorfer [REDACTED]; Supt Bruce McNab
Cc: Craig Russell; Insp David Neville [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Removal of the microcon step from P1 workflow.
Importance: High

Hi Gerard and Bruce

I can confirm that the Microcon process has been applied to the below four sample as requested by the QPS on the dates listed below:

[REDACTED] – Snr Sgt Simpfendorfer requested Microcon 29/10/2018
 [REDACTED] – Snr Sgt Simpfendorfer requested Microcon 06/11/2018
 [REDACTED] – Snr Sgt Simpfendorfer requested Microcon 06/11/2018
 [REDACTED] – Snr Sgt Simpfendorfer requested Microcon 06/11/2018

During a meeting on 1st of Feb 2018, Paul Csoban (previous Executive Director for FSS) and I met with Supt Dale Frieberg to discuss the Options Paper that had previously been provided to the QPS for decision. During this meeting, the Superintendent agreed that Option 2 was the preferred option, which was later confirmed via email (as per below). During the discussion, the second part of Option 2 (section a) was discussed, which related to Priority 1 samples and the Superintendent indicated that Priority 1 samples should be processed the same as Major crime (P2) and Volume crime samples (P3), which is not to be automatically progressed through the Microcon process. After the approval from the QPS in Feb 2018, all samples have not automatically progressed through the Microcon process. The QPS or a Forensic DNA Analysis staff member can request a Microcon process for a sample at any time.

Automatic progression of samples through the Microcon process means that all available DNA extract will be consumed, so no further testing can be conducted on these samples after this step. This means that if a sample could yield a profile by specific Y chromosome testing for example, there would be no extract available for that testing to be conducted. It also means that samples that are eligible to be pooled together, as they are from the same item or area, are not able to be as there is no DNA extract left to undertake pooling. Scientists or Forensic officers reviewing results in the context of a case are able to request a Microcon process for a sample or samples.

As the decision on the automatic Microcon process was made last financial year, the budget for this financial year has been adjusted for that consumable, so this will increase the cost.

If the QPS wishes for P1 samples to automatically be processed through the Microcon process, which leaves no available extract for other testing, this process can be re-introduced. Please confirm if the QPS requires the re-introduction of this step.

The Options Paper reviewed 278 Major crime samples that had been progressed through the Microcon process over a one year period, as this was considered to be sufficient sample numbers to demonstrate a clear trend.

The laboratory is unable to search the FR to undertake any statistical analysis regarding 'useable' profile numbers – this was highlighted to FSS during development that large or medium scale interrogation of the FR could only be undertaken by the QPS, as they would need to construct the search and ensure the timing of the search was undertaken so as not to add extra burden to the FR during peak operational times. If the QPS were able to generate this data, the laboratory would undertake this analysis and provide feedback. The Microcon process was no longer automatically undertaken for P1 or P2 samples from the 12th of Feb 2018.

Whilst the Microcon process has not been automatically applied to Major crime samples (P2) since mid Feb, scientists have reviewed those results and requested a Microcon process if in the context of the case it could have been of potential benefit. If the QPS undertook a search of all 'DNA insufficient' results on P1 and P2 samples since the 12th of Feb, the laboratory could undertake an analysis of the cases to determine if additional testing through the Microcon process is required. This would require resources and would reduce the number of results that are reviewed by the lab until this analysis was completed.

I await your advice regarding this. If you have any further questions, please let me know how I can assist.

Cheers
Cathie



Cathie Allen
Managing Scientist

Police Services Stream, Forensic & Scientific Services
Health Support Queensland, Queensland Health

[REDACTED]

Integrity

Customers and patients first

Accountability

Respect

Engagement

Queensland Health acknowledges the Traditional Owners of the land, and pays respect to Elders past, present and future.

From: Neville.DavidH[OSC] [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 14 November 2018 2:47 PM
To: Cathie Allen
Cc: Craig Russell; McNab.BruceJ[OSC]; Simpfendorfer.GerardM[OSC]
Subject: Removal of the microcon step from P1 workflow.
Importance: High

Dear Cathie

During the course of the investigation into Operation Clarify over 15 samples were submitted as Priority 1. On initial testing, four samples were reported as having insufficient DNA present for further testing. Upon receipt of that result my staff requested additional testing and each of those samples yielded a result as follows:

- [REDACTED] - SINGLE SOURCE 20 LOCI DNA PROFILE LR > 100 BILLION (Deceased match); and POSSIBLE SUB-THRESHOLD INFORMATION
- [REDACTED] - SINGLE SOURCE DNA PROFILE - ASSUMED KNOWN CONTRIBUTOR – (Deceased match)
- [REDACTED] - SS DNA PROFILE 9 LOCI AND ABOVE LR > 100 BILLION (Deceased match)
- [REDACTED] - COMPLEX MIXED PROFILE UNSUITABLE FOR INTERP OR COMPARISON

Could you confirm if the profiles for the four samples listed above were obtained after micro-concentration was performed, please. Could you also confirm if the microcon step has been removed from the workflow as a matter of routine for P1 samples. My understanding as per the below was that this was only to occur for P2. If this process has been removed from the P1 workflow, could it please be reintroduced as it will stop delays in obtaining results that are considered urgent, please.

From: Frieberg.DaleJ[OSC]

Sent: Friday, 2 February 2018 3:38 PM

To: Cathie Allen [REDACTED] O'Malley.TroyS[OSC] [REDACTED]

Cc: Paul Csoban [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Options Paper for consideration

Hi Cathie and Paul,

Thank you for your time this afternoon and for discussion around this options paper. Thank you also t

As discussed, I am in agreement that:

- There is clear data that it is not an efficient use of time and resources to continue with the 'a
- Option 2. "Cease the 'auto-microcon' process for Priority 2 casework...." Would appear to be a
- Scientists time and resources would be better spent working samples with a higher DNA yield
- It would be beneficial to amend the Forensic Register to provide an automated Q-Prime updat
- DNA staff can request this additional processing if/when a request is received from the invest

I trust this is of assistance.

Kind regards,

Dale.

Dale Frieberg
Superintendent
Operations Commander
Forensic Services Group
Operations Support Command
Queensland Police Service
[REDACTED]

The removal of the microcon step in the process was agreed to on 2 February 2018 by Supt Frieberg based on the advice included in the attached paper. This paper estimates that there would be less than a 2% reduction in the number of useable results if the step was eliminated.

Based on the fact that 3 out of 4 samples for this case yielded a result when testing was continued, anecdotally it would seem that we may be missing out on more than 2% of results.

Since eliminating this step, has your laboratory undertaken any statistical analysis to determine if there has been a drop in the proportion of samples that give a useable profile, please.

There are other serious matters including homicides where testing has stopped once advice was received that there is insufficient DNA for further testing. Based on the results for this case (75% success rate for the ones received back so far), would you recommend that these cases be re-examined please.

Could you please direct your response to Gerard and Bruce.



David Neville
Inspector
DNA Management Unit | Forensic Services Group
Operations Support Command
QUEENSLAND POLICE SERVICE



CONFIDENTIALITY: The information contained in this electronic mail message and any electronic files attached to it may be confidential information, and may also be the subject of legal professional privilege and/or public interest immunity. If you are not the intended recipient you are required to delete it. Any use, disclosure or copying of this message and any attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this electronic message in error, please inform the sender or contact 1300ITPSBA@psba.qld.gov.au. This footnote also confirms that this email message has been checked for the presence of computer viruses.
