

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 8 November 2023 5:04 PM
To: Public
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Requirement for Written Statement – Adjunct Professor Wilson-Wilde OAM - Letter to COI - 071123.pdf [REDACTED]
Attachments: 0496_001.pdf; Letter to COI - 071123.pdf

Dear Jane

We refer to your email below and our correspondence of yesterday (**attached**) including the statement of our client sworn 7 November 2023.

We understand that the request for information relates to the following passage from our client's interview with The Australian:

"...and when I've gone back and looked at my notes I can see I've underlined on deck lysis versus off deck lysis and I can see, you know, my concerns around having the automated lysis step in that process and then I can see when I've looked at the 2009 method and statements I can see they've tracked when the off deck lysis was implemented and that's what I ... and you can see in my report that's actually what I've documented. When they made those changes because for me as a scientist who's experienced in this area that was the, that was the significant part of the, of the steps that they made and changes to the method...."

In response to the request, we are instructed that to the best of our client's recollection:

- The "notes" she was referring to in the interview with The Australian were the methods/SOPs 24897v1-5 (documents 19-22 in the **attached** letter, with version 5 of SOP 24897 with handwritten notes **attached**), change register (document 9), and the statements of Cathie Allen, Justin Howes, Allan McNevin and Thomas Nurthen (documents 24-27).
- She does not believe that she looked at any of the abovementioned documents in detail and that it was more of a cursory look to familiarise herself with the work.
- The notes made on the abovementioned documents (if any) were made in 2022 at or around the time she provided the Contamination Report to the First Commission of Inquiry.
- In the interview she was not referring to the validation documents (that is, the reports of Projects 9, 11, 13, 21 or 22) as these do not contain the information around what or when changes were made to the methods.
- As indicated in our letter of 7 November 2023, our client believes the notes written on the validation documents provided on 7 November 2023 (including the Project 13 report) were made in 2023. She cannot recall when in 2023 she wrote those notes, although some of the notes were written in preparation for this Inquiry. Our client cannot distinguish which note was made when. Our client cannot otherwise recall the purpose of those notes, save for those made in preparation for this Inquiry.
- To be clear, the notes made on:
 - documents 1-27 of the **attached** letter were made in 2022 at or around the time she provided the Contamination Report to the First Commission of Inquiry;
 - documents 28-32 were made in 2023, some of which were made in preparation for this Inquiry.

Please let us know if you require any further information.

Kind regards,

Caitlin Fletcher

Senior Associate

Ashurst Australia, [REDACTED]

www.ashurst.com

Ashurst is outpacing change with clients. [Find out how.](#)

Visit our [Future Forces](#) webpage for insights on the six megatrends shaping business over the next decade.

From: Public <public@dnaproject13inquiry.qld.gov.au>

Sent: Tuesday, 7 November 2023 3:57 PM

To: Fletcher, Caitlin 67002 <[REDACTED]>; Public <public@dnaproject13inquiry.qld.gov.au>

Cc: Forbes, Gabrielle 67024 <[REDACTED]>

Subject: RE: Requirement for Written Statement – Adjunct Professor Wilson-Wilde OAM - Letter to COI - 071123.pdf

[REDACTED]

Caution: External email.

Dear Caitlin

Thank you for your letter of today's date and for supplying Dr Wilson-Wilde's statement and the documents set out in your letter.

We would appreciate you providing more clarity and precision in determining which notes were the ones referred to in the transcript of 8 September 2023. This is not clear from your letter. The Commission appreciates that, as set out in your letter, Dr Wilson-Wilde cannot recall precisely which notes she was referring to in the interview of 8 September 2023. However, with respect, the provision of a long list of documents "for abundant caution" does not assist – the Commission is endeavouring to understand which "notes" Dr Wilson-Wilde was referring to in that interview.

In this regard, the Commission notes Item 30 in your letter is the 'Project 13 Report' which bears handwritten notes. It is unclear when these notes were made on the document, and for what purpose. It could have been that these notes were made on the document before Dr Wilson-Wilde finalised her report dated 20 October 2022 (in the First Commission of Inquiry).

In the circumstances, it would be appreciated if Dr Wilson-Wilde could provide greater clarity with respect to the question of which notes she was referring to in the interview on 8 September 2023, and advise as to which of the notes listed in your letter were made before her report of 20 October 2022, or after that date (and her best recollection of when those notes were made).

The Commission looks forward to your earliest reply.

Kind regards

Jane

Jane Moynihan

Executive Director

DNA Project 13 Commission of Inquiry

[REDACTED]