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- Method Modifications and Performance Checks (Robyn)

Day #3
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Brief Historical Overview

Quality problems in late 1980s with DNA testing
TWGDAM established under FBI Lab sponsorship in 1988
NRC I (1992) and NRC II (1996) issued reports recommending formal QA programs
DNA Identification Act of 1994 lead to formation of DNA Advisory Board (DAB)
DAB Standards issued in Oct 1998 and Apr 1999
When DAB was dissolved in 2000, SWGDAM assumed leadership role

DNA Identification Act (1994)

42 § 14131. Quality assurance and proficiency testing standards
(a) Publication of quality assurance and proficiency testing standards

(b) The advisory board shall include as members scientists from State, local,
and private forensic laboratories, molecular geneticists and population
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DAB Standards


Prepared by John M. Butler
## Outline of DAB Standards

1. **SCOPE**  
2. **DEFINITIONS**  
3. **QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM**  
4. **ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT**  
5. **PERSONNEL**  
6. **FACILITIES**  
7. **EVIDENCE (SAMPLE) CONTROL**  
8. **VALIDATION**  
9. **ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES**  
10. **EQUIPMENT CALIBRATION AND MAINTENANCE**  
11. **REPORTS**  
12. **REVIEW**  
13. **PROFICIENCY TESTING**  
14. **CORRECTIVE ACTION**  
15. **AUDITS**  
16. **SAFETY**  
17. **SUBCONTRACTOR OF ANALYTICAL TESTING FOR WHICH VALIDATED PROCEDURES EXIST**

## Validation Section of the DNA Advisory Board Standards


**STANDARD 8.1** The laboratory shall use validated methods and procedures for forensic casework analyses (DNA analyses).

8.1.1 Developmental validation that is conducted shall be appropriately documented.

8.1.2 Novel forensic DNA methodologies shall undergo developmental validation to ensure the accuracy, precision and reproducibility of the procedure. The developmental validation shall include the following:

8.1.2.1 Documentation exists and is available which defines and characterizes the locus.

8.1.2.2 Species specificity, sensitivity, stability and mixture studies are conducted.

8.1.2.3 Population distribution data are documented and available.

8.1.2.3.1 The population distribution data would include the allele and genotype distributions for the locus or loci obtained from relevant populations. Where appropriate, databases should be tested for independence expectations.

8.1.3 Internal validation shall be performed and documented by the laboratory.

8.1.3.1 The procedure shall be tested using known and non-probative evidence samples (known samples only). The laboratory shall monitor and document the reproducibility and precision of the procedure using human DNA control(s).

8.1.3.2 The laboratory shall establish and document match criteria based on empirical data.

8.1.3.3 Before the introduction of a procedure into forensic casework (database sample analysis), the analyst or examination team shall successfully complete a qualifying test.

8.1.4 Where methods are not specified, the laboratory shall, wherever possible, select methods that have been published by reputable technical organizations or in relevant scientific texts or journals, or have been appropriately evaluated for a specific or unique application.

---

### Developmental Validation Overview

**8.1.1** Developmental validation that is conducted shall be appropriately documented.

**8.1.2** Novel forensic DNA methodologies shall undergo developmental validation to ensure the accuracy, precision and reproducibility of the procedure. The developmental validation shall include the following:

8.1.2.1 Documentation exists and is available which defines and characterizes the locus.

8.1.2.2 Species specificity, sensitivity, stability and mixture studies are conducted.

8.1.2.3 Population distribution data are documented and available.

8.1.2.3.1 The population distribution data would include the allele and genotype distributions for the locus or loci obtained from relevant populations. Where appropriate, databases should be tested for independence expectations.

### Locus Definition and Characterization

**8.1.2.1** Documentation exists and is available which defines and characterizes the locus.

### Developmental Validation Studies

**8.1.2.2** Species specificity, sensitivity, stability and mixture studies are conducted.

### Population Data and Independence Testing

**8.1.2.3** Population distribution data are documented and available.

8.1.2.3.1 The population distribution data would include the allele and genotype distributions for the locus or loci obtained from relevant populations. Where appropriate, databases should be tested for independence expectations.
Internal Validation Overview

8.1.3 Internal validation shall be performed and documented by the laboratory.
8.1.3.1 The procedure shall be tested using known and non-probative evidence samples (known samples only). The laboratory shall monitor and document the reproducibility and precision of the procedure using human DNA control(s).
8.1.3.2 Before the introduction of a procedure into forensic casework (database sample analysis), the analyst or examination team shall successfully complete a qualifying test.
8.1.3.4 Material modifications made to analytical procedures shall be documented and subject to validation testing.

Reproducibility and Precision

8.1.3.1 The procedure shall be tested using known and non-probative evidence samples (known samples only). The laboratory shall monitor and document the reproducibility and precision of the procedure using human DNA control(s).

Match Criteria

8.1.3.2 The laboratory shall establish and document match criteria based on empirical data.

Qualifying Test

8.1.3.3 Before the introduction of a procedure into forensic casework (database sample analysis), the analyst or examination team shall successfully complete a qualifying test.

Material Modifications

8.1.3.4 Material modifications made to analytical procedures shall be documented and subject to validation testing.

9. ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES

STANDARD 9.1 The laboratory shall have and follow written analytical procedures approved by the laboratory management/technical manager.

9.1.1 The laboratory shall have a standard operating protocol for each analytical technique used.

9.1.2 The procedures shall include reagents, sample preparation, extraction, equipment, and controls, which are standard for DNA analysis and data interpretation.

9.1.3 The laboratory shall have a procedure for differential extraction of stains that potentially contain semen.
**Suitable Reagents**

**STANDARD 9.2** The laboratory shall use reagents that are suitable for the methods employed.

9.2.1 The laboratory shall have written procedures for documenting commercial supplies and for the formulation of reagents.

9.2.2 Reagents shall be labeled with the identity of the reagent, the date of preparation or expiration, and the identity of the individual preparing the reagent.

9.2.3 The laboratory shall identify critical reagents (if any) and evaluate them prior to use in casework. These critical reagents include but are not limited to:

(a) Restriction enzyme
(b) Commercial kits for performing genetic typing
(c) Agarose for analytical RFLP gels
(d) Membranes for Southern blotting
(e) K562 DNA or other human DNA controls
(f) Molecular weight markers used as RFLP sizing standards
(g) Primer sets
(h) Thermotable DNA polymerase

**Human DNA Quantitation**

**STANDARD 9.3** The laboratory shall have and follow a procedure for evaluating the quantity of the human DNA in the sample where possible. (NOT IN CONVICTED OFFENDER DATABASING STANDARDS)

9.3.1 For casework RFLP samples, the presence of high molecular weight DNA should be determined.

**Appropriate Controls and Standards**

**STANDARD 9.4** The laboratory shall monitor the analytical procedures using appropriate controls and standards.

9.4.1 The following controls shall be used in RFLP casework analysis:

9.4.1.1 Quantitation standards for estimating the amount of DNA recovered by extraction. (When required by the analytical procedure, standards for determining the amount of DNA recovered in comparison with the unknowns.)

9.4.1.2 K562 as a human DNA control. (In monitoring sizing data, a statistical quality control method for K562 and line sizes shall be maintained.)

9.4.1.3 Molecular weight size markers to bracket samples on an analytical gel. (Molecular weight size markers to bracket samples on an analytical gel. No more than five lanes shall exist between marker lanes.)

9.4.1.4 A procedure shall be available to monitor the completeness of restriction enzyme digestion. (Interpretation of the autorad/lumigraph is the ultimate method of assessment but a test gel or other method may be used as a necessary.)

9.4.2 The following controls shall be used for PCR casework analysis (database analysis):

9.4.2.1 Quantitation standards, which estimate the amount of human nuclear DNA recovered by extraction. (When required by the analytical procedure, standards which estimate the amount of human nuclear DNA recovered by extraction shall be used.)

9.4.2.2 Positive and negative amplification controls.

9.4.2.3 Reagent blanks. (Contamination controls.)

9.4.2.3.1 Samples extracted prior to the effective date of these standards without reagent blanks are acceptable as long as other samples analyzed in the batch do not demonstrate contamination.

9.4.2.4 Allelic ladders and/or internal size markers for variable number tandem repeat sequence (VNTR) based systems.

**Traceability to NIST Standard Reference Material**

**STANDARD 9.5** The laboratory shall check its DNA procedures annually or whenever substantial changes are made to the protocol against an appropriate and available NIST standard reference material or standard traceable to a NIST standard.

**Written Guidelines for Data Interpretation**

**STANDARD 9.6** The laboratory shall have and follow written general guidelines for the interpretation of data.

9.6.1 The laboratory shall verify that all control results are within established tolerance limits.

9.6.2 Where appropriate, visual matches shall be supported by a numerical match criterion. (NOT IN CONVICTED OFFENDER DATABASING STANDARDS)

9.6.3 For a given population(s) and/or hypothesis of relatedness, the statistical interpretation shall be made following the recommendations 4.1, 4.2 or 4.3 as deemed applicable of the National Research Council report entitled “The Evaluation of Forensic DNA Evidence” (1996) and/or court directed method. These calculations shall be derived from a documented population database appropriate for the calculation. (NOT IN CONVICTED OFFENDER DATABASING STANDARDS)

**10. EQUIPMENT CALIBRATION AND MAINTENANCE**

**STANDARD 10.1** The laboratory shall use equipment suitable for the methods employed.
Instrument Calibration

**STANDARD 10.2** The laboratory **shall identify critical equipment and** shall have a documented program for calibration of instruments and equipment.

10.2.1 Where available and appropriate, **standards traceable to national or international standards shall be used for the calibration.**

10.2.1.1 Where traceability to national standards of measurement is not applicable, the laboratory shall provide **satisfactory evidence of correlation of results.**

10.2.2 The frequency of the calibration shall be documented for each instrument requiring calibration. Such documentation shall be retained in accordance with applicable Federal or state law.

Instrument Maintenance

**STANDARD 10.3** The laboratory shall have and follow a documented program to ensure that instruments and equipment are properly maintained.

10.3.1 New (critical) instruments and equipment, or (critical) instruments and equipment that have undergone repair or maintenance, shall be calibrated before being used in casework analysis.

10.3.2 Written records or logs shall be maintained for maintenance service performed on instruments and equipment. Such documentation shall be retained in accordance with applicable Federal or state law.

Revised SWGDAM Validation Guidelines (July 2004)


Previous Guidelines Regarding Validation

  - Budowle et al. “Guidelines for a quality assurance program for DNA analysis”

- **TWGDAM (1991)** — Crime Lab Digest 18(2):44-75
  - Kearney et al. “Guidelines for a quality assurance program for DNA analysis”

- **TWGDAM (1989)** — Crime Lab Digest 16(2):40-59
  - Kearney et al. “Guidelines for a quality assurance program for DNA restriction fragment length polymorphism analysis”

AABB standards (1989) — first standards adopted by an organization dealing with DNA testing impacting human identification; the standards are not intended to provide the details of a technique but rather to give an overview of general policies that when followed will help guarantee reliable results...

From more information on American Association of Blood Banks (AABB) — see http://www.aabb.org

Differences between 1991 and 1995 TWGDAM Guidelines

- **Validation**
  - 4.1.3 Expanded upon RFLP and added information on STRs
  - 4.1.5.10 Added “where appropriate”
  - 4.4.2.1 Added (b) “when a PCR product is characterized by direct sequencing...”

- **Equipment, Materials, and Facilities**
  - 5.3.2 Added “an extraction area for samples containing low DNA levels...”

- **Analytical Procedures**
  - 7.2.2 Changed “regular use” to “periodic use” and removed “cellular”
  - 7.3 Added “where appropriate”
  - 7.5.1.3 Removed “substrates” and “(e.g. unstained areas adjacent...)”
  - 7.5.1.4 Deleted original 7.5.1.4 and moved 7.5.1.5 (1991) to 7.4.1.4 (1995)

- **Audits**
  - 10.1 Changed from “annually” to “at least once every 2 years”

At that time, it was not possible to quantify DNA down to the level where DNA could be amplified.

Sections 4.4.2.1 and 5.3.2 were added to accommodate mtDNA sequencing needs.

**TWGDAM (1995)** Each locus to be used must go through the necessary validation.

**TWGDAM (1995)** Once an RFLP procedure has been validated, appropriate studies of limited scope (e.g., population studies, human DNA control value determination) must be available for each new locus used. A similar standard should be maintained when adding new loci to the different PCR-based techniques (e.g., addition of short tandem (STR) locus to a validated STR procedure).
### Comparison of DAB Standards and Previous Validation Guidelines

#### DNA Loci

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance</td>
<td>Inheritance (4.2.1)</td>
<td>Defined</td>
<td>Inheritance (2.1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene mapping</td>
<td>Gene mapping (4.2.2)</td>
<td>Characterized</td>
<td>Mapping (2.1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polymorphism type</td>
<td>Polymorphism type (4.2.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primer publication not required (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probe available</td>
<td>Primers known (4.4.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detection basis (2.1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PCR Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Not discussed)</td>
<td>Minimum sample (4.1.10)</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Sensitivity studies (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primer sequence (4.4.1.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primer publication not required (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contamination control (4.4.1.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCR conditions (2.10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR cycle # (4.4.1.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCR conditions (2.10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differential PCR (4.4.1.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Differential PCR (2.10.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive &amp; negative controls (4.4.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive &amp; negative controls (2.10.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comparison of DAB Standards and Previous Validation Guidelines

### Developmental Validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard specimens</td>
<td>Different issues</td>
<td>Standard specimens</td>
<td>Standard specimens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different issues</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population studies</td>
<td>Reproducibility</td>
<td>Population studies</td>
<td>Reproducibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/Temp</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degradation/Meta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-probative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-human</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site (alpha/beta)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Internal Validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known samples</td>
<td>Proficiency tests</td>
<td>Known samples</td>
<td>Known &amp; non-probative (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reproducibility &amp; precision (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contamination control</td>
<td></td>
<td>Match criteria (3.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Non-probative | | Sensitivity & stochastic effects (3.4) |
| | Match criteria (3.3) | | Miscellaneous studies (3.5) |
| | Sensitivity (3.6) | | Contamination (3.8) |
| | Match criteria (3.7) | | Qualifying test (3.7) |