



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 email 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.



Guide for Role-Based Training in Facial Comparison

1. Scope

1.1 This guide will provide recommendations for a role-based training to achieve competency in facial comparison tasks.

1.2 This guide does not purport to address the specific content of an agency's training program but instead provides an overview of the structure of role-based training and levels of training. This document will not address the specific recommendations for role-based training, such as detailed topics or durations of supervised casework/mentorship programs.

1.3 The intended audience of this document is all personnel involved in facial comparison.

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 *ASTM Documents*¹:

E2916 Standard Terminology for Digital and Multimedia Evidence Examination

¹ For referenced ASTM standards, visit www.nist.gov/osac/astm-launch-code, or the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org for Annual Book of ASTM.

14 2.2 *FISWG Documents*²:

15 FISWG Facial Comparison Overview and Methodology Guidelines

16 3. Summary of Practice

17 3.1 The consistent and reliable use of facial comparison methods and facial
18 recognition technologies requires appropriate training of personnel to competence. For
19 a description of the different facial comparison roles, see Section 4.4. The level of
20 training necessary to conduct facial comparison is dependent upon the source, quality,
21 quantity, and complexity of the images that are being analyzed and the purpose of the
22 analysis. Agencies may choose to provide additional training beyond what is
23 recommended in this document.

24 3.2 Personnel who perform facial comparisons should be familiar with the
25 capabilities and limitations of relevant tools, technologies, and methods. Those engaged
26 in facial comparisons should be familiar with the procedures commonly followed. They
27 should also be cognizant of, and adapt to, new developments. Additionally, trainers of
28 those performing facial comparisons need advanced knowledge of these areas. In
29 support of these goals, the following recommendations are offered to personnel
30 engaged in this field:

31 3.2.1 Undertake validated aptitude testing to gauge innate ability prior to
32 employment and/or enrollment in a facial comparison training program, when available.

² Available from Facial Identification Scientific Working Group (FISWG), <http://www.fiswg.org/documents>.

33 When validated aptitude testing is not available, aptitude testing should still be
34 conducted. Validated or non-validated aptitude testing should continue throughout
35 training to evaluate the trainee's ongoing development for the roles of Facial Reviewer,
36 Facial Examiner, and Technical Reviewer.

37 3.2.2 Adhere to a structured and documented training program for determining
38 levels of competency.

39 3.2.3 Undertake a period of supervised casework/mentorship.

40 3.2.4 Maintain competency after training by pursuing applicable courses,
41 undertaking scheduled proficiency/competency testing, maintaining awareness of the
42 current standards, guidance and research relevant to facial comparison and
43 participating in research when possible.

44 3.2.5 Where applicable, define and employ a quality management system.

45 3.2.6 Maintain awareness of legal developments relating to the use of facial
46 comparisons.

47 **4. Significance and Use**

48 4.1 There are three broad categories of facial comparison tasks: facial assessment,
49 facial review, and facial examination; and all may involve interface with a facial
50 recognition system (FRS). The requirement for assessment, review or examination will
51 be dependent upon an agency's end-user requirement and the type and quantity of

52 facial comparison cases. The level of training for staff undertaking each of the three
53 tasks differs. In addition, support personnel and managers of persons performing facial
54 comparisons also need to be aware of the capabilities and limitations of specific tools,
55 technologies, and methods.

56 4.2 Facial assessment, review, and examination are defined in the FISWG Facial
57 Comparison Overview and Methodology Guidelines document.

58 4.3 Roles relevant to facial comparison include facial assessor, facial reviewer and
59 facial examiner. Additional roles may include administrative duties, policy or case
60 management. All relevant roles should be considered when developing a facial
61 comparison training program.

62 4.4 Below is a list of the different roles in a facial comparison environment. **These**
63 **are not job titles, but instead roles describing the tasks an individual may**
64 **perform.** Depending upon the organization of an agency, one individual may perform
65 multiple roles. This list is not exhaustive and other agency specific roles may exist.

66 4.4.1 **Facial Assessor:** Performs a quick comparison of image-to-image or image-
67 to-person, typically with controlled images, carried out in screening and access control
68 applications or field operations. Due to limitations such as time constraints, assessors
69 perform the least rigorous of all the facial comparison processes. For example, a person
70 at a port of entry or in the field using a mobile FR system to assist with identity
71 verification.

72 4.4.2 **Facial Reviewer:** Performs a comparison of image(s)-to-image(s) generally
73 resulting from the adjudication of a candidate list generated by an FRS. The comparison
74 results are often used in either investigative and operational leads or intelligence
75 gathering applications.

76 4.4.3 **Facial Examiner:** Performs a comparison of image(s)-to-image(s) using a
77 rigorous morphological analysis, comparison, and evaluation of images for the purpose
78 of effecting a conclusion, often used in a forensic application.

79 4.4.4 **Manager:** Sets agency policies or makes budget decisions or both.

80 4.4.5 **Supervisor:** Supervises or directs personnel engaged in the use of facial
81 comparison methods, tools, technologies, or a combination.

82 4.4.6 **Collector:** Obtains or captures source images to be used in facial
83 comparisons.

84 4.4.7 **Technical Reviewer:** Performs quality assurance review of the work product
85 of facial comparison.

86 4.4.8 **System Administrator:** Performs the system administration required to
87 implement, maintain, and optimize the automated facial recognition program.

88 4.4.9 **Trainer:** Provides instruction in facial comparison methods, tools, and/or
89 technologies. Designs and implements competency and proficiency testing. Designs
90 and implements aptitude testing when validated aptitude testing is not available.

91 4.5 **Categories of Training:** A facial comparison training program can be broadly
92 defined as consisting of the following five categories. The specific content for each of
93 these categories will be dependent upon the role and the requirements of an individual
94 agency, but a high degree of consistency should exist between different agencies.

95 4.5.1 **Introductory overview:** The comprehension of the basics of facial
96 comparison.

97 4.5.2 **Skills and abilities:** The ability to use applicable facial comparison tools,
98 methods, and technologies.

99 4.5.3 **Knowledge of processes:** The ability to select and apply the appropriate
100 information, skills and techniques for a given examination, from receipt of evidence
101 through to completion of the report and presentation at court when required.

102 4.5.4 **Court preparation and presentation:** The ability to prepare and review
103 accurate and reliable facial comparison evidence and/or present reliable facial
104 comparison testimony in court.

105 4.5.5 **Instruction:** The ability to instruct others in applicable areas of facial
106 comparison processes.

107 4.6 The level of assessment for each of the above categories will be dependent
108 upon an individual's role and type of task being performed. The levels of assessment for
109 a facial comparison training program can be defined as follows:

110 4.6.1 **Awareness:** General acquaintance with the relevant major elements of a
111 given method or technology to include specific capabilities and limitations.

112 4.6.2 **Competency:** Demonstration that an individual has acquired and
113 demonstrated specialized knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to conduct
114 examinations in a discipline or category of testing prior to performing independent
115 casework.

116 4.6.3 **Proficiency:** The ongoing evaluation and assessment of obtained
117 competency, for example by proficiency testing (ref ASTM glossary 2916).

118 **5. Minimum Training Recommendations**

119 5.1 Table 1 shows the level of assessment recommended for each role in the
120 defined categories of training. This table should be considered the minimum
121 requirements for a facial comparison training program.

122

123

AW – Awareness C – Competency P – Proficiency N/A – Not Applicable

	Introductory Overview	Skills and Abilities	Knowledge of Processes	Court Presentation	Instruction
Manager	AW	AW	AW	AW	N/A
Supervisor	C	AW	AW	AW	AW
Collector	AW	P	C	AW	N/A
Facial Assessor (non-FR user)	AW	AW	AW	AW	N/A
Facial Assessor (FR user)	C	C	C	AW	N/A
Facial Reviewer	P	P	P	C	N/A
Facial Examiner	P	P	P	P	N/A
Technical Reviewer	P	P	P	P	N/A
System Administrator	AW	AW	AW	N/A	N/A
Trainer*	P	P	P	P	P

Table 1 - Matrix of minimum training recommendations for roles being performed.

124

*A trainer needs to be proficient at the role they are instructing.

125

126

127

128

129

130

FISWG documents can be found at: www.fiswg.org

131