ASB Best Practice Recommendation Standard 143, First Edition 20202022

Best Practice Recommendations Standard for Technical Review in Friction Ridge Examination



Standard for Technical Review in Friction Ridge Examination

ASB Approved Xxxxx 20202022

ANSI Approved Xxxxxx 20202022



410 North 21st Street Colorado Springs, CO 80904

This document may be downloaded from: www.aafs.org/academy-standards-board

This document is provided by the AAFS Academy Standards Board. Users are permitted to print and download the document and extracts from the document for personal use, however the following actions are prohibited under copyright:

- modifying this document or its related graphics in any way;
- using any illustrations or any graphics separately from any accompanying text; and,
- failing to include an acknowledgment alongside the copied material noting the AAFS Academy Standards Board as the copyright holder and publisher.

Users may not reproduce, duplicate, copy, sell, resell, or exploit for any commercial purposes this document or any portion of it. Users may create a hyperlink to www.aafs.org/academy-standards-board to allow persons to download their individual free copy of this document. The hyperlink must not portray AAFS, the AAFS Standards Board, this document, our agents, associates and affiliates in an offensive manner, or be misleading or false. ASB trademarks may not be used as part of a link without written permission from ASB.

The AAFS Standards Board retains the sole right to submit this document to any other forum for any purpose.

Certain commercial entities, equipment or materials may be identified in this document to describe a procedure or concept adequately. Such identification is not intended to imply recommendations or endorsement by the AAFS or the AAFS Standards Board, nor is it intended to imply that the entities, materials, or equipment are necessarily the best available for the purpose.

This document is copyrighted © by the AAFS Standards Board, LLC. 20202022 All rights are reserved. 410 North 21st Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80904, www.aafs.org/academy-standards-board

Foreword

This document has been developed with the objective of improving the quality and consistency of friction ridge examination practices.

It is essential that friction ridge examiners provide a sound basis for each conclusion drawn. Technical review of an examiner's work product by another competent examiner is a proactive measure to determine if this basis exists. This document provides several recommendations to guidespecifies minimum requirements for the technical review process.

The American Academy of Forensic Sciences established the Academy Standards Board (ASB) in 2015 with a vision of safeguarding Justice, Integrity and Fairness through Consensus Based American National Standards. To that end, the ASB develops consensus based forensic standards within a framework accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), and provides training to support those standards. ASB values integrity, scientific rigor, openness, due process, collaboration, excellence, diversity and inclusion. ASB is dedicated to developing and making freely accessible the highest quality documentary forensic science consensus Standards, Guidelines, Best Practices, and Technical Reports in a wide range of forensic science disciplines as a service to forensic practitioners and the legal system.

This document was revised, prepared, and finalized as a standard by the Friction Ridge Consensus Body of the AAFS Standards Board. The draft of this standard was developed by the Friction Ridge Subcommittee of the Organization of Scientific Area Committees (OSAC) for Forensic Science.

Questions, comments, and suggestions for the improvement of this document can be sent to AAFS-ASB Secretariat, <u>asb@aafs.org</u> or 401 N 21st Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80904.

All hyperlinks and web addresses shown in this document are current as of the publication date of this standard.

ASB procedures are publicly available, free of cost, at www.aafs.org/academy-standards-board.



Table of Contents

1	Scope			
	Normative References			
	Terms and Definitions			
	Recommendations Requirements			
	nex A (informative) Sample Technical Review Checklist			
Annex B (informative) Sample Non-Conformity Assessment Form				



Best Practice Recommendations Standard for Technical Review in Friction Ridge Examination

1 Scope

This document provides best practice recommendations specifies minimum requirements for how to perform technical reviews review of friction ridge impression examinations. The document provides general guidance on technical reviews best practices including a check list and sample review forms.

This document does not address administrative review, verification, or testimony monitoring.

2 Normative References

There are no normative reference documents.

3 Terms and Definitions

For purposes of this document, the following definitions apply.

3.1

examiner (friction ridge)

competent friction ridge examiner

An individual who has successfully completed their FSP's training program and has demonstrated to the FSP that they possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities to perform the tasks required of their current position. An individual authorized to conduct independent friction ridge examinations for the FSP forensic service provider by observing and interpreting data, making decisions, forming conclusions and opinions, issuing reports and/or providing testimony. Use of the term "examiner" in these documents refers to a "competent friction ridge examiner" and not a "trainee."

3.2

Forensic Service Provider

ECD

A forensic science entity service provider

FSP

<u>Organization</u> or <u>individual that conducts and/or supplies</u> forensic science practitioner providing forensic science services.

ISO 21043-11

3.3

nonconforming work

Work that does not comply with FSP policies and procedures.

¹ ©ISO. This material is reproduced from ISO 21043-1:2018 with permission of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) on behalf of the International Organization for Standardization. All rights reserved.

3.4

technical review

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.

OSAC Preferred Term

1.1

verification

Confirmation, through either re- **(phase of examination** or review of documented data**method)**Independent examination by another examiner, that a one or more examiners to ascertain if a decision, conclusion, or opinion conforms to specified requirements and is reproducible.

3.5 NOTE "Specified requirements" are reproduced or is in conflict with the FSP's policies and procedures relating to analysis, comparison, and evaluation decision, conclusion, or opinion of friction ridge impressions another examiner.

NOTE 1 Verification may be implemented in multiple ways including blind verification, open verification and consensus review. The general term verification is inclusive of these various types.

NOTE 2 Verification is a quality assurance measure for friction ridge examination.

NOTE 3 The use of the term "independent" indicates an autonomous examination but not necessarily one without knowledge of a prior decision, conclusion or opinion.

3.6

verification (analytical)

<u>Performing subsequent testing to ascertain if the results are concordant.</u>
<u>OSAC Preferred Term</u>

4 Requirements

3.64.1 Technical review of the case record shall occur in every case. FSPs shall have a written policy defining what is required in technical review.

2 Recommendations

- **3.74.2** Technical review of the case record shall be conducted by a competent friction ridge examiner as defined in 3.1.
- 3.84.3 Technical review of the case record may be conducted concurrently with verification.
- 3.94.4 Technical review of the case record should occur in every case. FSPs shall have a written policy defining what is required in technical review. Technical review shall be documented in the case record. As an example, the requirements for technical review can be satisfied by completing a checklist (see Annex A).
- 3.104.5 The FSP shall have a policy to address nonconforming work.

3.114.6 Nonconforming work shall be documented in the case record. Refer to Annex B for a sample nonconformity assessment form.



Annex A

(informative)

Sample Technical Review Checklist

The presence of items on this checklist does not imply that they are required. Each agency may create a checklist that addresses its own policies and procedures.

YES NO) N/A	NOTES
	<u> </u>	Are the notes legible and proper?
	<u> </u>	Do the notes indicate that a proper inventory was conducted and completely documented?
		☐ Are the notes organized, neat and understandable?
		☐ Are the notes pages consecutively numbered?
		Have the FSP procedures been followed?
YES NO	N/A	EXAMINATION OF FRICTION RIDGE IMPRESSIONS
		Have the examinations been performed according to the FSP's standard operating procedures?
		Have the components of best practice recommendations for the friction ridge examination methods been met?
		Have the components of best practice recommendations for verification been met?
		If the verification was blind, was the verifier shielded from the case examiner's conclusion?
-		Were conclusion(s) selected from the FSP's standard operating procedures?
		Are the conclusion(s) appropriate based upon the data?
YES NO	N/A	SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION
		Are all images, printouts, and screenshots used to support conclusions in the case file?
		Has all relevant digital evidence been accounted for?
		Are all images, printouts, and screenshots properly labeled?
		Have observed details/characteristics been annotated where appropriate?
		If consultation occurred, has it been clearly documented?

	-		If conflict resolution occurred, has it been clearly documented?
YES	NO	N/A	EXAMINATION REPORT
			Is the report format and wording, including any limitations of conclusions, in accordance with the FSP's standard operating procedures?
<u> </u>			– Have the requested examinations been addressed?
<u> </u>		<u> </u>	-Are the results properly transcribed and clearly communicated to the reader?
<u> </u>	<u> </u>		Have appropriate additional samples/standards/exemplars been requested, if needed?
<u> </u>			Has the evidence submission been inventoried and its disposition included?

NOTES/REMARKS

INSTRUCTIONS: The examiner and reviewer must explain all "NO" responses that were not corrected.

Annex B (informative)

Sample Non-Conformity Assessment Form

Name of Examiner Involved:	Date:
FSP Case Number:	Agency Case Number:
Name of Reviewer:	
Non-Conformity:	
□ Incomplete Documentation □ Clerical I	Error Erroneous EXC Erroneous ID
Reviewer Comments:	
Suggested Action (Reviewer):	
Root-cause analysis:	
Corrective/preventive action:	
Supervisor/Director:	
Assessed by:	Position/Title:
Supervisor/Director Determined Action:	
Signad: Date	::CPA No:
orgicu. Date	or Arro.
Involved Examiner Acknowledgement:	Date:
Involved Examiner Comments:	



Academy Standards Board 410 North 21st Street Colorado Springs, CO 80904

www.asbstandardsboardaafs.org/academy-standards-board