



Disclaimer:

As a condition to the use of this document and the information contained herein, the Facial Identification Scientific Working Group (FISWG) requests notification by e-mail before or contemporaneously to the introduction of this document, or any portion thereof, as a marked exhibit offered for or moved into evidence in any judicial, administrative, legislative, or adjudicatory hearing or other proceeding (including discovery proceedings) in the United States or any foreign country. Such notification shall include: 1) the formal name of the proceeding, including docket number or similar identifier; 2) the name and location of the body conducting the hearing or proceeding; and 3) the name, mailing address (if available) and contact information of the party offering or moving the document into evidence. Subsequent to the use of this document in a formal proceeding, it is requested that FISWG be notified as to its use and the outcome of the proceeding. Notifications should be sent to: chair@fiswg.org

Redistribution Policy:

FISWG grants permission for redistribution and use of all publicly posted documents created by FISWG, provided that the following conditions are met:

Redistributions of documents, or parts of documents, must retain the FISWG cover page containing the disclaimer.

Neither the name of FISWG, nor the names of its contributors, may be used to endorse or promote products derived from its documents.

Any reference or quote from a FISWG document must include the version number (or creation date) of the document and mention if the document is in a draft status.



Investigative Lead Note Taking and Reporting Requirements

1. Scope

- 1.1 The purpose of this document is to provide minimum guidelines on facial comparison note taking and reporting procedures for investigative leads.
- 1.2 This document does not discuss how to conduct a facial comparison, a standardized conclusion scale to be used, or details which may be Organization dependent. Forensic note taking and reporting for facial comparisons will be addressed in a separate document.

2. Referenced Documents

- 2.1 ASTM Standards:
E3149 Facial Image Comparison Feature List for Morphological Analysis
- 2.2 Other references if needed

3. Terminology

- 3.1 Definitions:
- 3.2 Forensic Report: a document whose intent it is to provide information to assist a trier of fact (e.g., judge or jury)
- 3.3 Investigative Lead Report: a document whose intent it is to provide information to operational personnel to assist them with meeting their objective

4. Comparison Notes – This section refers to elements that are recommended to be included in case notes when an investigative lead facial comparison is being conducted. The items presented below are not in order of importance or priority.

4.1 Case Identifier

4.2 Dates

4.2.1 Date Received

4.2.2 Date Searched/Compared

4.2.3 Date of Image Capture (if available)

4.3 Requestor(s)

4.3.1 Contact Information

4.4 Any written/verbal correspondence

4.5 Examiner(s)

4.6 Origin of Images

4.7 Filename/Identifier of Images Received

4.7.1 Indication of images that meet agency specific requirements for comparison

4.8 Filename/Identifier of Processed Image(s) (if applicable)

4.8.1 Steps taken to Process Image(s)

4.9 Gallery searched

4.9.1 Number of candidates returned (based on maximum number returned or threshold used)

4.9.2 Ranking of returned potential candidate(s) if returned list is not randomized

4.10 Examination

4.10.1 Documentation of the comparison

4.10.2 Compare and document features of the face visible in each image, as defined in the E3149 Facial Image Comparison Feature List for Morphological Analysis.

4.11 Documentation of evaluation of comparison

4.11.1 Consideration of the effects of imaging conditions and physical stability of facial features

4.12 Conclusion

5. Reports – This section refers to elements that are required to be included in a report when an investigative lead facial comparison is being conducted. An Investigative Lead Report is only produced when the examiners reached a conclusion that images of the unknown person and the candidate display characteristics which are significant enough to indicate that they are potentially the same person. The items presented below are not in order of importance or priority.

5.1 Disclaimer – Agencies should include in all investigative lead comparisons their own disclaimer identifying the limitations of the comparison and the recommended usage of the investigative lead report.

5.2 Dates

5.2.1 Date Received

5.2.2 Date Searched/Compared

5.2.3 Date of Image Capture (if available)

5.2.4 Date of Report

5.3 Requestor(s)

5.4 Organization conducting examination to include:

5.4.1 Examiner(s)

5.4.1.1 If the examination is not verified by a second examiner, a disclaimer that the comparison is not verified must be included in the report.

5.4.2 Contact Information

5.5 Case Identifier

5.6 Example of Images Received

5.6.1 Example of Processed Image(s) (if applicable) and/or any steps taken to Process Image(s)

5.7 Reference to comparison method used

6. Additional Recommended Best Practices

6.1 In accordance with the Organizations' data retention policies, the following should also be saved (hard/digital):

6.1.1 All correspondence (e.g., email, case notes, reports, etc.)

6.1.2 Submitted Images

6.1.3 Processed Images

6.1.4 Chain of custody

6.2 There should be documentation within the Organization on the following:

6.2.1 Algorithm

6.2.1.1 Vendor name

6.2.1.2 Version

6.2.1.3 Specific configurations

6.2.1.4 Date implemented

6.2.2 Software

6.2.2.1 Vendor name

6.2.2.2 Version

6.2.2.3 Specific configurations

6.2.2.4 Date implemented