Best Practice Recommendations for the Verification Component in Friction Ridge Examination

OSAC
Organization of Scientific Area
Committees for Forensic Science

Draft Document

Keywords: verification, blind verification, open (non-blind) verification, quality assurance, friction ridge, fingerprints, conclusions, technical review, ACE-V

Abstract: This document addresses several important topics associated with the verification of friction ridge examination conclusions. Recommendations are offered regarding the scope, type and documentation of the verification.

Table of Contents

1   Scope

This document describes best practice recommendations for how to conduct the Verification phase during friction ridge impression examinations. These recommendations apply to both suitability determinations and resulting conclusions. The following topics will be addressed:

- Verification considerations (e.g. extent, utility, case type, approach)
- Types of verification and application options
- Documentation

This document does not address technical review.

2   Introduction

The final phase of ACE-V is Verification. A second examiner will review the friction ridge impressions to determine if the original examiner's conclusions are supported by the data in the impressions. This document provides recommendations and guidance for this important quality control measure.

3   Terms and Definitions

1. **Blind verification:**   A type of verification in which the subsequent examiner(s) has no knowledge of the original examiner's decisions, conclusions or observed data used to support the conclusion.

2. **Consensus opinion:** A type of examination in which a reported decision or conclusion is determined that reflects the collective judgment (e.g. majority) of a group of examiners.

3. **Forensic Service Provider (FSP):** An organization or individual that conducts and/or supplies forensic services.

4. **Open (non-blind) verification:**   A type of verification in which the subsequent examiner has access to the original examiner's decisions, conclusions or observed data used to support the conclusion.

5. **Nonconforming work:** Work that does not comply with FSP policies and procedures.

6. **Quality assurance measures:** Steps taken by an FSP to detect and correct nonconforming work. This may include, but is not limited to, root cause analysis, additional verification, non-conformity assessment, audits and corrective and/or preventative actions.

7. **Suitability for Comparison Decision (Suitability for Source Conclusions):** A decision made by an examiner in accordance with FSP policy and/or procedure, that a friction ridge impression contains sufficient observed data to be utilized for comparison and a Source Conclusion can potentially be reached. This designation is often referred to as "suitable for comparison" or "of value for comparison".

8. **Technical review**:   A qualified second party's evaluation of reports, notes, data, and other documentation to ensure there is appropriate and sufficient support for the actions, results, conclusions, opinions and interpretations.

9. **Verification:** Confirmation, through either re-examination or review of documented data by another examiner, that a conclusion or opinion conforms to specified requirements and is reproducible. NOTE: "Specified requirements" are the FSP's policies and procedures relating to Analysis, Comparison and Evaluation of friction ridge impressions.

4   Recommendations

a. Verification is a quality control measure, and should include the independent examination of one or more friction ridge impressions, by another examiner, to evaluate a conclusion or opinion. This may include a re-application of the best practice recommendations for Analysis, Comparison and Evaluation (ACE).

b. Verification should apply to all decisions including utility (e.g. suitability determinations) and examination conclusions. At a minimum, verification shall apply to source identification, support for same source and source exclusion conclusions[1] (Langenburg 2009, Ulery et. al 2011).

c. FSPs may choose to verify suitability determinations before the Comparison phase of the ACE process continues.

d. The decision to use a method other than open (non-blind) verification may be based on case circumstances and/or case type (e.g. person vs. property crime; high profile; complex comparisons).

e. FSPs should conduct enhanced verification (ie. blind, multiple, etc.) when a single 'Source Identification' or 'Support for Same Source' conclusion has been drawn to a particular individual after an AFIS search. This is due to the greater risk of error in these types of cases.

---

[1] This is not intended to require or recommend the inclusion of all individual candidates generated as a result of a database search (e.g. ABIS).

f.   There are different types of verification available.   There have been no studies on whether open or blind verification is more likely to detect errors in latent print examinations, but the broader scientific community suggests that blind verification is a better way to assess consistency (reliability) across examiners and believed to be more likely to detect errors. FSPs should balance any advantage of blind verification (for quality control purposes) against the additional time it may require.   Therefore, the type of verification used should be determined by the FSP in accordance with their quality assurance measures and stated in the case documentation. These types include, but may not be limited to:

   i.   Blind verification: A type of verification in which the subsequent examiner(s) has no knowledge of the original examiner's decisions, conclusions or observed data used to support the conclusion – at the time the examiner is conducting the blind verification. (Note: Access to these data and conclusions may occur once the blind verification is completed and documented, e.g. sequential unmasking.) Blind verification should involve a completely independent reapplication and documentation of ACE by the subsequent examiner(s). FSPs should have a policy defining the circumstances in which blind verification will be required. At a minimum, blind verification should be used in the following scenarios.

   1.   Single-identification (or 'support for same source') ABIS searches to a particular individual
   2.   High-profile cases (due to greater potential for bias)
   3.   Simultaneity identification based on aggregate (no single impression stands alone for identification)
   4.   Complex impressions or comparisons (low quality, high ambiguity, distortion, etc. as defined by FSP policy)
   5.   Verifier discretion (first examiner concludes 'inconclusive' or 'support for same source', verifier concludes 'identification', third examination may be blind to mitigate bias)

   ii.   Open (non-blind) verification: A type of verification in which the subsequent examiner has access to the original examiner's decisions, conclusions or observed data used to support the conclusion. Open verification should also involve an independent reapplication and documentation of ACE; however, the subsequent examiner (s) may review the documented observations produced by the original examiner. Open verification may be used when none of the suggested criteria stated for blind verification are present.

g.   Consensus opinion is an additional quality control measure. It is a type of examination in which a reported decision or conclusion is determined that reflects the collective judgment (e.g. majority) of a group of examiners. This is achieved through independent examination (open or blind) by multiple examiners and subsequent discussion/determination. FSPs should have a

policy defining the circumstances in which consensus opinion will be required. At a minimum, consensus opinion shall be used in the following scenarios.

    i.   Conflicting (opposing) conclusions
    ii.   Complex comparisons (low quality, high ambiguity, distortion)

h. Current research has demonstrated that erroneous exclusions are the most commonly observed error. Verification is a vital process for helping mitigate this error. Closed database searching ("case AFIS") can be an effective verification tool when specific persons of interest are provided for comparison. A database of only these persons is created and then the questioned impressions are searched using AFIS algorithms against this closed database. This may be useful as an additional quality control measure when either Source Exclusion or Support for Different Source conclusions have been drawn (Langenburg, Hall, Rosemarie 2015).

i. Contemporaneous documentation of the verification shall be included in the case record. This documentation should be commensurate with the complexity level of the examination (e.g. more complex comparisons will require more extensive documentation).

j. The FSP shall have a policy to address non-conforming work.

k. The FSP shall have a policy to address conflicting analysis (suitability, search parameters) decisions and conflicting examination conclusions.

5 Procedure

a. Determine if the verification will be open or blind.
    i.   If open, then the verifier will receive the original examination documentation and conclusion.
    ii.   If blind, then the verifier should only receive unmarked and un-enhanced (e.g. digitally processed) images of the questioned and exemplar impressions.

b. For open verification, the verifier should conduct and document an independent ACE prior to reviewing the data originally used to support the reported conclusion (e.g. image annotations, bench notes)[2]. The verifier should ensure that the data are carefully weighed under both propositions (same or different sources), being mindful

---

[2] The OSAC FRS recognizes that some FSPs allow the verifier to reference the documented observations produced by the original examiner without conducting an independent ACE. FSPs that utilize this approach must be sensitive to confirmation bias.

that consideration of only one proposition can lead to confirmation bias error..

    c.   For blind verification, the verifier will: Conduct and document an independent ACE on two or more unmarked friction ridge impressions (e.g. questioned and exemplar):

- Analyze the questioned impression to determine suitability and will annotate the features used to support this decision according to FSP policy. If the impression is suitable for source conclusions, then the verifier will ensure that the exemplar is properly recorded for comparison.

- Proceed with the comparison and document potential correspondence or non-correspondence between the impressions according to FSP policy.

- Assess the significance of the correspondence or non-correspondence in the evaluation phase, after which the examiner will record a conclusion.

    d.   After either open or blind verification, it is necessary to determine if the examiner and verifier support the same conclusion. If so, then the verification is complete. If support for the same conclusion is lacking, then the examiner and verifier shall enter into conflict resolution based on the OSAC FRS Best Practice Recommendations for Conflict Resolution.

6. Bibliography

1. Ulery, B.T., Hicklin, R.A., Buscaglia, J. and Roberts, M.A. (2011). Accuracy and reliability of forensic latent fingerprint decisions. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, Volume 108, Number 19, 7733 – 7738
2. Langenburg, G. A Performance Study of the ACE-V Process: A Pilot Study to Measure the Accuracy, Precision, Reproducibility, Repeatability, and Biasability of Conclusions Resulting from the ACE-V Process. J. For. Ident. 2009, 59 (2), 219 – 257.

3. Langenburg, G., Hall, C. and Rosemarie, Q. Utilizing AFIS searching tools to reduce error in fingerprint casework. Forensic Science International 2015, 257, 123 – 133.