

Article Title: SWGFAST - <<DRAFT>> Standard for the Application of Blind Verification

Origin: SWGFAST

Date Published: 2010-09-10

Author: SWGFAST

Article's Subject Matter:

A draft copy of the suggested Blind Verification standard to be adopted by SWGFAST. It covers what Blind Verification is, where and when it can be implemented in Fingerprint work, and some suggested file examples where it should/can be used.

Key Points in Article

- **Blind Verification does not replace Verification**
- **It is a QA measure beyond ACE-V**
- **Removes sources of BIAS**
- **Required use in high-profile cases, complex cases, Simultaneous Impressions**
- **Should be used in conflicting case work (initial examiner vs verifier)**
- **Should be used where there is a Large level of experience disparity between initial and verifier**
- **Should be used for training purposes, and in significantly influential cases**

Fallacies and Issues

- This article is timely and important, as I can attest that in court, Defense Council is raising this issue in court in Manitoba.
- We have no policy in this regard and should SWGFAST adopt this, and subsequently the IAI, we will need to evaluate it and decide if we need to 'go down this road'.
- This process could be used to remove the AFITC proficiency component on courses if it is incorporated into either Divisional or National directives.
- **Should be sent to the Fingerprint Advisory Group (RCMP) being assembled, for comment and/or action.**



DRAFT FOR COMMENT

STANDARD FOR THE APPLICATION OF BLIND VERIFICATION

Preamble

SWGFAST recognizes the importance and significance of establishing quality assurance (QA) protocols and procedures for friction ridge examination. Blind verification is a QA measure beyond the ACE-V process.

The aim of incorporating a blind verification process into a QA system is to test the reproducibility of the determinations or conclusions made at any phase during ACE-V by removing sources of bias. This is accomplished by performing another examination in an environment that minimizes the influences of any context information that might lead to invalid results. Blind verification does not replace verification.

Blind verification as used in friction ridge examination, is the independent examination of one or more impressions by another competent examiner (hereafter referred to as the blind verifier), who is provided with no, or limited, contextual information, and has no expectation or knowledge of the determinations or conclusions of the original examiner.

1 Scope

Should an agency decide to implement a blind verification policy, this document provides parameters on how it should be conducted.

2 Applications for Blind Verification

2.1 Required use of blind verification in situations involving:

- 2.1.1** Strong contextual influence, such as high profile cases
- 2.1.2** Complex examinations
- 2.1.3** Simultaneous impressions [1]

2.2 Suggested use of blind verification in situations involving:

- 2.2.1** Conflicting results between the initial examiner and the verifier.
- 2.2.2** Large disparity in the level of experience of the examiner and the verifier.

DRAFT FOR COMMENT

Standard for the Application of Blind Verification
8/20/10 ver. 1.0
Posted: 9/10/10

- 2.2.3 A latent print recovered from a highly probative location.
- 2.2.4 A conclusion based on a single latent print that could significantly influence the outcome of the case.
- 2.2.5 AFIS searches with low number of features, features with low quality, or features that are not discriminative.
- 2.2.6 Uncertainty in the decision of the anatomical origin (e.g., finger, palm, and toe) of the latent.
- 2.2.7 Quality assurance control based on a random case selection (for example, any 10%, 25 cases a year per examiner, or at agency discretion).
- 2.2.8 Training purposes.

3 Responsibilities

3.1 Agencies are responsible for:

- 3.1.1 Implementing their blind verification policy and process.
- 3.1.2 Developing policies for differing and conflicting conclusions.
- 3.1.3 Developing collaborative policies between the requesting and the supporting agencies when relying on an external agency for the blind verification policy.
- 3.1.4 Determining which information is provided to the blind verifier in addition to copies of the images of the friction ridge impressions.
- 3.1.5 Ensuring that the outcome of the blind verification, including conflict resolution, is documented.
- 3.1.6 Designating the coordinator of the blind verification process. This person will select the blind verifier, compare the results, and initiate the conflict resolution process if needed.
- 3.1.7 Ensuring that the verification process is properly documented in the case file. Examination notes will be as described in the SWGFAST *Standard for Documentation of Analysis, Comparison, Evaluation, and Verification* (ACE-V) [2].

4 Blind Verifier

4.1 The blind verifier shall:

- 4.1.1 Be trained to competency.
- 4.1.2 Be selected by the coordinator of the blind verification process.
- 4.1.3 Not be made aware who performed the first examination.
- 4.1.4 Not have previously worked or been consulted on the case.
- 4.1.5 Not consult with examiners previously involved in the case.

4.2 The blind verifier may:

- 4.2.1 Know that he or she is performing a blind verification.

DRAFT FOR COMMENT

Standard for the Application of Blind Verification
8/20/10 ver. 1.0
SWGFAST

4.2.2 Perform the verification, as long as the blind-verification of the ACE method is completed first.

5 Overview of the Blind Verification Process

5.1 Blind verification can be performed at any phase of the ACE-V process.

5.2 Analysis – Blind verification can be used to test the reproducibility of value or no value determinations. Blind verification can also focus on tonal reversal, anatomical aspects, orientation, presence or absence of features, effect of the substrate, distortion effects, and assessment of the quality of the latent print.

5.3 Comparison – Blind verification can be used to test the reproducibility of the pairing of friction ridge features between two prints. When blind verification is performed to test the outcome of the comparison phase, it is expected that blind verification be performed on the analysis phase as well.

5.4 Evaluation – Blind verification can be used to test the reproducibility of the conclusion (individualization, inconclusive, or exclusion) reached by an examiner after performing the evaluation phase.

5.5 Verification – Blind verification can be used to test the reproducibility of the conclusion reached by one examiner and verified by another one.

6 Implementation of the Blind Verification Process

6.1 For any given case, the examiner, the verifier, the technical reviewer, or the supervisor will advise whether blind verification is appropriate.

6.2 The coordinator will provide images of the friction ridge impressions to the blind verifier(s). The images will be the same, or of the same quality, as the original and will be presented with no markings or annotations related to the impression.

6.3 The material provided to the blind verifier(s) will contain the images of the friction ridge impressions and may contain additional information such as substrate, matrix, and development technique.

6.4 The blind verifier(s) will use the applicable portions of the examination process (e.g., analysis, comparison, or evaluation) to obtain a determination or conclusion.

6.5 The coordinator will compare the determination or conclusion from both examinations. The coordinator will review its reproducibility.

6.6 Any differences will be handled according to the conflict resolution policy of the agency.

6.7 Blind verified determinations or conclusions are reported as necessary.

7 References

1. SWGFAST, *Standard for Simultaneous Impression Examination*, 12/5/08, ver 1.0.
2. SWGFAST, *Standard for the Documentation of Analysis, Comparison, Evaluation, and Verification (ACE-V) (Latent)*, 2/12/10, ver. 1.0.

DRAFT FOR COMMENT

Standard for the Application of Blind Verification
8/20/10 ver. 1.0
Posted: 9/10/10