

## Required Standards for Employing FSSP's for Voluntary License Applicants

| Standard Document      | Reference No. or Document  | Description of Requirement   | Applicable License Categories: Compliance Instruction   |
|------------------------|--|--|---|
| OSAC Registry Standard | <a href="#">OSAC Proposed Standard for Friction Ridge Examination Training Program</a> | <p>Requirement for employing laboratory to demonstrate a current, documented training program specific to latent print (friction ridge examination), containing defined passing criteria for all tests, practical exercises and verbal assessments. The key elements of the training program shall include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• History</li> <li>• Biology (with an emphasis in Embryology and Distortion)</li> <li>• Friction Ridge Morphology (may also be referred to as Ridgeology)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Including: fingerprints, phalange prints, palm prints, and footprints</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Examination Method               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Including: ACE-V methodology, value determination, friction ridge comparison, interpretation/decisions/opinions/conclusions, documentation, peer review and verification</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Human Factors/Bias</li> <li>• Testimony/Articulation</li> <li>• Latent Print Processing (as applicable for Friction Ridge Examiners participating in this sub-discipline)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Including: development methods and preservation methods</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p><b>Latent Prints:</b> Employing Forensic Science Service Provider must demonstrate current, documented training program specific to the latent print (friction ridge examination) containing defined passing criteria for all tests, practical exercises and verbal assessments. Key elements of the training program must include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• History</li> <li>• Biology (with an emphasis in Embryology and Distortion)</li> <li>• Friction Ridge Morphology (may also be referred to as Ridgeology)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Including: fingerprints, phalange prints, palm prints, and footprints</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Examination Method               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Including: ACE-V methodology, value determination, friction ridge comparison, interpretation/decisions/opinions/conclusions, documentation, peer review and verification</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Human Factors/Bias</li> <li>• Testimony/Articulation</li> <li>• Latent Print Processing (as applicable for Friction Ridge Examiners participating in this sub-discipline)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Including: development methods and preservation methods</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

|                     |              |  |   |  |
|---------------------|--------------|--|---|--|
|                     |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Automated Fingerprint / Biometric Identification System (as applicable for Friction Ridge Examiners participating in this sub-discipline)</li> </ul> <p>The employing laboratory may consider the OSAC <i>Standard for Friction Ridge Examination Training Program</i> as a reference tool for incorporation into their own training program/policy.</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Automated Fingerprint / Biometric Identification System (as applicable for Friction Ridge Examiners participating in this sub-discipline)</li> </ul> <p>The employing laboratory may consider the OSAC <i>Standard for Friction Ridge Examination Training Program</i> as a reference tool for incorporation into their own training program/policy.</p> |  |
| ANAB AR 3125 (2023) | 7.8.1.2.2.c) | <p><u>Requirement for communicating reason(s) for ‘inconclusive’ result:</u> There shall be a procedure for reporting of results that communicate the reason(s) in the report when the reported results are inconclusive.</p>  | <p><b><u>Latent Prints:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a procedure for reporting results that communicate the reason for an inconclusive result.</p>  | <p><b><u>Digital/Multimedia Evidence:</u></b> Not applicable</p>   |
| ANAB AR 3125 (2023) | 6.2.3.1      | <p><u>Requirement for competency testing:</u> All personnel who perform testing or calibration shall be competency tested. Testing or calibration includes the review and authorization of results and expressing an opinion or an interpretation. The competency test shall include practical examination(s) that cover the spectrum of anticipated tasks related to the test or calibration. The competency test intended results shall be achieved prior to performing the tasks on a test or calibration item.</p> <p>*Competency testing can be conducted for an individual task or a group of tasks covered by a module of a training program.</p> | <p><b><u>Latent Prints:</u></b> Employing FSSP must require practical exercises that demonstrate competency.</p>  | <p><b><u>Digital/Multimedia Evidence:</u></b> Employing FSSP requirement that personnel demonstrate competency through certification by Certified Forensic Computer Examiner (CFCE), Global Information Assurance Certification Certified Forensic Examination (GCFE), Global Information Assurance Certification Certified Forensic Analyst (GCFA), SysAdmin, Audit, Network, and Security (SANS), International Association for Computer</p> |

|                                   |                  |   |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|---|--|--|
|                                   |                  |   |  | <p>Investigative Specialists (IACIS), National White Collar Crime Center (NW3C), Law Enforcement &amp; Emergency Services Video Association International, Inc. (LEVA), U.S. Military, Computer Analysis Response Team (CART) (FBI Training), Seized Computer Evidence Recovery Specialist (SCERS), U.S. Secret Service, or equivalent non-vendor certification examinations or trainings with competency test(s).</p> |
| <p><b>ANAB AR 3125 (2023)</b></p> | <p>7.2.1.1.2</p> | <p><u>Requirement for evaluation of unknowns:</u> All test methods that involve the comparison of an unknown to a known for the purpose of source association shall require the evaluation of the unknown item(s) to identify characteristics suitable for comparison and, if applicable, characteristics suitable for statistical rarity calculations, prior to comparison to one or more known item(s).</p> | <p><b><u>Latent Prints:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a written policy for evaluation of unknown impressions that requires evaluation of unknown and identification of characteristics before proceeding to comparison.</p> | <p><b><u>Digital/Multimedia Evidence:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a written policy or procedure that addresses evaluating demonstrated verification that the evidence being examined is an <i>actual</i> copy of the original evidence. In addition, if due to damage to the evidence or otherwise, analyst is unable to have that match or verification, define the</p>  |

|                            |            |  |  |   |
|----------------------------|------------|--|--|---|
|                            |            |  |  | sectors that have been damaged.   |
| <b>ANAB AR 3125 (2023)</b> | 7.5.1.3    | <u>Requirement for documenting technical records:</u> Technical records to support a report (including results, opinions, and interpretations) shall be such that, another reviewer possessing the relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities could evaluate what was done and interpret the data.  | <b><u>Latent Prints:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a written procedure to substantiate or dictate what the analyst should do to properly document in accordance with ANAB AR 3125 (2023). If the results, opinions and interpretations were reached based on consultation with another analyst, the consultation shall be documented. | <b><u>Digital/Multimedia Evidence:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a written procedure that includes a requirement for documenting some combination of software data, screenshots, bench notes, etc. where applicable. If the results, opinions and interpretations were reached based on consultation with another analyst, the consultation shall be documented. |
| <b>ANAB AR 3125 (2023)</b> | 7.5.1.5    | <u>Requirement for documenting disagreements:</u> If an observation, data, or calculation is rejected, the reason, the identity of the individual(s) taking the action and the date shall be recorded in the technical record.   | <b><u>Latent Prints:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a policy for documenting disagreements.  | <b><u>Digital/Multimedia:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a policy for documenting disagreements.  |
| <b>ANAB AR 3125 (2023)</b> | 7.7.1.g).1 | <u>Requirement for verification:</u> When a verification of a result is carried out: (1) it shall be conducted by personnel who are currently authorized or an external service provider qualified to perform the testing; (b) a record of the verification shall be made and the record shall identify who performed the verification, when it was performed, and the | <b><u>Latent Prints:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a policy for verifying results pursuant to ANAB AR 3125 (2023) 7.7.1.g).1.   | <b><u>Digital/Multimedia:</u></b> N/A see technical review.   |

|                            |                 |   |  |  |
|----------------------------|-----------------|---|--|--|
|                            |                 | result of the verification, and (c) the resolution of any discrepancy shall be recorded.  |  |  |
| <b>ANAB AR 3125 (2023)</b> | 7.7.1.I)        | <p><u>Requirement for technical review:</u> There shall be a procedure for the technical review of technical records, including reports, and testimony. The procedure shall: (1) require the individual performing the technical review to have been competency tested to perform the testing or calibration work that is being reviewed; (2) preclude an individual from technically reviewing their own work; (3) define the process to be used to ensure a representative sample of technical records and reports in each discipline are subjected to technical review; (4) define the process to be used to ensure testimony in each discipline is reviewed; (5) define the process to be used to conduct and record the review; (6) ensure that the results, opinions and interpretations are accurate, properly qualified and supported by the technical record; (7) ensure conformance with methods and applicable management system documents; and describe a course of action to be taken if a discrepancy is found.</p> <p>*An individual conducting the technical review need not be an employee of the FSSP, currently proficiency tested or currently performing work.</p> | <b><u>Latent Prints:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a policy for technical review that complies with ANAB AR 3125 (2023).          | <b><u>Digital/Multimedia Evidence:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a policy for technical review that complies with ANAB AR 3125 (2023).          |
| <b>ANAB AR 3125 (2023)</b> | 7.7.2.1 – 7.7.7 | <p><u>General proficiency monitoring requirements:</u> The FSSP’s monitoring of performance by comparison with results of other FSSP's shall, where available and appropriate for the FSSP activities: (a) demonstrate successful performance in at least one proficiency test or an approved alternative means of inter-FSSP comparison for the forensic discipline; and</p> <p>(b) demonstrate successful performance in at least one proficiency test or an approved alternative means of inter-</p>   | <b><u>Latent Prints:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a policy for completing ongoing proficiency monitoring (internal or external). | <b><u>Digital/Multimedia Evidence:</u></b> Employing FSSP must have a policy for completing ongoing proficiency monitoring (internal or external). |

FSSP comparison for each licensed forensic discipline per calendar year at each FSSP location.

\*To be considered an inter-FSSP comparison, there must be participants from two or more FSSP's operating under separate management systems.

\*For proficiency tests taken at the end of one calendar year, evaluation of successful performance can occur in the subsequent calendar year.

The FSSP shall monitor the performance of all personnel who perform FSSP activities. The monitoring shall demonstrate successful performance in at least one proficiency test, other inter-FSSP comparison, or intra-FSSP comparison per calendar year in each forensic discipline in which the individual is authorized to conduct work. In the event that the preceding options are not available or appropriate, observation-based performance monitoring is acceptable.

\*The monitoring should be varied over time to cover all aspects of assigned job functions but does not have to include all aspects of the work performed each time.

\*Solely performing verifications or solely reviewing and authorizing results are considered to be testing or calibration and are subject to these requirements.

\*For performance monitoring conducted at the end of one calendar year, evaluation of successful performance can occur in the subsequent calendar year.

The process for monitoring the performance of the FSSP and personnel shall: (a) ensure the results are not known or readily available to the participant being monitored; (b) ensure use of approved methods by the individual(s) whose performance is being monitored; (c) establish criteria for successful performance prior to the monitoring activity being conducted; (d) require a mechanism to ensure the quality of the monitoring activity prior to personnel performance being monitored; (e) for calibration FSSP's, require the monitoring activity to be performed using an item that was calibrated by the person whose performance is being monitored; and f) require notification to the Commission within 30 days when the expected result is not attained during any monitoring activity.

\*f) For a consensus-based proficiency test, the consensus result is the expected result.

\*f) When an identification or exclusion is the expected result, an outcome of inconclusive is considered an unexpected result.

The FSSP shall have a performance monitoring plan that ensures inclusion of a portion of the components/parameters (categories of testing) and equipment/technologies within each licensed discipline.

The FSSP shall: (a) use a proficiency test provider that is accredited to ISO/IEC 17043 by an accreditation body that is a signatory to the ILAC MRA and has the applicable proficiency test on its scope of accreditation; and (b) submit results to the proficiency test provider on or before the date determined by the test provider; and (c) authorize the

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | proficiency test provider to release the test results to the Commission; or gain approval from the Commission for an alternative means of inter-FSSP comparison. |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

### **Applicable Definitions**

Complex print: when there are factors influencing the quality of a latent print and their presence could interfere with proper interpretation (should be documented in the case notes).

Consultation: one in which the reasoning or insight of the second examiner causes the original examiner to reach a decision or conclusion different from the one that would otherwise have been reached (at any point during the examination).  
(Further, *significant consultation*: a consultation that leads directly to a decision or that alters a decision).

Disagreement (applicable to friction ridge/latent print discipline): when the verifier and the original examiner reach differing conclusions that cannot be resolved between the two of them.