

Paula Brisotto

From: Justin Howes
Sent: Friday, 8 March 2019 9:04 AM
To: Paula Brisotto
Subject: FW: DNA Insufficient for further processing

FYI

**Justin Howes**

Team Leader - Forensic Reporting and Intelligence Team

Forensic DNA Analysis, Forensic & Scientific Services
 Health Support Queensland, Queensland Health



www.health.qld.gov.au/healthsupport

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: Alicia Quartermain
Sent: Thursday, 7 March 2019 5:27 PM
To: Kylie Rika <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Justin Howes <[REDACTED]> Allison Lloyd <[REDACTED]> Sharon Johnstone <[REDACTED]>
Subject: DNA Insufficient for further processing

Hi Kylie,

I just wanted to email you regarding a concern that I have.

I have come across quite a few samples in a case that I am reviewing ([REDACTED]) where, because the samples have all been registered as P1, quite a few have gone straight through to auto-mic based on their quant values. A number of them have produced useable profiles that we would never have been able to provide police with if they gone through the usual P2 workflow. They would have been reported as 'DNA insuff for further processing'. A few other staff members have had a similar experience lately, where, for various reasons, samples have gone onto microcon when they would otherwise have stopped after quant based on their quant values being in the 0.001-0.0088ng/uL range.

After having had my CSP discussion on Monday, and understanding the importance of the ICARE principles we are to strive for as individuals and as a department, I couldn't let this one pass without bringing it to the management team's attention. Our customers are not just QPS, but the Courts, the complainants, the defendants and the general community. I believe we should revise the value range we are using for 'DNA insuff for further processing' and/or potentially reinstate P2 samples which quant in the range of 0.001-0.0088ng/uL to go for an auto-mic.

We sign our statements in good faith, and they state that we could be liable for prosecution if we are stating anything we know is false. Saying 'DNA insufficient for further processing' when a quant value is near that

0.0088ng/uL figure I believe, based on my recent experiences, is false. We aren't serving the community or doing our best work if we don't make a change or at least have a team discussion here. What we currently do is obviously something we have made an agreement with the QPS about, but surely this topic can be revisited and that agreement modified? I believe it is our responsibility to provide QPS with guidance around these things, as we are the ones who are carrying out and reporting this work back to them every day.

I also believe that if we report something as 'DNA insuff', then for some reason the Court, or a defence barrister requests an extract is sent elsewhere for testing, we could potentially come off not looking great. Especially if that other testing facility generates a great DNA profile from the extract.

Thanks,
Alicia



Alicia Quartermain

Scientist

Forensic DNA Analysis | Police Services Stream | Forensic & Scientific Services
Health Support Queensland, Queensland Health

a 39 Kessels rd, Coopers Plains, Q 4108

e www.health.qld.gov.au/healthsupport

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.