

1



2

3 **Disclaimer:**

4

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

17 **Redistribution Policy:**

18

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

21

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

24

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

27

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

30

31

32



Investigative Lead Note Taking and Reporting Requirements

27

28 1. Scope

29 1.1 The purpose of this document is to provide minimum guidelines on facial
30 comparison note taking and reporting procedures for investigative leads.

31 1.2 This document does not discuss methods for how to conduct a facial image
32 comparison, conclusion scale(s), or details that may be Agency-dependent.
33 Note taking and reporting for forensic facial comparisons are addressed in a
34 separate document.

35 2. Referenced Documents

36 2.1 ASTM Standards¹:

37 2.1.1 E3149 Facial Image Comparison Feature List for Morphological Analysis

38 2.2 Other references if needed

39 2.2.1 FISWG Image Processing to Improve Automated Facial Recognition

40 Search Performance

¹ For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org. For Annual Book of ASTM Standards volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

41 **3. Terminology**

42 3.1 Definitions:

43 3.1.1 Forensic Report: a document whose intent it is to provide information to
44 assist a trier of fact (e.g., judge or jury).

45 3.1.2 Investigative Lead Report: a document whose intent it is to provide
46 information to assist operational personnel (e.g., investigator, detective,
47 or analyst).

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

51 4.1 Case Identifier

52 4.2 Dates

53 4.2.1 Date Received

54 4.2.2 Date Searched/Compared

55 4.2.3 Date of Image Capture (if available)

56 4.3 Requestor(s)

57 4.3.1 Contact Information

58 4.4 Any written/verbal correspondence

59 4.5 Examiner(s)

60 4.6 Origin of Images

61 4.7 Filename/Identifier of Images Received

62 4.7.1 Indication of images that meet agency specific requirements for
63 comparison

64 4.8 Filename/Identifier of Processed Image(s) (if applicable)

65 4.8.1 Steps taken to Process Image(s)

66 4.9 Gallery searched (if applicable)

67 4.9.1 Number of candidates returned (based on maximum number returned or
68 threshold used)

69 4.9.2 Ranking of returned potential candidate(s) if returned list is not
70 randomized

71 4.10 Examination

72 4.10.1 Documentation of the comparison

73 4.10.1.1 Compare and document features of the face visible in each
74 image, as defined in the E3149 Facial Image Comparison
75 Feature List for Morphological Analysis.

76 4.11 Documentation of evaluation of comparison

77 4.11.1 Consideration of the effects of imaging conditions and physical stability
78 of facial features

79 4.12 Conclusion

80 **5. Reports** – This section refers to elements that should be **included** in a report when
81 an investigative lead facial comparison is being conducted. An Investigative Lead
82 Report is only produced when the examiners reached a conclusion that images of
83 the unknown person and the candidate display characteristics which are significant
84 enough to indicate that they are potentially the same person. All negative or
85 inconclusive results should be returned to the requestor(s) as per agency policy. The
86 items presented below are not in order of importance or priority.

87 5.1 Disclaimer – Agencies should include in all investigative lead comparisons, their
88 own disclaimer identifying the limitations of the comparison, and the
89 recommended usage of the investigative lead report.

90 5.2 Dates

91 5.2.1 Date Received

92 5.2.2 Date Searched/Compared

93 5.2.3 Date of Image Capture (if available)

94 5.2.4 Date of Report

95 5.3 Requestor(s)

96 5.4 Agency conducting examination to include:

97 5.4.1 Examiner(s)

98 5.4.1.1 If the examination is not verified by a second examiner, a
99 disclaimer that the comparison is not verified must be included in
100 the report.

101 5.4.2 Contact Information

102 5.5 Case Identifier

103 5.6 Example of Images Received

104 5.6.1 Example of Processed Image(s) (if applicable) and/or any steps taken to
105 Process Image(s)

106 5.7 Reference to comparison method used

107 **6. Best Practices for Mark-Ups** – this section refers to the best practices for examiners
108 when marking up compared facial features for an investigative lead.

109 6.1 Examiners should utilize the following types of mark-ups to clearly indicate
110 noteworthy facial features that were assessed and evaluated during the
111 comparative analysis process. Mark-ups between the probe and candidate
112 should be clearly visible, consistent, and annotated. It may be beneficial to
113 include a unique identifier (e.g., numbers or letters) to correlate a mark-up with
114 the corresponding annotation. The type, color, and amount of mark-ups used
115 will be agency specific but should fall within the below guidelines.

116 6.1.1 Circles or boxes – to outline specific features such as facial marks (e.g.,
117 scars, moles, etc.)

118 6.1.2 Brackets – to illustrate relative distance between facial features (e.g.,
119 spacing between nasion, length of the nose, etc.) or to highlight a
120 grouping of features (e.g., striae or facial marks)

121 6.1.3 Arrows, numbers, or dots – to indicate specific facial features

122 6.2 Examiners shall not utilize the following types of mark-ups, as doing so would
123 introduce contextual bias or obstruction of facial features within the report.

124 6.2.1 Draw or trace on facial features

125 6.2.2 Apply text or text boxes over the head, face, or neck

126 6.2.3 Obstruct facial features via mark-up

127 6.2.4 Clutter or overlap mark-ups

128 **7. Best Practices for Anatomical Annotation** – this section refers to the best
129 practices for examiners when annotating compared facial features for an
130 investigative lead. An anatomical write-up must accompany a forensic facial
131 comparison and should fall within the below guidelines.

132 7.1 Examiners must use anatomically correct language per the E3149 Facial Image
133 Comparison Feature List for Morphological Analysis Guideline. Examiners may
134 use layman's terms in addition to anatomically correct language.

135 7.1.1 Examiners shall not use words such as unique, significant, same,
136 identical, or exact to describe a specific feature. This language would

137 suggest that the features are derived from the same source which is not
138 scientifically or statistically supported.

139 **8. Additional Recommended Best Practices**

140 8.1 In accordance with the Agency's data retention policies, the following should also
141 be saved (hard/digital):

142 8.1.1 All correspondence (e.g., email, case notes, reports, etc.)

143 8.1.2 Submitted Images

144 8.1.3 Processed Images

145 8.1.4 Chain of custody

146 8.2 There should be documentation within the Agency on the following:

147 8.2.1 Algorithm

148 8.2.1.1 Vendor name

149 8.2.1.2 Version

150 8.2.1.3 Specific configurations

151 8.2.1.4 Date implemented

152 8.2.2 Software

153 8.2.2.1 Vendor name

154 8.2.2.2 Version

155 8.2.2.3 Specific configurations

156 8.2.2.4 Date implemented

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

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

DRAFT