



Quality Division Use Only

Quality Tracking #:	2017-IA-08	Date Quality Division Notified:	4/10/2017
Non-Conformance Level:	Class I	Date Submitted to Management for Review:	8/4/2017
Date Submitted to Quality for Review:	8/8/2017	Dated Closed:	8/8/2017

Date of Discovery:	3/28/2017	Division:	Crime Scene/Digital and Multimedia Division
Date of Incident:	6/24/2016	Section:	Forensic Multimedia Unit

Forensic Case Number(s), if applicable:	Agency Case Number(s), if applicable:
2016-04811, 2016-05030, 2016-05777, 2016-09500, 2016-11915, 2016-13802, 2016-16056, 2016-24951, 2016-25012, 2016-25048, 2017-00086, 2017-02849, 2017-03146, 2017-03888, 2017-03390	030580516, 035189216, 044051416, 057106916, 074105416, 007954416, 101393416, 161484616, 164600416, 165041816, 000369617, 002551817, 019672917, 021268317, 020136717

Description of Discrepancy/Non-conformance. Do not include analysts' names unless otherwise instructed by the Section Manager or Division Director(s):

Multiple case records contained insufficient case information to establish an audit trail or had incorrect information in the record. This missing or incorrect information would likely prevent another trained analyst from evaluating the work performed and interpreting the data. Details concerning the nonconformances associated with each case are listed below. 2016-24951: The following information was not documented as required by FAVU Scene Response SOP: location type; investigator name; contact information for location; type of DVR at the location (manufacturer and model); date and time of incident and how much video or audio will need to be downloaded; subject matter of video; DVR make, model, serial number; number of recording units; if the system is networked; date/time displayed; actual date/time; recording capacity and when the DVR will overwrite; system settings; playback software; photographs of the DVR; and any menu settings. 2016-25012: The case record contained no case notes and the submission form did not clearly indicate this was a call-out. 2017-03146: The case record contained no case notes. 2017-03390: The case record contained no case notes and only one picture of the DVR. The make, model, and serial number were not recorded. The report stated that no video from the date in question exists but the case record did not indicate how this was determined. The date of analysis was not clear from the screen captures. 2016-04811: Case notes did not indicate who did what analysis. All indications are that an analyst other than the author of the report completed the



analysis. This may be a training case but that is not documented in the case record. 2016-05030: The case record contained no case notes. The date of analysis was not clear from screen captures. DVR settings were not captured in photos, the DVR time offset was not documented, and the case record did not state whether or not the DVR was powered on. 2016-05777: The submission form did not include submitter information and the call-out box was not checked. It is unclear when the call-out occurred because the submission form, chain of custody, and case notes are not in agreement. 2016-09500 (multiple AV requests): Report #3 indicated this was a call out but there were no scene notes in the case record. This scene involved two locations but photographs did not indicate which DVR was at which location and the audit team could not determine (from the photographs) which photographs corresponded to which DVR. Report #4 - The original submission form did not clearly indicate what evidence (if any) was submitted by the investigator on 5/16/2016. The updated submission form listed items 7 and 7.1 as received and the date and time of receipt of these items but evidence was never listed under items submitted (section C). The case record did not indicate if 7.2 and 7.3 were derived from archived files or if they were derived from Item 7 since it is unclear when item 7 was returned to the investigator. 2016-11915: Case notes did not indicate who did what analysis. All indications are that an analyst other than the author of the report completed the analysis. This may be a training case but that is not documented in the case record. 2016-25048: Location type was not in case notes (residential, business, etc.) 2017-00086: The submission form indicated a format conversion was requested but no format conversion was done. This case was a call-out but 'call-out' was not indicated on the submission form. Report states, "One additional DVD-R copy of the files was burned and given to the investigator". However, an additional copy was never created. DVR/system settings were not included in the case record (only the time difference was recorded). 2017-02849: The case record contained no case notes. 2017-03888: The completion date written on the submission form was 3/2/17. The date written on the case notes was 3/1/17. The last day of analytical activity listed in the notes was 2/28/17. Photos included pictures of a DVD identified as Item 1 but Item 1 appeared to be in the HPD Property room. Item 2 was listed as the item created from video files. It is unclear if Item 1 was also examined/created. Photographs of a DVD included another analyst's initials and the item number assigned to this evidence was not clear; the analyst's involvement in the case was not documented. All sides of the DVR were not photographed at the scene. 2016-13802: The LIMS case record contained no case notes. The Amped FIVE version used for analysis was not recorded, no Amped FIVE report was included in the case record, and the record does not include date(s) of analysis. 2016-16056: Photos of item 3 (a DVR) and 3.1 are not identified by the assigned forensic case number, item number, or analyst initials.

Actions Taken:

In order to address the lack of documentation in various cases, the Administrative/Quality, DVR Extraction, and Scene Response SOPs were revised to clarify and reiterate the documentation requirements of the HFSC Quality Manual, Section SOPs, and ISO/IEC 17025. The Quality Division also conducted a Quality Boot Camp to reinforce the necessity for proper documentation. The training also covered the importance of a critical technical and administrative review process. Additionally, multiple staff members attended a training class given by ANAB that covered the requirements of ISO/IEC 17025 and ISO 17020. Prior to January 2017, the section did not create LIMS case records for cases where video evidence was not collected. Since January, reports were written but no case notes were included in the case records of 2016-24951, 2016-25012 (submission form was corrected and uploaded to case record), 2017-03146, 2017-03390. These cases cannot be corrected. The following corrections were made: 2016-04811 = This was a training case and the case notes were updated to include both who performed the work and who supervised the work. 2016-05030 = The report was amended to reflect there was no power source to the DVR resulting in an



inability to record DVR settings. The analyst did not record case notes therefore case notes cannot be uploaded to the case record. 2016-05777 = updated case notes to correct findings. The submission form was corrected and scanned into LIMS. IT corrected the chains of custody (COC) for Items 15, 15.1, and 15.2 and comments were added to the COC. 2016-09500 = Report #3 - DVR photo file names were changed to show which DVR was associated with which scene based on the DVR models described in the case note. Report #4 - The submission form was updated to include the evidence that was submitted (Item 7) and was uploaded into LIMS. Report #5 explains that 7.2 and 7.3 came from archived files of item 7. 2016-11915 = The case notes were updated with the identity of the analyst who did the processing. The notes were uploaded to LIMS. This was a training case. 2016-25048 = The case notes were amended to include the location type. The notes were uploaded to LIMS. 2017-00086 = Format conversion was requested but was not needed for this case. A direct copy was made. Direct copies are not tracked in LIMS. The analyst corrected the submission form to reflect the investigator was not present at the scene. It was requested make direct copy of evidence. Format Conversion was originally selected in the event that the copy wouldn't be able to play without a conversion. 2017-02849 = Case notes were included in the report. The report was amended to reflect that case notes were not needed for conversions at this time. 2017-03888 = The date on the submission form is an acceptable completion date. Item 1 was the copy given to the investigator at the scene and the investigator tagged it in the HPD Property Room. Item 2 is a copy brought back by the analyst and archived and the report and notes are based off of that item. Photographs of the DVR cannot be corrected since this was a call out. 2016-13802 = The analyst is no longer employed with HFSC, therefore the case record cannot be corrected. 2016-16056 = The analyst labeled the evidence items with the case number, item number, and initials.

Summary of Root Cause Analysis:

Requirements of examination documentation are included in the Quality Manual and/or sectional SOPs. Staff members documented a review and understanding of these policies and procedures. Since the root cause of this nonconformance appears to be related to employee performance, the Quality Division has referred this finding to Human Resources in accordance with HFSC policy.

Additional Information/Follow-Up:

This nonconformance was discovered during the 2017 Forensic Multimedia Unit Internal Audit.

Section Manager: Ryan Johnson

Date: 8/4/2017

Division Director: Jerry Pena

Date: 8/7/2017



Houston Forensic Science Center
Corrective Action Report
Quality Division

Quality Director: Lori Wilson

Date: 8/8/2017