METROPOLITAN POLICE
FORENSIC SCIENCE LABORATORY
109 Lambeth Road, London SE1 7LP
Telephone 071–230 6432
Facsimile 071–230 6393 Telex 892733

Dr P M Schneider (Prof Ch Rittner)
Institut fur Rechtsmedizin
der Universitat Mainz
Am Pulverturm 3
D 6500 Mainz
WEST GERMANY

18 January 1991

Dear Peter,

Here are the minutes of the EDNAP meeting which was held in Strasbourg. I apologise for the delay, but there were some difficulties with the production.

Please note the date of the next meeting. I will circulate details, together with a provisional agenda, as soon as I have discussed them with Vince Pascali.

If you have any items which you would like to discuss in the Rome meeting, please let me have them for inclusion in the agenda.

I wish you a very successful 1991.

Yours sincerely

Peter

P D Martin
(on behalf of EDNAP)

Enc

EUROPEAN DNA PROFILING GROUP - STRASBOURG - 30 NOVEMBER 1990

Report of Meeting

The meeting was held in the European Council Chambers, Strasbourg.
Chairman : Peter Martin

Prof Patrice Mangin welcomed members to the meeting.

1st EDNAP Collaborative Exercise

The proceedings started with a presentation of the manuscript, by Peter Schneider, of the first EDNAP collaborative exercise. The content was well received and generally accepted and Peter asked that any suggested changes should be conveyed to him by 14 December 1990.
On behalf of Forensic Science International, Patrick Lincoln offered to publish the final manuscript in the form of a report and therefore peer review is not required. This was accepted unanimously.

2nd EDNAP Collaborative Exercise

The results and the analysis of the second EDNAP collaborative exercise were given to the meeting by Peter Gill. The initial analysis shows that there was very good agreement between the collaborating laboratories with some minor exceptions. Peter Gill will prepare a draft manuscript which will be submitted to members for scrutiny prior to publication.

Uniform System for DNA Profiling

Peter Gill followed his presentation with a discourse on the desirability of a uniform system for DNA profiling. He discussed the advantages and disadvantages of setting up a such a system.

Uniformity would have the following advantages :-

1. Ease of control

2. Band weight estimations from each laboratory would be directly comparable.

3. Statistical methodology for the interpretation of results would be the

same for each laboratory.

4. A common European protocol could be used.

5. Fewer probes would be necessary because match windows would be narrower.

Disadvantages were:-

1. New data bases would have to be compiled both nationally and internationally.

(There followed a discussion on the size of databases needed for the determination of population frequencies. Ian Evett said that sample sizes of 200 individuals could be large enough to obtain statistical information if his methods were employed).

If a common European protocol is to be adopted it must not be so rigid that it prevents any development. However any changes which are made should be co-ordinated through an agreed framework in order that the changes do not alter the estimation of the band weights.

There was general agreement to take part in an exercise to determine whether the technique of each laboratory had improved since the first EDNAP exercise. Each laboratory should test the genomic control (sample from laboratory donor used in 1st EDNAP exercise) using their present technique and the CRSE method (used in the 2nd EDNAP exercise). The testing should also include the Cell Line Control K562.
Peter Gill will circulate details.

Quality Assurance

The question of who should be our Quality Assurance assessor was raised.
The alternatives appeared to be CRSE or Cellmark (UK).
A Quality Management system was suggested by Peter Gill but there was considerable debate on the desirability of acceptance. There was a reluctance to have a Quality Assurance group directing laboratory policy.
The subject was debated at length but no conclusion was reached.

Bernd Brinkmann was concerned about the confidentiality of information

obtained in QA trials.

It was agreed that Peter Gill will prepare an account of the CRSE QA testing procedure with costings for distribution to each of the member laboratories. Cellmark can be considered as an alternative.
A decision can be made at the next meeting.
Patrice Mangin will contact Luxembourg to enquire about funding for QA programmes within European initiatives.

Computerised Indexes

Matthew Greenhalgh gave a brief report on the experiences of the MPFSL with the use of a computerised DNA index. At the present time there are 1,200 blood profiles and 200 profiles from scenes of crime on this index. It has proved very useful for linking together unsolved crimes which were committed by the same offender, especially when crimes occur in different police districts.
He identified problems with the size of the search window. If it is too big it identifies too many profiles and if it is too small there is a danger of missing some matches. With only 2 probes common to the EDNAP laboratories international searches could be difficult.
Ian Evett considered that more advanced statistical methods could remove the need for large search windows.

Expansion of EDNAP

Peter Martin introduced the subject of expanding EDNAP to encompass all Europeans who are either active in the field of DNA profiling or planning to introduce the subject into their laboratories.
Because large numbers may inhibit decision making it was suggested that it might be necessary to elect an advisory board to make reccomendations to the membership.
Due to the problems of attendance at an ever growing number of conferences Bernd Brinkmann suggested that we could have the EDNAP meetings at the same time as the International Society for Forensic Haemogenetics (ISFH), as all EDNAP members attend both meetings.

This was generally accepted by all members and it was further suggested that the ISFH secretariat could be used for the dissemination of EDNAP information.

It was also agreed that EDNAP invitations should be sent to those attending the ISFH meeting in Mainz. However it should be made clear that the original

aims of EDNAP should not change ie. the members meet to discuss the determination of DNA profiles from stained material with a view to common methodology which allows for the exchange and comparison of results.

Reaction rates of Hinf 1 and Hae III

Peter Schneider gave a second presentation on work comparing two restriction enzymes; Hinf 1 and Hae III. Using a multilocus probe which is sensitive to partial restriction he demonstrated that Hinf 1 has a slower reaction rate than Hae III. It might take as long as 10 hours before restriction is complete and consequently long incubation times are required in casework.

Next Meeting

Vince Pascali offered to host the next EDNAP meeting in Rome to be held on April 19. Details will be sent to members as soon as possible.