

UNITED STATES ARMY CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION COMMAND



FORENSIC PSYCHOPHYSIOLOGICAL DETECTION OF DECEPTION (PDD) POLICY AND PROCEDURE MANUAL

Effective 21 February 2005

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 [Purpose](#)
- 1.2 [Scope](#)
- 1.3 [Policy](#)
- 1.4 [Exceptions to Policy](#)
- 1.5 [Certification](#)

CHAPTER 2 UTILIZATION OF PDD

- 2.1 [Scope of PDD Examinations](#)
- 2.2 [Review of PDD Authorization Messages](#)
- 2.3 [Special Circumstance PDD Requests](#)
- 2.4 [Polygraph Consideration for Civilian Employee Union Representation](#)
- 2.5 [Premature Requests](#)
- 2.6 [Requests when Laboratory Results are pending](#)
- 2.7 [Operational Testing Guidelines](#)

CHAPTER 3

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE PDD EXAMINATIONS

- 3.1 [Examination of MPs, MPI or Special Agents](#)
- 3.2 [Examination of TDS Clients](#)
- 3.3 [Examination of Juveniles](#)
- 3.4 [Examination of Murder Suspects](#)
- 3.5 [Examination of Rape Suspects](#)
- 3.6 [Examination of Alleged Sexual Assault Victims](#)
- 3.7 [Examination of Suspects with AIDS](#)
- 3.8 [Examination of Suspected Pedophiles](#)
- 3.9 [Examination of Suspected Juvenile Pedophiles](#)
- 3.10 [Examination of USACIDC Sources](#)
- 3.11 [PDD Requests Concerning USACIDC Sources](#)
- 3.12 [Suspected Adulterated Urine Sample](#)
- 3.13 [PDD Testing for Positive Urinalysis Results](#)
- 3.14 [PDD Support Involving Off-Post Incidents](#)
- 3.15 [PDD Support to Commanders and MPI](#)
- 3.16 [PDD Support to External Agencies](#)
- 3.17 [Suitability of Pregnant Examinees](#)
- 3.18 [Polygraph Support Regarding Category 1 Monitored ROIs](#)

CHAPTER 4 TEST ADMINISTRATION

- 4.1 [When to Use the ZCT, CTF, or MGQT](#)
- 4.2 [Test Data Analysis](#)
- 4.3 [Moving Comparison Questions on the MGQT, CTF, and ZCT](#)
- 4.4 [Statement Tests](#)
- 4.5 [“Yes” Tests](#)
- 4.6 [Production of a Fourth Chart](#)
- 4.7 [Multiple/Additional Testing Issues](#)
- 4.8 [Test Question Construction for Multiple Series Testing](#)
- 4.9 [Confessions and Admissions to Other Offenses](#)
- 4.10 [Admissions Involving Intent](#)
- 4.11 [Release of Examinee](#)
- 4.12 [Length of Post-test](#)
- 4.13 [Observation Room](#)
- 4.14 [Government Witnesses](#)
- 4.15 [Monitor Responsibilities](#)

CHAPTER 5 PDD TESTING PROTOCOLS

- 5.1 [General ZCT Instructions](#)
- 5.2 [Symptomatic Questions](#)
- 5.3 [Sky Phase on ZCT Test](#)

- [5.4 Use of the Bi-Zone Test](#)
- [5.5 General MGQT Instructions](#)
- [5.6 Moving Relevant Questions on the MGQT](#)
- [5.7 Comparison Test Format \(CTF\)](#)
- [5.8 Known Solution Peat of Tension \(POT\) Test](#)
- [5.9 Searching POT Test \(SPOT\) or Probing Test](#)
- [5.10 Criminal R and I Tests](#)
- [5.11 Silent Test \(ST\)](#)
- [5.12 Silent Answer Test \(SAT\)](#)

CHAPTER 6

COMPARISON QUESTIONS

- [6.1 Comparison Question Rules](#)
- [6.2 Sacrifice Relevant Questions](#)
- [6.3 Symptomatic Questions](#)
- [6.4 Irrelevant Questions](#)
- [6.5 Suspected Pedophile Comparison Questions](#)
- [6.6 Sodomy Suspect Comparison Questions](#)
- [6.7 Suspected Indecent Assault Comparison Questions](#)
- [6.8 Lie Comparison Questions](#)
- [6.9 Drug Comparison Questions](#)
- [6.10 “Yes” Answers to Comparison Questions](#)
- [6.11 Comparison Question Admissions](#)

CHAPTER 7

RELEVANT QUESTIONS

- [7.1 Relevant Question Rules](#)
- [7.2 Rape Relevant Questions](#)
- [7.3 Inventory Shortage Questions](#)
- [7.4 Confirmatory Questions](#)
- [7.5 Incorrect Answers to Relevant Questions](#)
- [7.6 The use of the term “Knowingly” during Urinalysis Examinations](#)

CHAPTER 8 PDD OPERATIONS

- 8.1 [Standard Chart Markings](#)
- 8.2 [Axciton Calibration](#)
- 8.3 [Conducting an Examination](#)
- 8.4 [Axciton](#)
- 8.5 [Question Lists](#)
- 8.6 [Purity](#)
- 8.7 [Controlled Breathing](#)
- 8.8 [GSR Response \(Off-Screen\)](#)
- 8.9 [Acquaintance Test](#)
- 8.10 [Recording of Correct Time on Charts](#)
- 8.11 [Physical/Emotional Status of Examinees](#)
- 8.12 [Examinee Suitability](#)

CHAPTER 9 COUNTERMEASURES

- 9.1 [General](#)
- 9.2 [Documenting Suspected/Confirmed Countermeasures in PDD Reports](#)

CHAPTER 10 PDD REPORTS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS

- 10.1 [Case Administration](#)
- 10.2 [PDD Examination Folder](#)
- 10.3 [Investigative Summary](#)
- 10.4 [Observations](#)
- 10.5 [Report Numbers](#)
- 10.6 [Documenting Polygraph Results in CID Reports](#)
- 10.7 [Foreign Language Examinations](#)
- 10.8 [Coordination with Supervisors](#)
- 10.9 [Requests for PDD Documentation](#)
- 10.10 [Document Requests from Individuals](#)
- 10.11 [Congressional Inquires](#)
- 10.12 [PDD Reports Involving Multiple Examiners](#)

CHAPTER 11 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

- 11.1 [PDD Examination Requests](#)
- 11.2 [Submission of PDD Request on Requests for Assistance \(RFA's\)](#)
- 11.3 [Polygraph Declinations](#)
- 11.4 [Offense Codes](#)
- 11.5 [Confessions and Admissions](#)

- [11.6 Gold Star Examinations](#)
- [11.7 Reporting PDD Results](#)
- [11.8 PDD Reports Attached as Exhibits to USACIDC ROI's](#)
- [11.9 Recording PDD Examinations](#)
- [11.10 Examiner Technical Proficiency](#)
- [11.11 Updating Polygraph Authorizations Over 30 Days](#)

CHAPTER 12 OTHER GUIDELINES & PROCEDURES

QUALITY CONTROL REVIEW PROCEDURES

- [12.1 Initial QC Review](#)
- [12.2 Final QC Review](#)
- [12.3 Telephonic Quality Control Review](#)

DRESS, APPEARANCE, AND PERSONAL CONDUCT

- [12.4 Examiner Dress and Appearance](#)
- [12.5 Examiner Conduct](#)
- [12.6 Statistics](#)
- [12.7 Group Supervisor Responsibilities](#)

[APPENDIX A – POLICY LETTER: PREMATURE PDD REQUEST](#)

[APPENDIX B – POLICY LETTER: PDD OF MURDER SUSPECTS](#)

[APPENDIX C – INTERN PROGRESS EVALUATION](#)

[APPENDIX D – PDD EXAMINATION REPORT \(SAMPLE\)](#)

[APPENDIX E – PDD EXAMINATION REPORT \(SAMPLE\)](#)

[APPENDIX F – PDD EXAMINATION REPORT \(SAMPLE\)](#)

[APPENDIX G – PDD EXAMINATION REPORT \(SAMPLE –
COUNTERMEASURES\)](#)

[APPENDIX H – PDD EXAMINATION REPORT \(SAMPLE –
COUNTERMEASURES\)](#)

[APPENDIX I – COUNTERMEASURES WORKSHEET](#)

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

This manual establishes policy and procedures for use of forensic psychophysiological detection of deception (PDD) examinations in the United States Army Criminal Investigation Command (CID).

1.2 Scope

This manual applies to all PDD examiners assigned to, or conducting PDD examinations for, the US Army Criminal Investigation Command (CID).

1.3 Policy

The Director, United States Army Crime Records Center (USACRC), is the Program Manager for the CID PDD Program. Army Regulation (AR) 195-6 and CID Regulation (CIDR) 195-28 contain CID policies and procedures pertaining to PDD examinations. This manual expands upon those policies and procedures, but is not intended to supercede the subject material in these regulations. Regarding technical aspects in the conduct of a polygraph examination, follow the policy and procedures promulgated at the DoD Polygraph Institute if not addressed in the cited regulations or this manual.

See Also CIDR 195-28, Policy

See Also AR 195-6, 1.4 Responsibilities

1.4 Exceptions to Policy

Request for exceptions to policies and procedures should be directed to the Director, USACRC.

1.5 Certification

Certification requires the completion of a minimum of 50 examinations within a six-month period.

Certified CID PDD examiners will monitor all of the exams. The Polygraph Division may approve telephonic monitorship of an intern examiner prior to the certification, based upon the intern examiners overall level of demonstrated expertise. After completing 50 examinations, interns will make an on-site visit to the Polygraph Division to become familiar with the Quality Control process. Follow the guidance in paragraph 4-2(b), CIDR 195-28, to request certification.

CHAPTER 2 UTILIZATION OF PDD

2.1 Scope of PDD Examinations

Relevant questions utilized in the conduct of criminal specific PDD examinations will be designed to test only specific acts of wrongdoing. Asking relevant questions concerning whether an individual ever committed a specific act without regard to specific allegations of wrongdoing is inappropriate, except when utilized in screening examinations conducted by PDD supervisors. Refer to **Chapter 7, [Relevant Question Rules](#)**, for further information concerning relevant questions.

2.2 Review of PDD Authorization Messages

Messages or other documents granting approvals for PDD examinations frequently contain qualifiers concerning the matter to be tested or cite specific information or instructions concerning the formulation of test questions. Review each approval message to confirm authorization, as well as to incorporate any specific guidance identified.

2.3 Special Circumstance PDD Requests

Coordinate closely with supported elements in the proper preparation of PDD requests. A sample PDD request is located in CIDR 195-1. Statements in the synopsis addressing Staff Judge Advocate opinions, command pressure, or local interest have no bearing on the approval process. However, such information should be provided by telephone or separate message if deemed necessary to enable USACRC to alert the CID Command Group of issues that are contentious. Coordinate with the Polygraph Division whenever there is an unusual request.

2.4 Polygraph Considerations for Civilian Employee Union Representation

IAW the provisions of CIDR 195-1, paragraph 5-4f(1), the Civilian Service Reform Act (CSRA), 5 USC 7114(a)(2)(b) provides that a civilian federal employee who is employed in a recognized collective bargaining unit represented by a labor organization is entitled at his/her request to be represented by a union representative if the employee reasonably believes that the examination may result in disciplinary action against him. Judicial and administrative interpretations of this provision have held that the employee's belief will be tested by objective criteria, rather than a subjective probe into the employee's mind. Consequently, for practical purposes, during USACIDC interviews the employee is entitled to union representation upon request, even though the USACIDC special agent may consider the employee to be only a witness and not a subject. The union representative may be present during the review of the rights warning/waiver certificate, polygraph consent form and during any subsequent post-instrument interview. The union representative may not be present during the pre-test portion or monitor the in-test phase of the polygraph examination. In the event the examinee is unwilling to comply with the stated rules the examination will not be conducted.

2.5 Premature Requests

The success of the PDD technique is dependent upon knowledge of the elements of the crime and other investigative details known at the time of testing. Application of the PDD technique based on inaccurate or incomplete investigative details can cause invalid, inaccurate or inconclusive test results. It is difficult to discern the causes for physiological reactions indicative of deception when the examiner has inaccurate information or does not have all available case facts. [See Appendix A](#) (policy letter) for clarification of this policy.

2.6 Requests when Laboratory Results are Pending

It is normally appropriate to wait for laboratory results if the delay in conducting a PDD examination will not jeopardize the investigation. In some cases it is useful for the examiner to have the laboratory results to use in preparing relevant questions. If it appears that waiting for the results would jeopardize the investigation, submit the PDD request. Explain in the request the reason for testing before receipt of laboratory results. Also provide the waiting time yet to be experienced before receipt of lab results.

2.7 Operational Testing Guidelines

The fact that a PDD examination request has been approved does not, in and of itself, obligate a PDD examiner to conduct the examination, when, in the opinion of the examiner, the test should not be conducted. When further review of the case facts by the examiner on site reveals that a test should not be conducted on an approved examination, contact the Polygraph Division immediately for clarification. If a medical condition, change in investigative case facts or other reason exists which precludes the administration of a proper examination, the examiner is obligated to clarify the issues prior to initiating a PDD examination, or contact the Polygraph Division for guidance prior to initiating any PDD testing.

CHAPTER 3 SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE PDD EXAMINATIONS

3.1 Examination of MP's, MPI or Special Agents

The mere fact that a person makes an unsupported allegation against a law enforcement officer or agent in the performance of their assigned duties does not normally justify immediate PDD testing of the police officer or agent. It is appropriate to determine the veracity of the complaint before testing police or agents. If the results of a PDD examination of the accuser indicate the allegation is factual, consider administering a PDD examination to the accused law enforcement officer. Requests for exception to this policy will provide sufficient documentation in the PDD request for the authorizing official to make a determination as to the propriety of the request. **Also see Para 2-6, CIDR 195-28**

3.2 Examination of TDS Clients

a. Schedule the PDD examination through the defense counsel. If the counsel does not wish to monitor the examination, provide the counsel with the date and time of the examination. If the counsel wishes to be present, attempt to schedule the examination so the counsel can be present. In instances wherein defense counsel advises a client not to undergo testing but the examinee wishes to submit to testing outside counsel's advice, the exam may be conducted. Allow the examinee to annotate a brief comment on DA Fm 3881 and/or DA Fm 2801 reflecting their decision to discuss the offense(s) under investigation and participate in polygraph testing. Coordination will also be effected with the appropriate trial counsel prior to conduct of the exam. **See paragraph 3-5, CIDR 195 -28**, concerning documenting defense requested PDD examinations. In those instances where TDS Counsel or Civilian Defense Counsel decline to witness exculpatory examinations, a comment will be recorded on the Polygraph Worksheet under the Exam Data section. See example below:

Start: 0800, 14 Jul 04 End: 1100/14 Jul 04

Total Examination Time: 3.0 hrs

Travel Time: 2.0 hrs

Other Time: 2.0 hrs

Comment: The examinee's defense counsel declined to be present during this examination.

b. All PDD reports that are generated in support of Trial Defense Service, Unit Commanders (Including 15-6 Investigations, Commander's Inquiries and Reports of Survey), will list the address for the servicing CID Office in the "Memorandum For" section of the PDD report. PDD reports prepared for local MPI Offices will list the address for the servicing Provost Marshal or Directorate of Public Safety in the "Memorandum For" section of the PDD report. PDD reports will not list TDS, civilian attorneys, civilian law enforcement agencies or unit commanders in the "Memorandum For" portion of the PDD report. Requests for PDD reports from TDS and unit

commanders will be referred to the Trial Counsel responsible for providing legal support to the examinee's unit.

c. When conducting PDD examinations of examinees that have tested positive for an illegal drug(s) and are represented by TDS, it may be inappropriate to formulate relevant questions that address the issue of "possession". Typically, examinees that test positive for an illegal drug(s) are only listed for the offense of Wrongful Use of a Controlled Substance and not possession. As such, TDS attorneys often object to the use of any questions on the PDD examination that address an offense for which their client is not being charged. Provided below are some relevant questions that can be used as a substitute for normal questions addressing the issue of possession:

Q: Do you know why your urine sample tested positive for marihuana?

Q: Do you know why your urinalysis was positive for cocaine?

Q: Do you know why your urine sample tested positive for methamphetamines?

Q: Do you know why the urine sample you submitted tested positive for ecstasy?

3.3 Examination of Juveniles

This Command does not establish a minimum age limitation on the testing of juveniles. Evaluate each case and each potential examinee to determine their suitability for PDD testing. However, only in rare cases, will we administer a PDD examination to a child under 12 years of age. The suitability of any child to undergo a PDD examination is dependent on their level of maturity, intelligence and their attention span. PDD Examiners should seek guidance from psychologists, physicians or attorneys who have previously interviewed the juvenile when appropriate. **See paragraph 3-4, CIDR 195-28**, concerning juvenile testing protocol.

3.4 Examination of Murder Suspects

Under most circumstances, do not administer a PDD examination to a murder suspect related to the victim (by blood, marriage, or emotionally) until after the funeral, memorial or internment of the deceased. Use common sense and logic when making a decision on when to test a murder suspect. Remember that the PDD examiner has the final decision concerning the suitability of an individual to undergo PDD testing. [See Appendix B](#) (policy letter) for clarification of this policy.

3.5 Examination of Rape Suspects

In those instances where the suspect(s) denies having engaged in any form of sexual intercourse with the victim, examiners should initially test the issue on whether or not the examinee engaged in sexual intercourse with the victim, without any reference to force issues. Additional testing may then be necessary to resolve any remaining issues pertaining to force, as provided in the victim's complaint.

3.6 Examination of Alleged Sexual Assault Victims

PDD testing involving reported sexual assault victims continues to be a sensitive topic. Provided below are some considerations, which are typically reviewed during the evaluation process for approval/disapproval of PDD tests involving sexual assault victims.

- a. PDD testing is a stressful experience, even for the truthful (PDD testing of sexual assault victims requires the individual “relive” the incident).
- b. AR 27-10, para 18-2b, Military Justice (Victim Witness Assistance): “In those cases in which a victim has been subjected to attempted or actual violence, every reasonable effort will be made to minimize further trauma. Victims will be treated with care and compassion, particularly in circumstances involving children, domestic violence or sexual assault”.
- c. It is USACIDC policy to not conduct polygraph examinations of reported sexual assault victims to verify a crime has occurred.
- d. PDD testing of individuals suspected of making false complaints regarding sex offenses (alleged sexual assault victims) may be considered when the following exists:
 - The suspect was found non-deceptive subsequent to polygraph testing.
 - There is a testable dichotomy appropriate for PDD testing.
 - Substantial evidence (physical or testimonial) exists to believe the alleged victim committed a criminal offense (i.e., false swearing).
- e. PDD testing continues to be an invaluable investigative tool. However, the indiscriminate use of PDD testing by USACIDC could cause the loss of this technique to Army law enforcement or create even greater restrictions on its use. Examiners must realize that polygraph testing is not a panacea to all unresolved issues in criminal investigations. Some issues cannot be resolved by polygraph and are best addressed by the judicial system.

3.7 Examination of Suspects with AIDS

As with all serious illnesses or medical problems, coordinate with medical specialists before conducting the examination. Verify that the examinee is medically suitable to undergo PDD testing.

3.8 Examination of Suspected Pedophiles

Care must be exercised when formulating comparison questions for suspected pedophiles as “normal” sexual comparison questions could be potentially relevant to a pedophile. Research and empirical data suggest that pedophiles generally have a history of repeated offenses with children prior to their first encounter with authorities. Standard sex comparison questions may be relevant to such individuals. Refer to [Para 6.5](#) for further guidance.

3.9 Examination of Suspected Juvenile Pedophiles

Examiners must exercise great care in formulating proper comparison questions for suspected juvenile sex offenders and alleged juvenile pedophiles. Typically, juveniles have a limited number of sexual experiences in the past, as compared to adults. Further, juveniles past sexual experiences may be limited to sexual contact with other juveniles and pose a problem when formulating both comparison and relevant questions. As a result, examiners should use normal "lie" comparison questions when testing suspected juvenile pedophiles to avoid encompassing relevant material when formulating comparison questions. Examiners are encouraged to discuss proposed relevant and comparison questions with their Group Supervisor or Quality Control personnel prior to PDD testing of suspected juvenile pedophiles.

3.10 Examination of USACIDC Sources

PDD testing of USACIDC sources is permitted when there is a question as to the veracity of the information being provided by the source. Other considerations may include compromising the identity of covert law enforcement personnel, safety issues, and preserving the overall integrity of the anticipated covert operation. Applicable issues must be documented in the PDD request. Some PDD requests could require the identity of a USACIDC source be divulged during the pretest interview. In those instances, the PDD request must include information addressing possible disclosure of the source's identity during the PDD process and the fact that it will not compromise future anticipated covert operations.

3.11 PDD Requests concerning USACIDC Sources

PDD examination requests concerning the testing of registered/confidential sources will only identify the person to be examined by their source control number. PDD examiners must call the Polygraph Division to provide additional personal identification after such requests have been submitted. Contact the Polygraph Division for guidance on question formulation and appropriate PDD protocol. **See paragraph 2-2(m), CIDR 195-28.**

3.12 Suspected Adulterated Urine Sample

Polygraph testing of an examinee suspected of altering a urine sample should be delayed until completion of the USACIL analysis. The laboratory results are necessary to confirm the actual existence of an adulterated urine sample, the type(s) of substance used to alter the sample (if any) and the presence or absence of any illegal drug(s). Receipt and review of the laboratory results prior to the conduct of PDD testing is also necessary to assist in proper relevant test question construction. If laboratory analysis of a suspected adulterated urine sample has not been completed, examiners must coordinate with Quality Control personnel prior to conducting any such PDD testing. Sample questions for an adulterated urine sample are provided below:

Q: Did you alter your urine sample?

Q: Did you alter the urine sample you submitted on 4 Aug 99?

Q: Did you know your urine sample was altered when you submitted it?

3.13 PDD Testing for Positive Urinalysis Results

The ZCT format is the primary testing protocol for an examinee that has tested positive for an illegal drug(s). In instances when it is determined that additional relevant issues must be addressed to resolve the cited offenses(s) under investigation, the Army MGQT and CTF formats may also be utilized. Relevant questions will be formulated to encompass the 30 days "before" or "prior to" the date the urinalysis was administered. When utilizing a ZCT testing technique, the primary relevant questions R5 and R7 will address "use" of the drug identified during the examinee's urinalysis and relevant question R10 will address possession of the drug. In some instances an examinee may provide an explanation for the urinalysis results and deny "knowingly" using the cited illegal drug. In those instances, PDD examiners may modify relevant questions to determine whether or not the examinee "knowingly" used the cited drug. Also, in some instances, such as TDS exculpatory tests, it may be inappropriate to address possession of the cited drug. As a result, PDD examiners may construct relevant questions at R10 designed to address the examinee's knowledge concerning the urinalysis results. Sample questions are provided below:

R5: Did you use any form of marijuana within the 30 days before that urinalysis?

R7: Did you use any form of marijuana within the 30 days before that urinalysis at Fort Benning?

R5: Did you use any form of cocaine between 4 January 1999 and 4 February 1999?

R7: Did you use any form of cocaine between 4 January 1999 and 4 February 1999, while assigned to Fort Benning?

R5: Did you use any form of methamphetamines within the 30 days before either of those urine tests?

(Two positive urinalysis)

R7: Did you use any form of methamphetamines within the 30 days before either of those urine tests at

Fort Benning? (Two positive urinalysis)

R5: Did you knowingly use any form of marijuana within the 30 days prior to that urinalysis?

R7: Did you knowingly use any form of marijuana within the 30 days prior to that urinalysis at

Fort Benning?

R10: Did you possess any form of marijuana within the 30 days before the urine test?

R10: Did you have any cocaine in your hands within the 30 days prior to that urine test?

R10: Do you know for certain why you tested positive for LSD?

3.14 PDD Support Involving Off-Post Incidents

Conducting PDD examinations in support of local law enforcement where there is no military interest or nexus may be a violation of the Posse Comitatus Act. When requesting a PDD examination involving an off-post incident, ensure coordination with the local SJA has been accomplished and that such coordination has established a sufficient nexus or military interest for CID involvement. In most cases, the supporting CID office should assign an ROI case number to the action. Exculpatory requests not affiliated with an ROI should be supported by a sequence number or MPR as appropriate.

3.15 PDD Support to Commanders and MPI

Coordinate directly with unit commanders and MPI and advise them that PDD services are available in support of their investigations. PDD support may be provided for AR 15-6 investigations wherein criminality is suspected. However, the requirement for PDD authorization is the same as any other criminal investigation as outlined in AR 195-6. Inform commanders that requests for PDD examinations in exculpation must be made by the person to be tested and not offered by the commander or investigating officer.

3.16 PDD Support to External Agencies

All requests for PDD support from external agencies will be processed through the Polygraph Division, USACRC, in accordance with normal established procedures. In cases involving the results of a background investigation (DSS investigations) only test the specific incident that precipitated the request for PDD testing. Efforts will be made to conduct approved PDD examinations for external agencies within two weeks of receipt. The Polygraph Division will be kept apprised on the status and completion of all such requests.

3.17 Suitability of Pregnant Examinees

The provisions of CIDR 195-28 (paragraph 3-3) provide regulatory guidance for the testing of pregnant examinees. Examiners must be familiar with the precautions necessary to ensure the health and safety of pregnant examinees. As such, the following policies are incorporated into this manual:

(a) If a pregnant examinee has ever suffered a miscarriage the polygraph examination will be postponed until after the current pregnancy unless approved by her physician (in writing) and coordinated with polygraph quality control supervisors at CRC.

(b) During the first and second trimester of a prospective examinee's pregnancy, coordination will be effected with the attending physician prior to the conduct of the examination to determine if the prospective examinee is physically fit to undergo a polygraph examination. Again, the physician's approval will be in writing.

(c) Once a prospective examinee has entered the third trimester of pregnancy the polygraph examination will be postponed until after the pregnancy.

All information pertaining to the above guidelines will be thoroughly documented in the Examiner Comments section of the polygraph report and forwarded to CRC (along with any written medical clearances or opinions). Exceptions to these guidelines will be addressed to the Director, CRC.

3.18 Polygraph Support Regarding Category 1 Monitored ROIs

Polygraph Group Supervisors and the Polygraph Division, CRC, will be notified immediately by any examiner solicited to conduct a polygraph examination in support of a Category 1 monitored ROI. The Polygraph Division will be kept apprised of the status of such requests, and any resulting exams, until completion. Polygraph charts collected subsequent to an exam in support of a monitored ROI will be forwarded electronically for QC review.

CHAPTER 4

PDD TEST ADMINISTRATION

4.1 When to use the ZCT, CTF, or MGQT

These techniques each have distinct advantages. Examine the situation and available case facts to determine which protocol is best suited for use. Use the ZCT when the situation involves a single, primary issue. Use the MGQT when there are several possibilities of examinee involvement or when the ZCT cannot cover all issues in question. The CTF is a single issue, multiple question protocol allowing the examiner to probe multiple areas of examinee involvement in a single incident.

4.2 Test Data Analysis

During the test data analysis process, examiners must review all physiological data collected during the examination. Artifacts, distortions, answer changes and purity issues must be recognized and addressed by the examiner as data often unsuitable for numerical evaluation. USACIDC PPD examiners will employ the three-position scale during the test data analysis phase of the examination. The examinee's responses at the relevant questions will be compared to the responses at the appropriate comparison question(s). When the physiological responses are greater at the relevant question(s) the examiner will evaluate the data as a "-". Conversely, when the physiological responses are greater at the comparison question(s) the examiner will evaluate the data as a "+". A value "0" will be assigned when the physiological responses are equal. Responses not evaluated due to artifacts or distortions will be recorded with a slash through a "0". If the artifact or distortion is not readily apparent, a brief explanation will be documented on the score sheet. Provided below is a summary of scoring procedures and numerical cut off scores for the Zone Comparison Test (ZCT), Modified General Questioning Technique (MGQT) and "You" Phase technique(Bi-Zone):

Zone Comparison Test (ZCT)

Three Relevants: R5, R7, R10 Compare C4 and C6 to R5

Three Comparisons: C4, C6, C9 Compare C6 to R7 and E8

 Compare C9 to R10

Test Data Analysis: (3 Position Scale)

NDI: Plus in each spot and a minimum of an overall +6

DI: Minus 3 or lower in any spot or a minus 2 in all spots

NO: All other combinations are considered no opinion

*Comparison questions may be moved after the collection of the first chart.

**Evaluation of E8: If the examiner determines that on five or more occasions the physiological responses at E8 are greater than the responses at R7 and the appropriate comparison question, the examiner may not make a conclusive NDI decision. The test data results are documented as "No Opinion" and additional testing is required to resolve the relevant issues. Also, if the examiner determines that on four or

Three Relevants: R4, R5 and R7
R8

Three Comparisons: C3, C6, C8
and C8

Scoring Three (3) Question CTF:
CTF:

Compare: R4 and R5 to C3 and C6
C6

Compare: R7 to C6 and C8
and C9

Test Data Analysis: (3 Position Scale)

NDI: Plus 3 or greater in each spot

DI: Minus 3 or less in any spot

NO: All other combinations are considered no opinion.

Four Relevants: R4, R5, R7 and
R8

Three Comparisons: C3, C6
and C8

Scoring the Four (4) Question
CTF:

Compare: R4 and R5 to C3 and
C6

Compare: R7 and R8 to C6
and C9

4.3 Moving Comparison Questions on the MGQT, CTF, and ZCT

After the collection of the first chart, comparison questions may be moved to different numerical positions on the MGQT, CTF, Bi-Zone, and ZCT tests at the discretion of the examiner. Examiners should always endeavor to place the “strongest” comparison question adjacent to the strongest relevant question.

4.4 Statement Tests

Examiners will test issues through direct questioning before consideration of administering an examination on a signed, sworn statement. When an examiner is unable to obtain conclusive results through direct questioning, and after coordination with and approval of the Polygraph Division, have the examinee write a sentence or two denying the allegations against him/her on a DA Form 2823. The examiner will administer an oath attesting to the truthfulness of the statement. The Polygraph Division will provide guidance concerning which PDD technique to use based upon the circumstances and the case facts. Forward the original of the tested statement to CRC with the polygrams and allied PDD documentation.

4.5 Yes Tests

Employ this type of test only in allegations of suspected False Swearing by the alleged victim. Construct relevant questions so the examinee answers “yes”. Construct comparison questions so the examinee answers “no”. All other standards remain the same as any other type of testing. Employ a “no” answer test if an initial “yes” test is evaluated as No Opinion. Coordination will be made with the Polygraph Division before using this testing technique.

4.6 Production of a Fourth Chart

In some instances, examiners may experience artifacts, such as answer changes, noise, distortions, movements, etc, which make a question(s) unsuitable for test data analysis. In order to make a conclusive numerical evaluation (NDI/DI), the examiner must have a minimum of two artifact free askings of each relevant question. If this exists, the examiner may not collect a fourth chart. If, however, after the collection of the third chart, the examiner was unable to collect the minimum of two artifact free askings of each relevant questions, collection of a fourth chart is authorized. During the test data analysis phase, the examiner will numerically evaluate all four charts. Collection of a fifth chart is not authorized.

4.7 Multiple/Additional Testing Issues

Upon collection of Series I and the test data analysis phase, the examiner will inform the examinee of the results and conduct a post-test interview. Should the post-test interview result in minor admissions or admissions that fall short of “completely” resolving the relevant issues tested, the examiner is required to conduct additional testing. Additional testing will be accomplished by formulating appropriate relevant questions addressing the remaining unresolved relevant issues. Provided the examinee is cooperative, PDD testing will continue until all relevant questions/issues are resolved. Multiple or separate series PDD testing is appropriate when case facts suggest multiple offenses have occurred and are separated by time, place and /or emotional intensity. Examiners are not authorized to conduct a “Break-out” PDD examination to address unresolved questions/issues.

4.8 Test Question Construction for Multiple Series Testing

In those instances when multiple series testing is required, PDD examiners will formulate test questions (both Relevant and Comparison questions), which differ from the previous series. Examiners may also consider changing to a different testing format when appropriate, but identical questions will not be used during multiple series testing.

4.9 Confessions and Admissions to Other Offenses

When an individual admits to a crime outside the issue of the PDD examination, report the crime to the Military Police or CID, as appropriate.

4.10 Admissions Involving Intent

When an examinee provides an explanation for their action(s) involving intent (...” I did it accidentally”, etc.) complete additional testing to confirm their explanation if possible or technically appropriate. All issues should be cleared before testing is concluded.

4.11 Release of Examinee

Avoid making statements that give the examinee an impression that the conclusions of the PDD

examination are final. This is critical with NDI examinations. Employ a methodology in the release of an examinee that facilitates future investigative contact or additional PDD testing.

4.12 Length of Post-Test

Field studies show that the majority of confessions come between the second and third hour of the interrogation. Stay with the deceptive examinee until the issues are resolved or the examinee declines further interview or requests an attorney. Examiners should not normally stop the interrogation process for further interviews at a later date.

4.13 Observation Room

The examiner has total control over who is allowed in the observation room. It is generally not in the best interest of the examiner, examinee, or examination as a whole, to allow anyone in the observation room that does not have a need to be there. This includes family and friends. If an unresolved argument occurs over whom can be in the observation room, terminate the examination and immediately contact a supervisor. Attorneys may observe examinations requested for their clients, but civilian examiners accompanying attorneys will not be allowed to observe such examinations as the polygraph technique is protected from disclosure under Section 552, Title 5, United States Code and DOD Directives.

4.14 Government Witnesses

Examiners are directed to review the provisions of CIDR 195-28, paragraph 3-2, regarding government witnesses. As directed, all USACIDC examinations will be monitored by a government witness. In no instance will a Defense Attorney be the sole monitor of a polygraph examination. Also, female monitors are mandatory when male examiners are testing female examinees. These common sense safeguards are necessary to preserve the overall integrity of the program and protect PDD examiners against potential allegations of improprieties.

4.15 Monitor Responsibilities

Certified examiners who monitor intern examiners are responsible for the accuracy and quality of examinations conducted. The Polygraph Division forwards all quality control messages to the monitor with a copy to the intern examiner. Monitors will provide an Intern Progress Evaluation ([Appendix C](#)) to the intern. Forward the computer generated Intern Progress Evaluation, signed by the monitor and initialed by the examiner, with the polygrams and allied documentation to CRC. Monitors will constructively identify strengths and weaknesses of the intern examiner as well as any unusual testing circumstances noted. In order to be of value to the intern examiner, as well as quality control supervisors, these evaluations must be candid, factual assessments. If a disagreement occurs between the monitor and the intern, follow the guidance of the monitor. Should the intern believe the guidance provided was inappropriate, the intern

will address the unresolved issue in the Intern Progress Evaluation that applies to that examination. The Polygraph Division will clarify the unresolved issue by telephone (or by e-mail) with both the intern examiner and monitor.

CHAPTER 5 PDD TESTING PROTOCOLS

5.1 General ZCT Instructions

The Zone Comparison Test or ZCT is the primary single issue testing protocol utilized by this Command for criminal specific testing. This test consists of 10 questions. The test is conducted in the following sequence:

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Irrelevant | 6. Comparison Question |
| 2. Sacrifice relevant | 7. Primary Relevant Question |
| 3. Symptomatic question | 8. Symptomatic Question |
| 4. Comparison question | 9. Comparison Question |
| 5. Primary relevant question | 10. Secondary Relevant (Evidence connecting) |

Comparison questions may be rotated at the discretion of the examiner but will retain their assigned number. Relevant questions will not be rotated or moved from their assigned position. The following is the accepted wording or variation authorized for the questions listed:

1. IRRELEVANT: “Is today.....?” , “Are you now sitting down?” , or “Are you called Johnny?”

Any non-emotion provoking known truth, question, the answer to which is absolutely known to the examiner as “yes”. Be careful of questions that may not be known truth or could cause problems for the examinee. Questions concerning the examinees place of birth, age, last name etc. may either cause problems (the examinee is not sure) or could be fabricated.

2. SACRIFICE RELEVANT: “Regarding (the theft of that money..., whether you struck Susie..., the damage to that car...) do you intend to answer truthfully, each question about that?”

3. SYMPTOMATIC (Trust): “Are you convinced I will not ask an un-reviewed question on this test?” “Are you convinced I will not ask you a surprise question on this test?” Minor changes to the wording of the question that do not effect the meaning or intent of the question are authorized.

4. COMPARISONS: (C4,C6,C9) Word comparison questions so they are broad in time and coverage, isolated by time, situation or category from the relevant issue, and related to the relevant issue by type (steal with steal, damage with damage, hurt, harm, and injure with assaults, sex with sex). Note variations for specific crimes listed under Chapter 6.

5. RELEVANTS: (R5,R7,R10) Relevant questions R5 and R7 are the primary relevant test

questions. R10 is a secondary relevant question that addresses secondary involvement, knowledge, or evidence connecting issues. Both R5 and R7 questions must address the direct involvement of the examinee. Question R7 should be the same as question R5 with a qualifier such as:

R5: "Did you steal any of that money?"

R7: "Did you steal any of that money from that safe?"

R10: "Do you know where any of that stolen money is now?"

At the discretion of the PDD examiner, relevant questions may be used which are restatements of the issue

at R5 such as:

R5: "Did you steal any of that money from that safe?"

R7: "Are you the person who stole any of that money from that safe?"

R10: "Do you know for sure who stole any of that money?"

8. SYMPTOMATIC (Outside Issue): "Is there something (else) you are afraid I will ask you a

question about, (even though I told you I would not)?"

ZCT Test Data Analysis: USACIDC PDD examiners will use the three-position scale to numerically

evaluate the ZCT.

Zone Comparison Test (ZCT): Scoring ZCT:

- Three Relevants: R5, R7, R10 Compare C4 and C6 to R5

- Three Comparisons: C4, C6, C9 Compare C6 to R7 and E8

Compare C9 to R10

Test Data Analysis: (3 Position Scale)

NDI: Plus in each spot and a minimum of an overall +6

DI: Minus 3 or lower in any spot or a minus 2 in all spots

NO: All other combinations are considered no opinion

*Comparison questions may be moved after the collection of the first chart.

**Evaluation of E8 – see [Para 4.2](#)

5.2 Symptomatic Questions

To preclude unwarranted responses to symptomatic questions, explain the actual meaning of the questions. Advise the examinee that it is both unethical and a violation of policy to ask any un-reviewed questions during the examination. It is inappropriate to interrogate an examinee following responses to the symptomatic questions after the collection of an individual chart. If an examinee is responding to the symptomatic question for a valid reason, the responses should be present on each iteration of the question. If the reaction was spurious it should dissipate in subsequent iterations of the question. Evaluation of symptomatic question responses is addressed in [Paragraph 4.2](#).

5.3 Sky Phase on ZCT Test

The S-K-Y phase of the Zone Comparison Test (ZCT) can be a helpful tool in determining an examinee's guilty knowledge concerning an incident under investigation without the need to include the knowledge question in the body of the protocol. When

used for this purpose, the primary questions of the ZCT are used for primary relevant and evidence connecting questions. The S-K-Y questions are numbered as 11, 12 and 13. The S-K-Y questions should be reviewed during the pre-instrument phase, along with other relevant questions on the test. The examinee should be advised that all of the questions reviewed may not be utilized on any particular test, but that only reviewed questions will be asked. The first test is collected in the normal manner, without the S-K-Y questions. After the first test is collected, and prior to collection of the second test, the examinee should be told "The next test will contain those other questions that were not on that first test that we talked about." The first one is "Do you suspect anyone in particular of.. (stealing, damaging, writing, etc.) that..." , Do you know for sure who (stole, damaged wrote, etc.) that....." and "Did you (steal, damage, write, etc.) that..." .. Advise the examinee that the questions will be in that order ("Do you suspect...Do you know for sure... Did you..."). Question 13, the "You" question, should be worded the same as question 5 of the ZCT. Tell the examinee when he hears the "Do you suspect" question, he will hear the "Do you know" question and then the "Did you question" . The third test should be collected in the same manner as the second test. The examinee should be reminded of the order of the S-K-Y questions, just as in the second test. If the examinee indicates that he/she suspects someone in particular of the crime, then the question should be modified to "Other than (John, Joe, St Smith, etc.) do you suspect anyone else of....." or "Besides those three people you named, do you suspect anyone else..." . To evaluate the S-K-Y portion of the examination, compare the "Suspect" or 11 question to the "Knowledge" or 12 question and to the "You" or 13 question., Treat question 11 as a comparison and 12 and 13 as relevant questions. Assign a "+" or a "-" or a "K" score to each component based upon the greater reaction. If the greatest reactions occur in the "Suspect" question, then guilty knowledge is not indicated. If the greatest reaction is to the "Knowledge" question, then guilty knowledge is indicated. If a minus score is indicated (greatest reaction is to the "Did you" question), then deception to the relevant issue should also be present in the primary relevant questions at positions 5, 7 and 10. Knowledge can be assumed if the combined vertical score at the S-K-Y is "K4" or greater.

An opinion of Deception Indicated will not be made based solely upon a numeric score in the S-K-Y portion of the examination.

5.4 Use of the "You" Phase or Bi-Zone Test

The "You" Phase is a secondary technique used in instances where there is only one testable issue. Such a situation occurs only rarely in PDD testing. Obtain approval from the Polygraph Division before using this technique. The accepted format for this technique is the same as the ZCT, except do not ask question R10 and reverse question E8 and C9. Question order is: 1,2,E3,C4,R5,C6,R7,C9,E8. Question C9 remains a comparison question and E8 remains as a symptomatic. A minus three (-3) in either spot is DI. Additionally, a minus 4 total from both spots (-2,-2) is considered deception indicated. A plus in both spots with a grand total of at least plus four (+4) is NDI.

5.5 General MGQT Instructions

The Modified General Question Technique (MGQT) is a single issue, multiple question protocol allowing the examiner to probe multiple possible areas of examinee involvement in a single crime issue. The protocol is not designed to test separate crime issues, but does allow the examiner to utilize questions about various facts of an issue. The question sequence is as follows:

1. Irrelevant
2. Irrelevant
3. Weak Relevant
4. Irrelevant
5. Primary Relevant
6. Comparison
7. Irrelevant
8. Evidence connecting or secondary relevant
9. Evidence connecting, knowledge or secondary relevant
10. Comparison

Question sequence remains the same on both the first and second test in a series. Comparisons may be rotated as required. On the third test of a series, the numeric order is mixed. The location of relevant questions is at the discretion of the examiner, usually placing the least reactive relevant questions observed at the first two relevant question positions. On the mixed test, the order may be varied as the below examples illustrate:

[4-1-5-6-3-10-9-6-8-10] [4-1-9-10-8-6-5-10-3-6] [4-1-8-6-9-10-3-6-5-10]

The first relevant question (question 3) should be moved away from its initial position to protect against spot reaction.

Scoring the MGQT:

Four Relevant: R3, R5, R8, and R9	Compare R3 to C6
Two Comparisons: C6, C10	Compare R5 to C6
	Compare R8 to C6 and C10
	Compare R9 to C10

Test Data Analysis: (3 Position Scale)

NDI: Plus 3 or greater in each spot

DI: Minus 3 or less in any spot

NO: All other combinations are considered no opinion

5.6 Moving Relevant Questions on the MGQT

The reason for a mixed series is to avoid a “spot” reactor. Changing the position of relevant questions on the mixed series from the sequence taught at the polygraph institute is at the discretion of the examiner. Place the “weakest” relevant in position one (1) of the mixed series chart. Do not move relevant questions on charts 1 and 2. If collection of a fourth chart is necessary, collect the chart in the same numerical sequence as the problem chart.

5.7 Comparison Test Format (CTF)

The CTF is a single issue, multiple question protocol allowing the examiner to probe multiple areas of possible involvement in a single crime issue. The CTF can be utilized as a three (3) or four (4) relevant question test. The question sequence is listed below:

Three (3) Question CTF:

1. Irrelevant
2. Sacrifice Relevant
3. Comparison Question
4. Secondary Relevant
5. Primary relevant
6. Comparison Question
7. Secondary Relevant Question
8. Comparison Question

Four (4) Question CTF:

1. Irrelevant
2. Sacrifice Relevant
3. Comparison Question
4. Secondary Relevant
5. Primary Relevant
6. Comparison Question
7. Secondary Relevant
8. Secondary Relevant
9. Comparison Question

Three (3) Question CTF:

- Three Relevants: R4, R5 and R7, R7, and R8
- Three Comparisons: C3, C6 and C8, C6, and C9

Scoring Three (3) Question CTF:

Compare: R4 and R5 to C3 and C6
C6

Compare: R7 to C6 and C8
and C9

Four (4) Question CTF:

- Four Relevants: R4, R5, R7, and R8
- Three Comparisons: C3, C6, and C9

Scoring the Four (4) Question

Compare: R4 and R5 to C3 and

Compare: R7 and R8 to C6

Test Data Analysis (3-Position Scale):

NDI: Plus 3 or greater in each spot

DI: Minus 3 or less in any spot

NO: All other combinations

Question sequence for the CTF will not remain the same on all three charts in a series. On at least one of the subsequent charts the relevant question sequence will be mixed. If collection of a fourth chart is necessary, collect the chart in the same numerical sequence as the problematic chart. At the discretion of the examiner, comparison questions may be rotated on charts two and/or three.

At least two additional irrelevant questions (1A and 1B) should be reviewed with the examinee for possible use during the collection of the charts.

5.8 Known Solution Peak of Tension (POT) Test

PDD examiners should consider a POT test only after obtaining conclusive DI results from a previously conducted ZCT, CTF or MGQT examination. The known solution POT is employed when the examinee denies any knowledge of the specific area to be tested, which has been verified and is "known" only to law enforcement officials and the person(s) involved in the criminal act(s). Examiners should use POT tests only when sufficient peak material exists. The protocol requires six to nine questions; two forward runs, one reverse order run, and if required, a mixed sequence run. Before conducting the POT ensure (by asking the examinee) that none of the questions have any particular significance to the examinee. Do not list POT Questions on the PDD Examination Report; print out the question along with other questions utilized. On the PDD Examination Report, document the conduct of the POT by stating:

In an effort to further resolve this incident, additional PDD testing was conducted concerning the caliber of the weapon used in the shooting (for example). Specific responses were (or were not) noted concerning the caliber of the weapon.

A sample POT is provided below:

POT #1

Q: Regarding the caliber of the weapon used to shoot that man, was it a .50 caliber?

Q: Was it a .22 caliber?

Q: Was it a .25 caliber?

Q: Was it a .38 caliber? (Key)

Q: Was it a .45 caliber?

Q: Was it a .357 caliber?

POT #2

Q: Regarding the caliber of the weapon used to shoot that man, was it a .50 caliber?

Q: Was it a .22 caliber?

Q: Was it a .25 caliber?

Q: Was it a .38 caliber? (Key)

Q: Was it a .45 caliber?

Q: Was it a .357 caliber?

POT #3 (Reverse Order)

Q: Regarding the caliber of the weapon used to shoot that man, was it a .357 caliber?

Q: Was it a .45 caliber?

Q: Was it a .38 caliber?(Key)

Q: Was it a .25 caliber?

Q: Was it a .22 caliber?

Q: Was it a .50 caliber?

POT Test Data Analysis: PDD examiners will use global analysis to evaluate POT examinations. During the test data analysis phase, significant physiological responses at the "key" on two out of the three components, on at least two out of the three charts, is considered Significant Response (SR). All others are considered No Significant Responses (NSR).

5.9 Searching POT Test (SPOT) or Probing POT

PDD examiners should consider a SPOT test only after obtaining conclusive DI results from a previously conducted ZCT, CTF or MGQT examination. The SPOT is conducted when it is suspected that the examinee possesses key knowledge regarding the offense(s). The SPOT is often used to locate evidence, a crime scene, or even the name of an accomplice. Examiners should use SPOT tests only when sufficient peak material exists. The protocol requires nine questions; two forward runs, one reverse order run, and if required, a mixed sequence run. Before conducting the SPOT ensure (by asking the examinee) that none of the keys or padding questions have any particular significance to the examinee. Do not list SPOT questions on the PDD Examination Report; print out the questions along with other questions utilized. On the PDD Examination Report document the conduct of the SPOT by stating:

In an effort to further resolve this incident, additional PDD testing was conducted concerning the location of the stolen weapon used in the shooting (for example). Specific responses were (or were not) noted concerning the location of the stolen weapon.

A sample SPOT is provided below:

SPOT #1

Q: Regarding the location of that stolen weapon, is it in Canada? (padding question)

Q: Is it in Hawaii? (padding question)

Q: Is it in Area A? (key choice)

Q: Is it in Area B? (key choice)

Q: Is it in Area C? (key choice)

Q: Is it in Area D? (key choice)

Q: Is it in an area not mentioned? (coverall)

Q: Is it in Panama? (padding question)

Q: Is it in Mexico? (padding question)

SPOT #2

Q: Regarding the location of that stolen weapon, is it in Canada? (padding question)

Q: Is it in Hawaii? (padding question)

Q: Is it in Area A? (key choice)

Q: Is it in Area B? (key choice)

Q: Is it in Area C? (key choice)

Q: Is it in Area D? (key choice)

Q: Is it in an area not mentioned? (coverall)

Q: Is it in Panama? (padding question)

Q: Is it in Mexico? (padding question)

SPOT #3

Q: Regarding the location of that stolen weapon, is it in Mexico? (padding question)

Q: Is it in Panama? (padding question)

Q: Is it in an area not mentioned? (coverall)

Q: Is it in Area D? (key choice)

Q: Is it in Area C? (key choice)

Q: Is it in Area B? (key choice)

Q: Is it in Area A? (key choice)

Q: Is it in Hawaii? (padding question)

Q: Is it in Canada? (padding question)

SPOT Test Data Analysis: PDD examiners will use global analysis to evaluate SPOT examinations. During the test data analysis phase, significant physiological responses at the "key choices" or "coverall" on two out of the three components, on at least two out of the three charts is considered Significant Response (SR). All other are considered No Significant Responses (NSR).

5.10 Criminal R and I tests

In the rare event an examinee will not agree to a PDD examination that contains comparison questions, examiners may utilize the criminal R&I protocol. This protocol must be approved for use by a Quality Control Supervisor and the test questions discussed prior to conduct of the examination. The PDD report will reflect that no technical opinion was formed and the results will be listed as "no opinion".

The Criminal R&I question sequence will be as follows:

The development and presentation of the questions is accomplished during the pretest interview phase. In the criminal R & I technique, there is a possibility of three different types of questions.

First, there are the relevant questions. Operationally, they are given number identities. There are at least three and no more than five relevant questions asked for each PDD examination. In this technique, as you verbally walk the examinee through the crime, various offenses associated with that one crime can be mixed; however, different criminal acts separated by time and/or distance cannot be included. Avoid relevant questions that will allow an examinee to justify by responding with a non-criminal explanation.

Secondly, there are the irrelevant questions, which operationally are identified with capital letters. These questions must be non-relevant and should not cause any emotional response when presented to the examinee. Avoid questions like the type of clothing worn if an examinee could have worn it during the crime.

Third, overall truth questions, which operationally are identified with the capital letter "T" followed by a number i.e., T-1 or T1. These questions are utilized as a sacrifice relevant and are not normally given a numerical evaluation.

Avoid un-reviewed questions, reversed norm questions, and any form of a very important question (VIQ), such as the type utilized in an applicant/screening style of PDD testing.

DATA COLLECTION PHASE

All basic requirements as taught in the DODPI Basic PDD Course apply. With the R & I technique, other rules concerning the data collection phase are as follows:

If a stimulation (acquaintance) test is utilized, it will be the first test collected.

In the initial examination, the examiner may conduct either two (2) charts with a minimum of two (2) askings of the relevant questions or four (4) charts with one (1) asking of each relevant question. Do not ask more than three relevants in sequence nor ask the same relevant immediately after it has been asked. The first chart begins with at least two irrelevant; however each chart thereafter need only begin with one irrelevant question. Do not ask any question back to back. The overall truth question will be asked prior to the first relevant question, or after the last relevant question has been asked on a test. After viewing the previous chart(s), do not position the most responsive relevant question as the first relevant question on the next chart. Operational procedures dictate that responses occur in at least two separate recording components to render a decision for that asking. If there is no significant response to any class of questions during the test, the result will be viewed as a "No Opinion" decision. When this occurs, the PDD examiner should be alert for countermeasures.

GLOBAL TEST DATA ANALYSIS

Although the PDD report will reflect No opinion for Criminal R&I tests, the examiner should review the tests in the following manner to determine post-test procedures.

The response must be CONSISTENT.

The response must be SPECIFIC.

The response must be SIGNIFICANT.

Consistency is established by repeating the questions and varying the order in which the questions are asked. When the examinee responds consistently to a relevant question, regardless of the order asked, the examinee can be considered deceptive on the PDD examination. Specificity refers to the response occurring at or immediately following application of the stimulus (question). The PDD examiner should expect the reaction to occur during or immediately following question and answer. Responses outside this parameter will not be considered "specific." Significance is determined by comparing one question to another that is free of artifacts and unwanted noise on the signal of interest and determining if significant responses occur.

If consistent, specific and significant reactions occur in two out of the three recording components, then a percentage formula may be applied to determine an examination outcome. If the examinee responds:

0 out of 4 askings - 0% (NDI)

1 out of 4 askings - 25% (NDI)

2 out of 4 askings - 50% (INC)

3 out of 4 askings - 75% (DI)

4 out of 4 askings - 100% (DI)

CRIMINAL R & I TECHNIQUE SAMPLE QUESTIONS

RELEVANT QUESTIONS:

1. Did you receive anything of benefit from that missing stereo equipment?
2. Did you remove any of that stereo equipment from that room?

3. Did you steal that missing stereo equipment?
4. Do you know where any of that missing stereo equipment is now?

IRRELEVANT QUESTIONS:

- A. Is today _____?
- B. Is this the month of _____?
- C. Are you sitting down?
- D. Are the lights on in this room?

OVERALL TRUTH QUESTIONS:

- T-1 Have you truthfully answered all of the questions on this test?
- T-2 Have you falsely answered any of the questions on this test?
- T-3 Have you deliberately withheld any pertinent information throughout this interview?

CRIMINAL R & I TECHNIQUE EXAMPLE

- A. Is today _____?
- B. Is this the month of _____?
- T-3 Have you deliberately withheld any pertinent information throughout this interview?
 1. Were you in that barracks room when any of that stereo equipment was removed?
 2. Did you remove any of that stereo equipment from that barracks room?
- C. Are you sitting down?
3. Did you steal that missing stereo equipment?
4. Do you know where any of that missing stereo equipment is now?
- T-1 Have you truthfully answered all of the questions on this test?
- D. Are the lights on in this room?

5.11 Silent Test (ST)

Use the silent test in situations where there are unexplained artifacts caused by purposeful movement, or when an examinee is attempting to employ countermeasures. In cases where the examinee might be an anxious truthful examinee, consider utilizing the ST technique instead of direct confrontation. Conduct the ST by telling the examinee that nothing will be said for an extended amount of time; no questions will be asked and no answers will be given. Place a "X" at the beginning of the ST and a "XX" at the end of the ST. Evaluate whether the tracings are now distorted or if they reverted to a "normal" pattern. If they still appear distorted, this might be the examinee's norm. If they change to a "normal" pattern, consider confronting the examinee with the tracings to resolve future problems during testing. Forward the ST polygram with the PDD report and document the conduct of the ST in Examiner Comments. In addition, a review of the tracings prior to saying "The test is about to begin." and after..." This portion of the test is over" can provide valuable information concerning the examinee's normal tracing pattern.

5.12 Silent Answer Test (SAT)

If the pneumograph tracings are greatly distorted by the examinee answering the questions, consider the conduct of an SAT PDD examination. Coordination with Quality Control, Polygraph Division, will be made prior to the conduct of this type of test. In a SAT ask the questions as with any other test and instruct the examinee to answer each question silently when asked. Numerically evaluate the SAT assuming appropriate (rehearsed) responses were given. Explain in Examiner Comments the reason for using a SAT. Forward all SAT polygrams as with any other PDD examination.

CHAPTER 6 COMPARISON QUESTIONS

6.1 Comparison Question Rules

- a. Make comparison questions known possible or probable lies, broad in time and/or scope of behavior, and of the same type as the relevant question offense except as otherwise noted in this manual.
- b. Isolate comparison questions from relevant questions by use of a time bar, place bar, or category of behavior.
- c. To avoid structuring a comparison question that is too weak or too strong, make them similar in nature to the relevant issue being tested. Use steal comparisons with steal relevants; hurt, harm and injure comparisons with assault relevants; damage comparisons with property damage relevants (including arson); and sex comparisons with most sex relevants, except as noted in paragraphs entitled [Suspected Pedophile Comparison Questions](#), [Sodomy Suspect Comparison Questions](#) and [Suspected Indecent Assault Comparisons](#).
- d. Use the same action verb in the comparisons as in the relevants, whenever possible. For example, take versus take; steal versus steal. Use a comparison question that coincides with the nature of the relevant issue.
- e. As provided above, comparison questions are constructed so they do not encompass relevant issues. Comparison questions are isolated from the relevant questions by time, place or category. Some examples are provided below:

(Time Bar): Q: Prior to 2002, did you ever violate anyone's trust by stealing?

(Place Bar): Q: Prior to arriving at Ft. Belvoir, did you ever lie to avoid responsibility for your actions?

(Category Bar): Q: Did you ever deliberately damage any private property? (Use when the relevant

issue is damage to government property).

- f. In an effort to address the use of potential countermeasures directed at comparison questions, examiners are authorized to construct one comparison question (optional) on each PDD examination which reflects the time or place bar at the end of the question.

(Time Bar) Q: Did you ever violate anyone's trust by stealing prior to 2002?

(Place): Q: Did you ever lie to anyone that trusted you before coming to Virginia?

6.2 Sacrifice Relevant Questions

Standard testing protocol requires the use of a sacrifice relevant question on ZCT, CTF, and You-Phase PDD examinations. This question must address the relevant issue to be

tested and serves to introduce the examinee to the relevant test questions. This question is not numerically evaluated during the test data analysis phase. The sacrifice relevant question will be constructed so as to avoid any inference that presupposes knowledge or guilt. Sample sacrifice relevant questions are listed below:

Q: Regarding whether you stole any of that money, do you intend to answer truthfully each question about that?

Q: Regarding whether you had sexual intercourse with that woman after she told you to stop, do you intend to answer truthfully each question about that?

6.3 Symptomatic Questions

Standard testing protocol requires the use of a symptomatic question on both the ZCT and You-Phase PDD examinations. This question is used to address any significant outside issue(s), as perceived by the examinee. Physiological responses observed at symptomatic questions (E8) are evaluated by USACIDC examiners during the PDD test data analysis phase ([See para 4.2](#)). Sample symptomatic questions are listed below:

“Is there something else you are afraid I will ask you a question about?” (E8)

“Do you believe I will only ask you the questions we reviewed?” (E3)

6.4 Irrelevant Questions

Irrelevant questions will be utilized by PDD examiners during the data collection phase. These questions will normally appear at the beginning of all PDD examinations and may be inserted at the discretion of the examiner to address artifacts/distortions or to establish homeostasis prior to the introduction of a relevant or comparison question. Irrelevant questions must be constructed to avoid encompassing any relevant material and will not be scored during the test data analysis of the PDD examination. Examples are listed below:

Q: Are you now sitting down?

Q: Are the lights on in this room?

In an effort to identify the use of countermeasures during PDD testing, examiners may introduce all irrelevant questions as “control” or “comparison” questions. Also, examiners may use one time barred irrelevant question. It is not necessary to use a time-barred irrelevant question during every examination, and PDD examiners should limit the use of a time-barred irrelevant to those examinations in which there is a reasonable belief the examinee may employ countermeasures. Examples of time-barred irrelevant questions are provided below:

Q: Before 2002, did you ever attend school?

Q: Prior to your 30th Birthday, did you ever drive a car?

Q: Before being assigned to Ft. Belvoir, did you ever drink water?

6.5 Suspected Pedophile Comparison Questions

“Normal” sex comparisons may be inappropriate when testing pedophiles as they could encompass relevant material. Pedophiles commonly have a history of abusing children; therefore, use a category bar to avoid comparison material that could involve children. For example, “Did you ever perform an unnatural sex act with an adult female?” (no time bar required). Use “adult female” sex comparisons only when the examinee has a history of heterosexual contact (marriage, birth of children, etc.). If no history of adult, opposite sex contact can be ascertained, use “normal” lie comparisons (not “sexual lie” comparisons). Time bar the lie comparisons before the age of any of the other children in the suspected pedophile’s environment. Consideration should also be given to utilizing lie comparison questions in those incidents in which only minor touching has been reported. Explain in Examiner Comments the use of lie comparisons versus adult female sex comparisons. Refer to [paragraph 3.9](#).

6.6 Sodomy Suspect Comparison Questions

“Normal” sex comparisons may be inappropriate as they could encompass relevant material for individuals suspected on committing sodomy with persons of the same sex. “Normal” lie comparison questions are recommended and examiners are encouraged to contact their Group Supervisor or Quality Control personnel when formulating comparison questions prior to PDD testing of suspected same-sex sodomy offenders.

6.7 Suspected Indecent Assault Comparison Questions

Using “normal” sex comparison questions in indecent assault cases involving minor touching or removing of clothing may be too strong. In such cases, consider the use of sex lie comparisons. For example, “Before..., did you ever lie about your sexual activities?” or “Before..., did you ever engage in any sexual act you are inclined to lie about?” Also, “normal” lie comparisons are appropriate for PDD testing of suspected indecent assault offenders.

6.8 Lie Comparison Questions

It is the policy of this Command, and the doctrine taught at the Polygraph Institute, to use comparison questions that are of the same category as the relevant issue. Use lie comparison questions when it is impractical to use comparisons that are of the same category as the testing issue. Lie comparisons for other than lie issues are inappropriate (except in False Swearing cases and as noted in this manual), unless it appears they have more meaning to the examinee than “normal” comparisons for the testing issue. The use of lie comparisons should be an exception and not a routine practice of the examiner. A sufficient justification should be provided in the Examiner Comments portion of the PDD Report when lie comparisons are employed in this manner.

6.9 Drug Comparison Questions

When the relevant issue is drug distribution, use, or possession, use normal lie comparison questions.

6.10 ” Yes” Answers to Comparison Questions

Do not evaluate a “yes” answer to a comparison question. Clarify the “yes” answer with the examinee before beginning another chart. Explain your efforts in Examiner Comments.

6.11 Comparison Question Admissions

It is inappropriate to report an examinee’s admissions in the comparison arena (except as noted in

Para 4.9). If an admission is so significant as to overwhelm the testing issue, it may be appropriate to suspend testing, advise the examinee of their rights for the new offense, and conduct an interrogation. Coordinate with the Polygraph Division in these instances. Should an examinee confess to a serious crime during the development of comparison question, this negates the use of that question as a comparison. The matter then becomes an investigation. Advise the examinee of their rights for the offense to which they confessed and initiate a preliminary inquiry into the matter in accordance with CIDR 195-1.

CHAPTER 7

RELEVANT QUESTIONS

7.1 Relevant Question Rules

- a. Ask what you want to know. Ask relevant questions that address physical acts.
- b. Use simple, direct, and easy to understand language.
- c. Provide a clear dichotomy (either/or proposition, not 'maybe'), for the examinee. Do not use terms such as "try", "tried", "attempt(ed)" or other variations in relevant test question construction. This type of verbiage tends to address intent, falls short of testing a completed act, and fails to present a dichotomy suitable for polygraph testing.
- d. Avoid legal terminology such as "murder", "rape", "assault", "forge", "extort", "burglarize", etc. Use action verbs that describe the physical act in question.
- e. When the issue(s) to be tested involves multiple items or money use the verbiage "any of" during test question construction. Examples: Did you steal any of that money? Or, Did you steal any of that electronic equipment?
- f. Avoid inferences that pre-suppose knowledge or guilt on the part of the examinee. For example, asking a suspect "Did you hold that woman down to have sex with her"? would be inappropriate if the suspect has denied any sexual contact with the alleged victim (even though the victim may have alleged the suspect held her down). In the sacrifice relevant, this is particularly important. Ask "Regarding whether you forced that woman..." not "Regarding your forcing that woman...".
- g. Refer to one offense or one element of an offense in a question.
- h. Relevant questions should stand alone and not require extensive pre-test explanation.
- i. Do not combine issues within one test series when time, place, and/or emotional intensity separate the targeted issues.
- j. Avoid words or names that might evoke an emotional response during the presentation of relevant questions. Normally, use "that man," "that woman" or "that child" rather than the name of the individual under investigation. This is particularly important when testing a subordinate concerning the alleged actions of a superior.
- k. Avoid the use of a relevant question that the examinee could be untruthful to, but not have committed the offense under investigation. example: Were you in that parking lot that day?

7.2 Rape Relevant Questions

When a suspect denies any sexual contact or involvement with the victim, construct relevant questions without injecting the force issue. For example, “Did you have sexual intercourse with that woman?” In this instance, if the examinee is truthful about a lack of sexual contact, the issue of force becomes moot. If the examinee is not being truthful, it is easier to resolve the force issue through additional testing. Avoid asking “Did you have sex with that woman”, as “sex” is open to interpretation. Whenever possible, use secondary relevant and evidence connecting questions that include physical acts. For example, “Did you remove that woman's panties?” and “Did you put your hand on that woman's breast?”

7.3 Inventory Shortage Questions

Consider the False Swearing issue in cases of inventory shortages. Examples of these are: “Did you lie about conducting an inventory on 11 May 9X” and “Did you lie about all of that property being stolen from that supply room?”.

7.4 Confirmatory Questions

In most confirmatory examinations the wording “Did you make up that story...?” is appropriate. However, if the suspect possibly embellished certain facts or circumstances, do not use the wording “Did you make up that story...?”. For example, an examinee may rationalize that he did not “make up the story” about his stereo equipment being stolen because portions of the equipment were in fact stolen. However, his stereo equipment may not have been stolen under the circumstances that he initially reported. Therefore, phraseology such as “Did you lie...?” or “Are you lying...?” is more specific and reduces the potential of a deceptive examinee rationalizing out of the question. In every instance, individual case facts dictate which type of confirmatory question is most appropriate.

7.5 Incorrect Answers to Relevant Questions

When an examinee answers a relevant question inappropriately with “yes” or answers inappropriately on a “yes” answer relevant question, this does not constitute an admission. The examinee’s attention may have drifted or he may not have understood the question, etc. If an examinee provides the “wrong” answer several times to a relevant question, suspend testing and offer the examinee an opportunity to explain their answers. A "yes" answer to any relevant question during a PDD examination will not be numerically evaluated during the test data analysis phase.

7.6 The use of the term “Knowingly” during Urinalysis Examinations

When formulating relevant test questions for a urinalysis examination, only use the term “knowingly” when the examinee provides an explanation for his/her positive urinalysis results. If the examinee fails to provide an explanation for his/her positive urinalysis results, do not formulate relevant questions that address the issue of “knowingly” possessing or using illicit drugs.

CHAPTER 8

PDD OPERATIONS

8.1 Standard Chart Markings

+ Yes
- No
T Talking
T---T Extended Talking
M Movement (unspecified)
M(arm) Movement (specified)
M---M Prolonged Movement
SZ Sneeze
SN Sniff
SI Sigh
C Cough
C---C Extended Cough
B Belch or Burp
R "Repeat the question..."
CT Clear Throat
L Laugh
L---L Extended Laugh
Y Yawn
SW Swallow
SP Asleep
SP-SP Extended Sleep
WU Wake-up
SM Smile
CP or CD Cuff Pain or Cuff Discomfort
CE Close Eyes
OE Open Eyes
X Begin Chart Run
XX End Chart Run
ADJ Adjustment (specify clearly)
OT Other Than...
TBK To the best of your knowledge
TBM To the best of your memory
BI Breathing Instructions
TI Talking Instructions
MI Movement Instructions
AI Answer Instructions
TDB Take Deep Breath Instruction
ISN Inside Noise
OSN Outside Noise
N Noise (unspecified)
N---N Extended Noise (specify)

PJ Paper Jam
EE Examiner Error (verbal)
WR Will Repeat the Question
E Examiner
S Subject
V Victim
I---I Other Instructions (specify)
PW or PWQ Poorly Worded Question
PS Pen Skip
IS Ink Skip
BPmm Beginning Cuff Pressure
EPmm Ending Cuff Pressure
K Knowledge or Know
DY Did you or Do you
DYK Did you know or Do you know
DYKW Do you know who
LQ Last Question
NQ Next Question
ZCT Zone Comparison Test
MGQT Modified General Question Test
GS General Series Test
R/I Peak of Tension Test
SPOT Searching Peak of Tension Test
GKT Guilty Knowledge Test
PK Prior Knowledge
EF Except For...
BS Besides...
SU Sensitivity Unit
CB Chest Breathing
SU+ Increase Sensitivity Units
SU- Decrease Sensitivity Units
SB Stomach Breathing
DB Deep Breath
M Manual Centering Mode
A Automatic Centering Mode
\\ Disregard
LA or LUA Cuff Location - Left Upper Arm
RA or RUA Cuff Location - Right Upper Arm
LFA Cuff Location - Left Forearm
RFA Cuff Location - Right Forearm
LW Cuff Location - Left Wrist
RW Cuff Location - Right Wrist
LL Cuff Location - Left Leg (thigh)
RL Cuff Location - Right Leg (thigh)
LC Cuff Location - Left Leg (calf)
RC Cuff Location - Right Leg (calf)

LA Cuff Location - Left Ankle
RA Cuff Location - Right Ankle
LT Transducer Location - Right Thumb
mm or mmHg Millimeters of Mercury

8.2 Axciton Calibration

Follow the guidance and procedures contained in the Axciton manual. Step-by-step procedures for calibration of the cardiograph component in the Axciton Windows version is listed under the “Tools” function on the “Give an Exam” screen. When components are moved, check the external sensor assemblies for leaks. PDD examiners are not required to record/insert the beginning cuff pressure listed on the sphygmomanometer on the polygrams.

8.3 Conducting an Examination

Establish tracing purity before asking a comparison or relevant question. Insert irrelevant questions when appropriate. Do not go out of operation immediately after the double Xs. Continue recording for a minimum of 20 seconds after the double Xs, then stop recording.

8.4 Axciton

Enter the correct time and date on your computer operating system. Place the gold-ended pneumograph component in the thoracic (CB) position on the examinee. Attach the green striped pneumograph tube to “Pneumo 1” on the sensor box. Enter the following information in each data field:

EXAMINEE: LAST, FIRST MI

EXAMINER: LAST

TAG 1: APPROVAL NUMBER

TAG 2: FILE NUMBER (ROI,SEQ,MPR...ie..9602312345)

Follow the procedure listed in the **Axciton Manual** for going into and out of operation. Record in the question list field for each examination a complete listing of all questions asked. On comparison questions place the letter “C” before the question number, i.e., “C4”. On relevant questions place the letter “R” before the question number. Place the letter “E” before the outside issue question i.e. “E8”. Examiners will maintain 20 to 25 second question spacing between the answer stim mark of the preceding question and the beginning stim mark of the following question. Each chart, to include the STIM test, will be saved

under the same file number for that series. Each subsequent series will be saved under a different file number. Save the individual files on the computer hard drive before initiating any additional testing on another examinee. At the examiner's discretion, print the charts either during the examination or after the examination. Submit a copy of the printed charts to QC along with the PDD report and allied documents.

8.5 Question Lists

A complete list of the questions utilized during each exam will be printed and placed on the left side of the polygraph file, under the charts collected during each series. Also, PDD examiners are reminded to sign all question lists prior to submission for QC review.

8.6 Purity

When a PDD examiner determines that a question(s) is unsuitable for numerical analysis due to the lack of purity (just prior to or during the asking of a question(s)), the examiner will record a "/" over the number "0" in the appropriate score sheet block to denote a lack of purity. Consequently, tracing(s) identified as exhibiting a lack of purity will not normally be evaluated during the test data analysis phase. Insert an irrelevant question if there is a lack of purity when appropriate.

8.7 Controlled Breathing

Controlled breathing is a common countermeasure. Avoid direct confrontation with the examinee about breathing distortions until all available non-confrontational remedies, such as: increasing the cardio cuff pressure, use of the SAT and/or ST, requiring the examinee to lean forward slightly, requiring the examinee to repeat the last word of each question before giving the answer, etc., are exhausted. Some anxious, truthful examinees exhibit distorted breathing patterns. If non-confrontational remedies fail, consider stronger confrontational measures.

8.8 GSR Response (off-screen)

When both the comparison and relevant GSR responses extend past the limits of the computer screen, the examiner will use the replay mode to reduce the units of sensitivity in the GSR before submitting the charts for QC review. Examiners will document all changes to original chart data in the Examiner Comments portion of the PDD Report.

8.9 Acquaintance Test

The acquaintance test will be administered by USACIDC examiners as the first test during a PDD examination. The acquaintance test is identified as a form of a known solution peak of tension test (POT) and is designed to familiarize the examinee with the PDD testing process. Upon completion of the acquaintance test, the PDD examiner is encouraged to review the test with the examinee to further demonstrate polygraph effectiveness. PDD examiners may not make any sensitivity changes during the acquaintance test after the first number has been asked. To increase the sensitivity at the key question or to decrease the degree of response after the key question is considered technical misconduct. To conduct the acquaintance test, PDD examiners will have the examinee select a number (the key) between a range of numbers (Example: between 3 and 8). The number selected by the examinee is referred to as the "key" number. The PDD examiner will pad the key number selected by the examinee with three numbers prior to

the key and two numbers after the key (Example: 3 - 4 - 5 - "6" - 7 - 8). The first question during the acquaintance test will be introduced by stating "Regarding the number you wrote", did you write the number (first pad number)? The examinee will be instructed to provide a "No" response to all questions on the acquaintance test. The acquaintance test will continue until all numbers have been introduced. The acquaintance test is not numerically evaluated. An example acquaintance test is provided below:

Q: Regarding the number you wrote, did you write the number 3?

A: No.

Q: Did you write the number 4?

A: No.

Q: Did you write the number 5?

A: No.

Q: Did you write the number 6? (key)

A: No.

Q: Did you write the number 7?

A: No.

Q: Did you write the number 8?

A: No.

8.10 Recording of Correct Time on Charts

Ensure that the time reflected on the Axciton charts is correct for the time zone in which the test is being conducted. This may be accomplished by either changing the computer clock time or by annotating the difference in Examiner Comments. In no instance should the time shown on the Rights Waiver, Consent Form or other PDD documents reflect a different time zone than that shown on the Axciton charts unless the difference is properly explained in the Examiner Comments.

EXAMPLE: The time reflected on the PDD charts is based on Eastern Standard Time (the time zone of the examiners home station), while the times shown throughout the report and allied documents reflect the local time zone where the test was conducted.

8.11 Physical/Emotional Status of Examinees

Ensure a potential examinee is both physically and emotionally fit for PDD testing. Normally this information should be obtained and evaluated during the pre-instrument phase of the examination and noted in the PDD Administrative Worksheet. Question examinees concerning their present physical state. Ascertain if female examinees are pregnant, and the stage of their pregnancy however, refrain from asking if they are "on their period" or menstruating. The below questions will elicit the same information. Examinees who take PDD examinations and subsequently make admissions or confessions will often allege they were unfit for testing, sick, tired, in pain or under the influence of medications, drugs or alcohol. Use questions such as:

... Are you in good health?

... Are you in any pain or discomfort?

- ... Are you presently under the care of or have you recently seen a medical professional for any physical or emotional problem?
- ... Are you presently taking a prescription or non-prescription medications or drugs?
- ... Are you pregnant?
- ... Do you have any respiratory or cardiovascular problems you are aware of?
- ... How many hours do you normally sleep each night?
- ... How many hours did you sleep last night?
- ... Did you consume any alcoholic beverages in the past 24 hours? How much?
- ... Are you experiencing any intermittent cramps, pains or aches as a result of any condition you haven't told me about?

8.12 Examinee Suitability

In those instances when the examinee is undergoing treatment by a medical or mental health professional, coordination with the attending medical or mental health professional is essential to evaluate the examinee's overall suitability and to obtain medical clearance to conduct PDD testing. This form of coordination is also necessary to ensure that PDD testing does not interfere with ongoing treatment efforts and to prevent PDD testing of an otherwise unsuitable examinee.

Psychological Suitability: Polygraph testing of an examinee receiving current, on-going treatment and/or prescribed medication by mental health professionals (psychiatrist, psychologist, mental health counselors or other mental health professionals) shall be discontinued or postponed until the examinee's attending mental health professional declares the individual suitable for PDD testing. Verbal authorization from the attending mental health professional is permitted, but should be the exception and not the rule. In instances where the examinee cites mental health related illnesses associated with severe depression or other severe illnesses, written authorization from the attending mental health professional is mandatory. Any questions concerning an examinee's psychological suitability for PDD testing must be addressed with the attending mental health professional and/or a CRC supervisor prior to PDD testing.

Physiological Suitability: Polygraph testing of an examinee being treated and/or prescribed medication by medical professionals (doctors, physician assistants, nurses, or other medical specialist) for significant injuries or illnesses shall be postponed until the examinee's attending medical professional declares the individual suitable for PDD testing. Verbal authorization from the attending medical health professional is permitted, but should be the exception and not the rule. In instances where the examinee cites severe medical illnesses, written authorization from the attending medical professional is mandatory. Any questions concerning an examinee's physiological suitability for PDD testing must be addressed with the attending medical professional and/or a CRC supervisor prior to PDD testing.

CHAPTER 9 COUNTERMEASURES

9.1 General

The use of countermeasures by examinees has increased in recent years, primarily due to information available over the Internet. Examiners are encouraged to incorporate non-confrontational instructions regarding cooperation during the pre-test portion of the PDD examination in an effort to discourage the use of countermeasures. Great care should be exercised not to over emphasize or heighten the examinee's awareness regarding the use of countermeasures.

Acoustic Countermeasure Devices (ACD) will be utilized to collect data via a fifth channel to the Axciton Instrument. The proper placement for the ACD cushion is resting on the polygraph chair, length-wise, running front to back. The minimal sensitivity setting necessary to obtain recognizable tracings will be utilized and fifth channel ACD tracings will be located at the bottom of the chart, so as not to interfere with cardiograph tracing visibility.

A function check of the ACD component will be conducted incident to instrument calibration. This check can be performed as a self-test and is not required to be recorded.

During the Instrument Explanation portion of the pre-test, the examinee will be informed of the ACD component as a device that is utilized to detect deliberate/CNS/skeletal muscle movements. This explanation will be presented in the same manner as that of the other components.

ACD responses, and other PDD component responses, will be evaluated in a manner to identify signatures, patterns, and timing of responses that are indicative of deliberate manipulations, or countermeasures.

Responses noted in the ACD component will be documented in the Examiner Comments and the Countermeasure Worksheet. Such responses will not be reflected on TDA Score Sheets or addressed in the Polygraph Report.

PDD examiners are discouraged from discussing any information pertaining to the use or identification of countermeasures or counter-countermeasures over the Internet. Requests for information concerning countermeasures should be directed to the Chief, Polygraph Division, USACRC, Ft. Belvoir, VA.

9.2 Documenting Suspected/Confirmed Countermeasures in PDD Reports

In an effort to simplify procedures for documenting suspected or confirmed countermeasures, the below listed changes have been incorporated into this manual:

a. Any PDD examination that contains suspected or confirmed countermeasures will not be evaluated as NDI.

b. The “Observations” section of the PDD report will no longer report whether the examinee was or was not cooperative.

c. In those instances where suspected or confirmed countermeasures were employed by the examinee that would preclude rendering a decision regarding the truthfulness of the examinee, the report will be written as a no opinion examination. Provided below is an example for documenting suspected or confirmed countermeasures in the PDD report, when a numerical evaluation results in a no opinion examination:

Observations: Unusual physiological/psychological reactions were observed during the examination, which resulted in the charts being unsuitable for numerical evaluation.

Examination’s Conclusions: An analysis of the polygrams collected determined that insufficient criteria

was present to form a conclusive decision regarding the truthfulness of the examinee.

d. In those instances where suspected or confirmed countermeasures were employed by the examinee, but resulted in a numerical evaluation of deception indicated (DI), the PDD report will reflect the examinee was practicing deception. Information addressing the use of countermeasures will be documented in the Examiner’s Comments and the Countermeasure Worksheet. Provided below is an example for documenting suspected or confirmed countermeasures in the PDD report, when a numerical evaluation results in a decision of deception indicated:

Observations: Unusual physiological/psychological reactions were observed during the examination, but sufficient data was present to conduct a numerical evaluation.

Examination’s Conclusions: An analysis of the polygrams collected determined the examinee was being deceptive when answering the relevant questions.

e. PDD reports will not directly list whether or not an examinee was noted as employing suspected or confirmed countermeasures. Instead, examiners will document suspected or confirmed countermeasures in the Examiner’s Comments and by completing a [countermeasure worksheet](#).

Examples for documenting suspected or confirmed countermeasures in Examiner’s Comments:

(Example 1): Throughout Series I and II, numerous responses were observed to the comparison questions that appear to be deliberate manipulations. The frequency and similarity of the responses, which occurred throughout the examination is highly atypical of responses generally observed. As such, the responses appeared to have been manufactured by the examinee.

(Example 2): Throughout this examination numerous responses were observed to the comparison questions that appear to be the result of deliberate manipulation in the pneumograph (breathing) tracings. The frequency and similarity of these responses are highly atypical of responses generally observed during PDD testing. As such, there are strong indications the examinee was employing countermeasures.

(Example 3): A review of the respiratory tracings concluded the examinee deliberately manipulated his/her breathing to the extent that the charts were unsuitable for numerical evaluation. A normal respiratory tracing consist of inhalation and exhalation cycles at a rate of 13 to 18 cycles per a minute. During this examination, the examinee was breathing at a ratio of 2 cycles per a minute. As such, there are strong indications the examinee was employing countermeasures.

(Example 4)(In addition to other observations): A review of the ACD component tracings found responses/significant responses that appear deliberate, timely, and restricted to comparison/irrelevant questions. As such, there are strong indications the examinee was employing physical countermeasures.

f. In those PDD examinations determined to be No Opinion due to suspected or confirmed countermeasures, a numerical score sheet will not be prepared or submitted with the PDD file.

**CHAPTER 10
PDD REPORTS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS**

10.1 Case Administration

Submit all standard forms in accordance with current policy. In addition, download each PDD examination to a diskette using the “Pack the Session” function on the Windows Axciton Tool Bar. Verify the desired examination is listed in the screen display when backup is selected. Include the diskette in the PDD package submitted to Quality Control. Place the following information on a label attached to the diskette:

NAME: APPROVAL#: YY-XXXX

Do not delete the examination from your computer hard drive until receipt of a resolved QC message. Upon receipt of the “resolved” message, delete the examination from your hard drive. Upon receipt of a resolved QC message, provide a copy of the PDD Examination Report to the requesting office in accordance with appropriate regulatory guidance.

10.2 PDD Examination Folder

Submit all PDD examinations in a “Criminal Investigation Report” file folder to Quality Control Division. Mark the folder with a bold diagonal line across the front of the folder starting at the upper left corner and extending to the lower right corner of the folder. In large letters, write the word POLYGRAPH along that line. Organize the folder in the following manner (top to bottom):

LEFT SIDE:

Polygrams stapled to top edge
on the disk,
Questions list (signed)

RIGHT SIDE:

Floppy Diskette (Examinee’s Name and Approval
placed inside a business envelope)
Intern Report (if applicable)
PDD Report
PDD Admin worksheet
Examiner Comments
DA Form 3881 (copy)
DA Form 2801 (original)
Juvenile Consent Form (if applicable)
CID Form 98/99
DA Form 2823 (copy if applicable)
Countermeasures Worksheet (if applicable)

On the right edge of the folder write in black “felt tip ink” the following information:
LAST, FIRST, MI LAST NAME/AGENT SEQ# ROI/SEQ/MPR/OFF
CODE (Examinee) (Examiner)

10.3 Investigative Summary

Frequently facts change between the time of the examination and the writing of the PDD Examination report. Verify that the investigative summary of the PDD Examination Report covers the entire salient issues and pertinent facts known at the time of the examination. Report the date(s) of the offense(s) and list the age of juveniles, regardless of their status as a victim, witness or suspect. Support each relevant question with information in the Investigative Summary. The Investigative Summary should “stand by itself” and not pose procedural dilemmas or questions in the mind of the reader. Remember, the PDD Examination Report is an independent report and may be read by someone who is not able to reference the Report of Investigation or Military Police Report.

10.4 Observations:

The “Observations” section of the PDD report will contain the statement “Unusual physiological/psychological reactions were/were not observed during this examination. **See Paragraph 9.2 for documenting suspected/confirmed countermeasures.**

10.5 Report Numbers

The majority of PDD testing support relates to felony crime. In most instances a ROI has been initiated in reference to polygraph testing issues. Notify the Polygraph Division if an investigation becomes a ROI and the PDD Report was already forwarded reflecting another reference number. Place the ROI number of the requesting office on the PDD Examination Report (in instances of a RFA), instead of the Sequence Number assigned by the responding office. The PDD technique should not be used as a screening method to determine whether a ROI number is to be assigned to an investigation. The PDD process is a logical step in the investigative process, not the initial step in that process.

10.6 Documenting Polygraph Results in CID Reports

USACIDC PDD examiners should conduct training and advise CID personnel on the proper procedures for documenting polygraph related information in CID reports and allied documents. Documenting polygraph information in USACIDC reports is outlined in **CIDR 195-1, paragraph 5-34.**

a. Polygraph Memorandum: CID agents may report polygraph declination information on a Polygraph Memorandum IAW the provisions of CIDR 195-1.

b. Limitations on the recording of polygraph results in CID reports: Polygraph examination results (Deception Indicated, No Deception Indicated or No Opinion) may not be recorded in the narrative portion of Initial Reports, Status Reports, or in the Final ROI. The results of a polygraph examination will be documented in the Polygraph Examination Report prepared by the examiner, and released once polygraph quality control review reflecting a satisfactory examination has been accomplished.

c. Polygraph Documents as Exhibits to the Final ROI: IAW the provisions of CIDR 195-1, the Polygraph Examination Report will be an attached exhibit to the USACRC, USACIDC major subordinate command, action commander, and unit file copies of the final ROI, again, once polygraph quality control review reflecting a satisfactory examination has been accomplished. See Example below:

EXHIBITS:

Attached:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
5. Polygraph Examination Report, SGT SMITH, 29 May 99.

Not Attached:

On file at USACRC:

6. Polygraph Examination Authorization, SGT SMITH, 28 May 99.
7. Polygraph Examination Statement of Consent, SGT SMITH, 29 May 99.
8. (1-4) Polygrams, SGT SMITH, 29 May 99.

d. Polygraph Testing on a Closed CID ROI: In some instances polygraph support may be requested after the final CID report has been completed. In those instances, the CID ROI will be re-opened and a Supplemental Report will be prepared. Upon completion of polygraph testing, a 2nd Supplemental Report will be prepared and the results of the interview(s), polygraph report(s), polygrams collected, etc, will be listed as added attached exhibits to the supplemental report.

10.7 Foreign Language Examinations

Examiners must ensure that questions utilized during foreign language examinations have been properly translated and the intent of the questions are clear. The interpreter/translator should read back the questions in English with the examiner and the specific meaning of each question discussed. Forward all foreign language documents and questions generated during an examination to this center with the PDD folder.

10.8 Coordination with Supervisors

Document in the Examiner Comments section any supervisor approval to use non-standard testing protocol or any other advice regarding the administration of a particular PDD examination which has a bearing on the examination results or testing technique.

10.9 Requests for PDD Documentation

Although the PDD Examination Report is releasable under the provisions of **AR 195-6**, PDD charts and technical documents are protected from routine release under Section 552, Title 5, United States Code and DOD Directives. All requests for the release of PDD charts and technical documents will be directed to the Polygraph Division, USACRC. For further release information see **AR 195-6, paragraph 2.9** and **CIDR 195-28, paragraph 3.9**.

10.10 Document Requests from Individuals

Have examinees and other individuals submit their request for PDD documentation to: Director, USACRC, ATTN: CICR-FP, 6010 6th Street, Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060. Refer to CIDR 195-1, for further information.

10.11 Congressional Inquires

For purposes of speed and uniformity, coordinate immediately with the Polygraph Division upon receipt of any congressional inquiries regarding PDD examinations.

10.12 PDD Reports Involving Multiple Examiners

An examiner should make every effort to complete any polygraph examination they initiate. When it is necessary for a second examiner to be tasked with conducting additional testing to complete an examination, the initial examiner will document this necessity in the Examiner Comments portion of his/her report. The information provided below addresses the proper method to document instances when multiple examiners are involved in testing the same examinee, under the same authorization number.

If additional testing is required and cannot be completed by the initial examiner of record, coordination will be made with the assisting examiner. The initial examiner will provide the assisting examiner with all information regarding the first exam, to include a copy of the PDD Report. The initial examiner will not submit his/her report for QC review until it is determined that the examinee has either declined or actually participated in additional testing. This delay will be documented in the Examiner Comments.

Should the assisting examiner determine that the examinee has declined additional testing, the initial examiner will complete his/her report by documenting the examinee's declination and forwarding the report to USACRC (Example Below):

EXAMINER'S CONCLUSIONS: During the pre-instrument phase, SMITH made no comments or statements contrary to those previously provided.

An analysis of the polygrams collected during Series I determined that insufficient criteria was present to form a conclusive decision regarding the truthfulness of SMITH. Additional testing was deemed necessary, to which the examinee consented.

On 14 Sep 04, SMITH declined to participate in any additional polygraph testing.
Note - Should additional testing be conducted by the assisting examiner, his/her report will be a continuation of the first report provided by the initial examiner. Once completed, the report will be forwarded to USACRC (See Examples Below).

Initial Examiner Example:

EXAMINER'S CONCLUSIONS: During the pre-instrument phase, SMITH made no comments or statements contrary to those previously provided.

An analysis of the polygrams collected during Series I, determined that insufficient criteria was present to form a conclusive decision regarding the truthfulness of SMITH. Additional testing was deemed necessary, to which the examinee consented.

On 14 Sep 04, SMITH participated in additional polygraph testing conducted by SA Norman Lafayette.

Assisting Examiner Example:

EXAMINER'S CONCLUSIONS: During the pre-instrument phase, SMITH made no comments or statements contrary to those previously provided.

An analysis of the polygrams collected during Series I on 12 Sep 04 by SA B.C. Davenport determined that insufficient criteria was present to form a conclusive decision regarding the truthfulness of SMITH. Additional testing was deemed necessary, to which the examinee consented.

An analysis of the polygrams collected during Series II on 14 Sep 04 by SA Norman Lafayette determined that SMITH was not being deceptive when answering the relevant questions.

Note - The assisting examiner's report will be further revised by listing both dates of testing and the exhibits section will list the total number of polygrams collected. Furthermore, the Instrumentation and Observations sections will be revised as follows:

INSTRUMENTATION: Series I of this examination was conducted using an Axciton computerized polygraph instrument, SN: 0001, last calibrated on the date of the examination.

Series II of this examination was conducted using an Axciton computerized polygraph instrument, SN: 0002, last calibrated on the date of the examination.

OBSERVATIONS: Unusual physiological/psychological reactions were not observed during these examinations.

Note - Only the PDD Examination Report reflecting all PDD testing and final opinion(s) will be provided to the office requesting the examination.

CHAPTER 11 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

11.1 PDD Examination Requests

- a. PDD requests which are submitted on criminal offenses within CID purview must contain a USACIDC ROI (See 195-1, Para 5-34g). In those instances when a USACIDC ROI is pending administrative review and dispatch of the Initial/Status or other message, the PDD request will simply list the ROI number as “pending”.
- b. Polygraph requests in which previous PDD exams were conducted will be addressed in sections G and H as appropriate. Additionally, examiners must address No Opinion and DI results by listing whether or not the examinee made admissions/confession, denied the offense(s), and/or declined additional PDD testing. The request will also reflect whether or not the QC review of previously conducted exams are pending or have been completed satisfactorily.
- c. Requests to conduct polygraph examinations will routinely be provided to the Polygraph Division by email. This will enable the Polygraph Division to track requests more efficiently and reduce the problems associated with faxed requests.

11.2 Submission of Polygraph Requests on Request for Assistance (RFA’s)

Frequently, examiners are required to conduct polygraph examinations on RFA’s submitted by other CID offices. Unfortunately, many of these RFA’s do not include all of the information necessary to prepare a thorough polygraph request. Examiners must ensure they review all pertinent documentation (Statements, AIR’s, etc) and ascertain whether or not previous exams were conducted, prior to submitting a polygraph request. This information is essential to ensure proper test question construction and to aid in the conduct of a subsequent post-test interview if necessary.

11.3 Polygraph Declinations

In those instances where a polygraph approval has been issued and the examinee declines polygraph testing, the examiner must provide a short email message to the Polygraph Division documenting the examinee’s declination to undergo polygraph testing. The message should include the following: Examinee’s Name, the approval number, the approval date, and the date the examinee declined testing.

11.4 Offense Codes

Polygraph examination requests and reports should list the primary offense code cited in the USACIDC ROI. Example: If the USACIDC ROI is initiated after a rape complaint, polygraph requests should cite the primary offense code as “6E1”. This would also apply when submitting requests to conduct PDD testing of alleged victims.

11.5 Confessions and Admissions

To qualify as a confession or admission, the examinee's statement must be an admission against his/her self-interest and is a positive acknowledgment of guilt that is related to the matter in which he/she is being examined. This could include a legitimate admission to a secondary area of a case related issue to which the examinee originally professed no knowledge. It should not be merely a mistaken statement about some minor aspect of the case or some slight alteration of the details or circumstances surrounding the incident under investigation. Admissions relating to other offenses which the examinee may admit to during the pre or post instrument interrogation will not be considered a confession or admission since they do not relate to the issue on which the subject was examined.

A confession is defined as complete acknowledgement of guilt. Anything less than a complete confession is an admission. Examiners should take care when using the term "confession" in a report, which does not reflect complete acknowledgement of guilt. **(CIDR 195-28, Appendix D)**

11.6 Gold Star Examinations

Gold star recognition is used by QC personnel to recognize examiner efforts that result in the successful resolution of highly sensitive or complex issues. These include confessions, and in some cases NDI examinations, which result in the resolution of sensitive issues. Every examination received by USACRC is screened as a potential Gold Star test. Some examples of potential Gold Star examinations include the following: a PDD examination which results in the recovery of private or government property, a PDD examination which results in a confession from a sex offender, arsonist, or someone involved in multiple crimes. Examiners are encouraged to contact the Polygraph Division with any questions concerning potential Gold Star examinations.

11.7 Reporting PDD Results

As provided in CIDR 195-1, para 5-34o(1), a Polygraph Examination Report will be utilized to report the results of polygraph examinations and will be an attached exhibit to the USACRC, USACIDC major subordinate command, action commander, and unit file copies of the final ROI, once a satisfactory polygraph quality control review has been accomplished. PDD results will not be recorded in other CID correspondence. Examiners are encouraged to discuss this matter with their supported offices and implement the necessary training to familiarize field agents with the proper procedures to disseminate polygraph information and documentation.

11.8 PDD Reports Attached as Exhibits to USACIDC ROI's

IAW AR 195-6, para 2-6, b(1), copies of the Polygraph Examination Report which are attached as exhibits to Reports of Investigation must contain the following:

Attached as Exhibit _____ is a Polygraph Examination Report. This exhibit will be destroyed not later than 3 months after the date of the report of investigation (AR 195-6, para 2-6b). The original, to include related polygraph records is at the U.S. Army Crime records Center, 6010 Sixth Street, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060. Reproduction of this exhibit or its contents is prohibited.

11.9 Recording PDD Examinations

Periodically, PDD examiners will be directed to record the pre-test interview portion of a selected PDD examination (IAW CIDR 195-28, para 3-6(b)). These tape recordings provide the opportunity for positive recommendations and to ensure field examiners are adhering to current PDD pre-test policies and procedures. Upon being directed by USACRC to audio/video tape a pre-test interview, PDD examiners are encouraged to review CIDR 195-28, para 3-6. Also, PDD examiners are reminded that current regulations require the examinee be advised the interview will be recorded and they must consent to the taped interview. CIDR 195-28, para 3-6(d) outlines the procedures for marking the tape and documenting the taped interview in the PDD Examiner Comments.

11.10 Examiner Technical Proficiency

The provisions of CIDR 195-28 address examiner responsibilities (paragraph 4-4) and technical misconduct (paragraph 4-5). One essential component addressed under the heading of technical misconduct is failure to maintain adequate technical proficiency (paragraph 4-5(6)). The information provided below is intended to further address the requirements for PDD examiners to maintain adequate technical proficiency as a USACIDC examiner.

- a. Polygraph is a highly technical field, which requires strict adherence to PDD policies and procedures. Examiner technical proficiency includes all aspects of the PDD process. This includes PDD requests, reports and forms, and the administration of a professional PDD examination.
- b. Polygraph Quality Control (QC) supervisors are responsible for monitoring and evaluating the technical proficiency of each examiner. In those instances when examiners fail to maintain adequate technical proficiency, the provisions of CIDR 195-28, paragraph 4-5 will apply. At the discretion of the Chief, Polygraph Division, examiners that fail to maintain adequate technical proficiency will receive a memorandum citing the deficiencies and the corrective action required. Significant discrepancies which may result in the preparation of a technical proficiency memorandum may include: repetitive/major errors, failure to follow QC technical guidance, inadequate polygraph utilization IAW DOD and CID policies and technical/ethical misconduct as cited in CIDR 195-28 (paragraph 4-5). Memorandum addressing instances of technical misconduct/technical proficiency will be provided to the examiner of record and a copy retained in the corresponding examiner's performance file.

11.11 Updating Polygraph Authorizations Over 30 Days

When a polygraph examination is to be conducted beyond 30 days of the authorization, examiners will obtain an updated authorization from CRC prior to testing. This updated authorization may be obtained telephonically or through email. The date the updated authorization was obtained will replace the original authorization date and be reflected in the PDD Report with the authorization number, which will remain the same.

CHAPTER 12

OTHER GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

12.1 Initial Quality Control Review

a. All PDD charts received from examiners in the field will be reviewed by at least one Quality Control Supervisor, or more if necessary, for the purpose of making a determination of "Deception," "No Deception Indicated," or "No Opinion." In the event reviews by the supervisors reveal discrepancies which cannot be resolved, the PDD charts will be referred to the Chief, Polygraph Division, or Director, CRC, for review. The results of these reviews will be utilized to advise the examiner of remedial action.

b. All PDD charts and allied documents to include the PDD Examination Statement of Consent (DA Form 2801), PDD Examination Report, PDD Examination Authorization Message, Rights Warning Procedure/Waiver Certificate (DA Form 3881), PDD Admin Worksheet, and numerical evaluation forms received from field examiners will be processed by the Polygraph Program Assistant (PPA). The PPA will enter receipt of the examination in the automated data processing log.

c. The PPA will sort the PDD reports received, separating initial reports from those previously returned for correction or re-examination. The PPA is responsible for ensuring the PDD folder contains all required documents, computer media, allied charts and is properly identified.

d. In those instances in which reports have been previously returned for correction or re-examination, the PPA will check the Polygraph Division suspense file and place the file suspense with the report received in the mail. The PPA will prepare a new data processing sheet and follow steps outlined below.

e. Initial reports will be checked by the PPA for a Report of Investigation (ROI) number, and a data processing sheet will be prepared. Examinations that have no ROI number will be assigned an in house Cross-Reference number. All documents on the right side of the folder will be covered with the data processing sheet. The PDD folder will be placed in the initial review box.

f. A blind analysis of the PDD charts will then be conducted by a QC Supervisor. During a review of the polygrams, the QC supervisor will review the chart patterns, chart markings, question sequence/spacing and conduct an in the blind numeric evaluation of the polygrams, without preparing a numerical analysis data sheet.

g. If the QC Supervisor evaluates the polygrams (in the blind) as NDI or DI and this decision agrees with the examiner of record, the charts will be annotated with an OK/1, the date and the QC Supervisor's initials. A Score Sheet will be not be prepared.

h. If the QC Supervisor evaluates the polygrams (in the blind) as No Opinion, the QC Supervisor will not review the decision provided by the examiner of record. Instead, the

QC Supervisor will numerically evaluate the polygrams and prepare a score sheet prior to reviewing the decision provided by the examiner of record. Consequently, if the QC Supervisor's numerical evaluation agrees with the decision provided by the examiner of record, the polygrams will be annotated with an OK/2, the date and the QC Supervisor's initials. The QC Supervisor's score sheet will be included in the PDD file folder.

i. If the QC Supervisor evaluates the polygrams (in the blind) and the decision differs from the examiner of record, a score sheet will be prepared and the polygrams will be evaluated by a second QC Supervisor (in the blind). If both QC Supervisors disagree with the examiner of record, the polygrams will be annotated X/2, the date and the QC Supervisors' initials, and both score sheets included in the file folder. Discrepancies identified by QC Supervisors will be reviewed by the Chief, Polygraph Division and/or the Director, USACRC, prior to returning a PDD examination to the examiner of record.

j. If the two QC Supervisor reviews are not in agreement, the examination will be referred to Chief, Polygraph Division or Director, USACRC, for a final blind review and decision.

k. Quality control review of PDD examinations require the diskette to be checked to ensure that it contains all related files for the PDD examination in question and will be viewed in replay mode to ensure that the files function properly.

l. The below items will be evaluated, to include, the PDD report and other required documentation to ensure that the polygraph examiner has complied with AR 195-6, CIDR 195-28 and this manual:

- (1) Pre-instrument interview
- (2) Test construction
- (3) Question construction
- (4) Instrumentation, to include chart patterns, chart markings, and time spacing between questions
- (5) Overall post-instrument interrogation
- (6) Length of examination
- (7) Timeliness in the conduct of the examination after approval by an authorizing representative
- (8) Timeliness in transmitting the PDD Examination Reports and charts to CRC.

m. Upon determining that all parts of the examination are satisfactory, the reviewer will check and initial the satisfactory block on the data processing sheet. The examination will then be returned to the PPA for preparation of a QC review message. In the case of computerized PDD charts, the PPA will compress the PDD chart files into one file named for the approval number of the examination and place that file on the storage system computer for subsequent CD ROM storage. Once stored, the floppy diskette may be erased and re-issued to the field.

n. In those instances that the PDD examination does not meet the standards of USACIDC, the QC

Supervisor will prepare a QC review sheet which is maintained in the PDD case folder, annotate on the data processing sheet the corresponding paragraph number in which the deficiencies occurred and identify which unsatisfactory message will be prepared by the PPA. The examination will then be forwarded to the PPA for preparation of the appropriate electrical message denoting the review of PDD examination. In the event of administrative errors, a worksheet with necessary corrective actions will be completed and placed in the polygraph file. Upon successful completion of the corrective actions the worksheet will be maintained in the individual examiner's file.

o. All electrical messages concerning examinations returned for re-examination/rewrite of the report will be approved and signed by the Director, CRC, or, in his absence, the Chief, Polygraph Division.

p. Once signed, the PPA will process the documentation for proper distribution to the field. In those instances in which all portions of the examination are satisfactory, the appropriate electrical message will be transmitted to the field examiner and upon receipt, the field examiner will provide the supported Army element with a copy of the PDD Report. A copy of the electrical message will be retained in the examination file.

q. Should it be necessary to return the PDD Report or other PDD forms for administrative corrections, the examiner will be notified by electrical or telephonic message with instructions to correct the deficiencies and return the corrected "original(s)", to CRC for file. The initially received documents will be retained at the Polygraph Division and will be marked "Void" upon receipt of the corrected original(s). PDD Supervisors will prepare a QC Assistance Data Sheet (QC ADS) to document administrative returns. The QC ADS will remain in the PDD file until the report has been corrected by the examiner of record. The PPA will then file the QC ADS in the appropriate examiner performance file.

r. Should a re-examination be necessary, the examiner of record will be advised by electrical message. All original PDD documents and charts will be retained at the Polygraph Division, CRC.

s. Upon completion of the data processing, the PDD file will be maintained on file within the Polygraph Division, by the PPA, pending final review (ROI cases only).

12.2 Final Quality Control Review

1. Upon receipt of a Final ROI by the Case Processing Branch (CPB), CRC, in which PDD examination(s) were conducted, the Chief, CPB will route those ROI's to the Polygraph Division prior to being placed on file.

2. The PPA will withdraw the PDD file retained in the Polygraph Division and attach it to the ROI for final review by a QC Supervisor. All PDD files will be reviewed by the PPA to assure the correct ROI

number is reflected on the examination, and make changes as appropriate. This review will consist of, but not be limited to, all PDD documentation of both the PDD and ROI files to determine whether the PDD documentation has been properly completed and is present, and that the appropriate PDD data and investigation results are reflected in the ROI. The reviewer will then annotate and initial a data processing sheet, and return the data sheet to the PPA for data reduction. The ROI and PDD file will then be forwarded to the Records Maintenance Branch. In the event all documentation has not been received or the documentation has not been processed, the QC Supervisor will effect retrieval of missing documentation as appropriate. This review of the ROI must also verify that the results of/refusal to consent to polygraph testing is not listed in AIR's or the narrative of the report. If errors are noted corrective action must be taken by CPB.

3. A final review will be conducted of PDD files relating to military police investigations when received. Final review data processing sheets of Military Police Reports shall also be provided to the PPA for data reduction at the time of review.

4. In instances where the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS), Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI) or another Federal agency conducts a PDD examination for USACIDC, a PDD report may be received from that agency. A review is conducted in these instances; however, no data processing sheet is initiated.

5. PDD material will be filed separate from Report(s) of Investigation or Military Police Reports, as required by AR 195-6.

6. The following is a guide for processing PDD examinations with their respective final Reports of Investigation (ROIs) and Military Police Reports (MPRs). This process is termed "finalization" of the PDD file. This is essential to verify the information appearing within the PDD report(s) to assure the PDD data base reflects true and accurate information.

a. Initially, review the ROI/MPR to determine the total number of PDD examinations administered in that investigation. To identify all examinations, a review of every DA Form 3881, Rights Warning Procedure/Waiver Certificate, is necessary, as not all reports will contain PDD administrative data. This review will identify those examinations wherein PDD charts were not collected, but credit was given for PDD examinations.

b. Remove the CID HQS Form 473, Polygraph Statistical Data Sheet, from each PDD file. Verify the examinee's name, the report name, the offense code, and examination results appearing on this form against the information reflected in the ROI/MPR. Mark the Data Sheet with any corrections. When a discrepancy exists between the ROI/MPR and the PDD file, appropriate actions are required to correct them. This will ensure that the USACRC database does not conflict with the PDD database. In those instances where a PDD file is a cross-reference number only, the data sheet will be annotated to reflect the date of the final review. The file will be reviewed to verify that all PDD documentation is present.

c. Review the PDD Report, and ensure that any pre/post test admissions/confessions are accurately reflected on the Data Sheet. Whenever a doubt exists to apply a pre/post test admissions/confession, coordination with the Chief, Polygraph Division, will be made to resolve those issues.

d. Review the ROI/MPR and compare the PDD results with the synopsis of the report as to whether probable cause existed to believe the examinee committed the offense(s) under investigation. When the examinee is shown in the PDD report as Deception Indicated (DI), and it is reported that probable cause existed to believe that the examinee committed the offense(s) under investigation, that test is considered to be "Confirmed" and the "Confirmed" block marked. Utilize the same procedure for DI results when victims are tested, and the ROI/MPR is annotated as "Unfounded". Whenever the examinee is listed as DI and the investigative report does not reflect probable cause to believe the subject committed the offense(s) under investigation, review the ROI/MPR to determine the rationale for this decision. Usually, this information will be found within that section of the ROI/MPR, which details Staff Judge Advocate coordination. If the examinee is determined to be "No Deception Indicated" (NDI), review the ROI/MPR to ascertain if a subject other than the examinee was identified as the perpetrator of the offense(s). If the subject(s), other than the examinee was identified as the perpetrator(s) the examination may be considered and recorded as a "Confirmed" NDI test, provided the below listed conditions are met:

- (1) the subject(s) identified are listed as such in the MPR/CID report and
- (2) the results of the investigation have concluded that the identified subject(s) acted alone and no remaining suspect(s)/subject(s) exist and
- (3) the investigation has confirmed the involvement of identified subject(s) by physical and/or testimonial evidence (confession) and
- (4) the investigation has by physical and/or testimonial evidence eliminated the examinee as having any knowledge in the cited investigation. Utilize the same procedure if the ROI/MPR is determined to be "Unfounded".

e. Normally, whenever the PDD data sheet reflects "No Opinion" or "Inconclusive" test results, these blocks are not changed during the final review process. The only time they can be changed would be to properly reflect whether the examinee or the examiner terminated the examination (see paragraph D-4(s), CIDR 195-28, Criminal Investigation Polygraph Activities, for further details).

f. Review the property value sections to insure that it coincides with the information appearing with the ROI/MPR. If these blocks are blank and the examination results are DI, fill in these blocks with the correct property value. This information is normally identified on the CID Form 17, CID Report Management Data Worksheet, which appears as the bottom document on the right side of the ROI folder.

g. Cross through the Date of Review block and write the date the PDD file was finalized.

- h. Provide the data sheet to the PPA for updating of the PDD database.
- i. On the right margin of the polygraph file folder mark the ROI/MPR number as it appears on the respective file. Mark the CID HQ Form 470, Case Notice and Retention Control, with the date PDD file(s) were finalized (along with the reviewing official's initials). The ROI/MPR and PDD file folder should then be submitted to the Records Maintenance Branch for filing.
- j. In some cases where an external agency conducts a PDD test in conjunction with a ROI, the ROI/MPR file will still be reviewed. A data processing sheet will not be prepared in these instances.
- k. If the examination results are NDI and there was a determination of probable cause to believe the examinee committed the offense(s) under investigation, review the ROI/MPR to determine the offenses for which the examinee was listed and the rationale for this decision. Whenever a conflict exists between the ROI/MPR and the PDD file, the Chief, Polygraph Division, will be notified.

12.3 EMAIL/FAX Quality Control Reviews

QC review of charts by e-mail/FAX will not be conducted on routine examinations. E-Mail/FAX QC reviews are authorized in exceptional cases involving sensitive issues, five-day finals, or in some instances involving TDY (to avoid unnecessary expenses). E-Mail/FAX QC will not be utilized to circumvent existing QC procedures.

12.4 Examiner Dress and Appearance

- a. PDD examiners are expected to dress in appropriate business attire when conducting PDD examinations.
- b. Appropriate attire is defined in CID Regulation 195-1 as: "Civilian clothing worn by special agents will be in good taste and commensurate with clothing worn by the business or law enforcement sector of the community in the area in which they are operating or as dictated by the specific investigative duties which they are assigned." PDD examiners must ensure that their attire is appropriate for the duties to be performed and suited to the prevailing climatic conditions. PDD examiners will adhere to the personal appearance and grooming standards of AR 670-1.
- c. Male PDD examiners are expected to wear an appropriate dress shirt, necktie and dress trousers when conducting PDD examinations. Sports coats, or suit coats may be removed at the discretion of the examiner as appropriate. Female PDD examiners are expected to wear appropriate business attire when conducting examinations. Sports clothing, casual "jeans", sweatpants or other inappropriate leisure clothing should not be worn during the conduct of PDD examinations. When PDD examiners do not have a PDD examination scheduled for a duty day, their office attire should be commensurate with the dress code of the office to which they are assigned.

12.5 Examiner Conduct

PDD examiners represent the CID polygraph program. Inappropriate conduct adversely reflects on all other PDD examiners and the program. PDD examiners will conduct themselves as professionals at all times. The following list includes but is not limited to those areas of particular importance to the expected conduct of PDD examiners: PDD examiners will:

- a. Report for duty and remain at duty commensurate with normal office duty hours unless in a TDY, training, pass, or leave status. Coordinate other absences from the duty location through a supervisor.
- b. Keep themselves available to agents, investigators, commanders, trial and defense attorneys and others desiring polygraph support.
- c. Participate in unit training when such training does not interfere with the administration of PDD duties. Schedule PDD duties to prevent such interference when possible.
- d. Maintain the condition of the PDD office, suite and equipment appropriately to reflect a professional environment.
- e. Follow all rules and procedures established for other agents within the District/Group.

12.6 Statistics

The CID PDD program maintains statistics and conducts statistical analysis of polygraph activities for each PDD examiner, CID office, District and Group/Region. PDD utilization statistics are provided to Group/Region commanders, through the PDD group supervisor on a quarterly basis. Additionally, the Polygraph Division provides a statistical summary of PDD activities to the Under Secretary of Defense, Command Control and Investigations on an annual basis in accordance with DOD directives and regulations.

12.7 Group Supervisor Responsibilities

Group supervisors perform both a staff and operational mission. In their staff role, they are the advisor to the Group/Region Commander and staff in all matters involving PDD utilization. Operationally, they are the senior PDD examiner responsible for operational supervision of the assigned Group/Region PDD examiners. This supervision includes, but is not limited to:

- (1) Scheduling of PDD examinations.
- (2) Coordinating TDY orders for PDD examiners.
- (3) Arranging for and/or monitoring the internship of PDD examiners.
- (4) Coordinating for and acquiring required vehicle and equipment needs (except for PDD

instruments/equipment).

- (5) Rating of PDD examiners and coordination of PDD examiner OER support forms.
- (6) Forecasting training funds for PDD required training.
- (7) Coordinating and scheduling pass and leaves of PDD examiners.
- (8) Review of PDD examiner workload and performance based on QC results.
- (9) Group supervisors should be available to all assigned examiners and the staff during both normal and non-duty hours, via telephone or pager. Supervisors should appoint a senior examiner from the Group/Region as acting supervisor during scheduled leave or passes.

**APPENDIX A
POLICY LETTER - PREMATURE PDD REQUESTS**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
UNITED STATES ARMY CRIME RECORDS CENTER
UNITED STATES ARMY CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION COMMAND
6010 6TH STREET, FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060**

CICR-PD
6 June 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR ALL USACIDC FORENSIC PYSCHOPHYSIOLOGICAL
DETECTION OF
DECEPTION (PDD) EXAMINERS

SUBJECT: Premature PDD Examination Requests

1. Recently, several incidents have occurred in which the requests for PDD examinations have been made prematurely. These generally involved high priority "command interest" investigations in which there was great "pressure" to solve the case quickly.
2. Through the years, PDD has established itself as an invaluable investigative aid. This has been accomplished only through appropriate application of the technique in combination with thorough investigations. Of concern to this center is that, in today's climate of diminishing resources, there appears to be an increased tendency to request PDD testing primarily as a means to expedite the investigative process. These requests do not adequately take into consideration the complexities of the PDD technique or potential adverse results of such testing.
3. The success of the PDD technique is dependent upon knowledge of the elements of the crime and other investigative details known at the time of testing (see para 2-1a(3), AR 195-6 Department of the Army Polygraph Activities). Elements of a crime and verifiable investigative details, which have not been verified through investigation, increase the probability that inaccurate details will be viewed as fact. Application of the PDD based on inaccurate investigative details can cause invalid and/or inaccurate/inconclusive test results. Further, the ability to resolve the causes for physiological reactions normally indicative of an individual practicing deception is inhibited when the examiner has inaccurate

information or does not have all available case facts. Even more important is that generally PDD testing will be the last occasion investigators will have unrestricted access to a suspect determined to be practicing deception.

4. In addition to needing verified investigative details, the PDD examination must have a comprehensive determination of the examinees suitability for testing. As an example, in highly charged investigations such as murder, PDD testing should not be requested of a suspected family member or close associate until sometime after the funeral of the deceased. This allows for a period of mourning that should help reduce the extreme emotional stress associated with such events (see para 3-3, CIDR 195-28, Polygraph Activities). This time also provides the opportunity to develop and corroborate case facts as detailed in para 3 above. Finally, conducting an examination immediately following lengthy interrogation should also not occur.

5. Another problem area being experienced in regards to incomplete investigative information for PDD examinations are Requests for Assistance (RFA). With advances in technology, RFAs containing requests for PDD testing are routinely received by E-Mail. The transmission of investigative details in the narrative form used in these RFAs has created several difficulties. Information significant to PDD testing may be omitted in this abbreviated format. Additionally, uncorroborated information may be inadvertently presented as fact. Although the use of E-Mail for RFAs is an excellent use of resources, PDD requests should include copies of case documentation such as statements, sketches, photographs, etc., to provide the examiner with sufficient evidence to conduct the examination.

6. We will continue to support investigations to the fullest extent possible. However, conducting PDD examinations prematurely and/or before sufficient facts are developed can be misleading and performs a service for no one.

7. Request your support and assistance in addressing these PDD issues to your supported units, to ensure maximum effective utilization.

// SIGNED //
PHILLIP J. MCGUIRE
Director, Crime Records Center

**APPENDIX B
POLICY LETTER - PDD OF MURDER SUSPECTS**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
UNITED STATES ARMY CRIME RECORDS CENTER
UNITED STATES ARMY CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION COMMAND
6010 6TH STREET, FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060**

CICR-PD
6 June 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR ALL USACIDC FORENSIC PSYCHOPHYSIOLOGICAL
DETECTION OF
DECEPTION (PDD) EXAMINERS

SUBJECT: PDD Examinations of Murder Suspects

1. This memorandum details the USACIDC policy concerning murder suspect examinations. In particular, this guidance details those examinations wherein the examinee is or may be related to, or emotionally involved with the victim.
2. Presently, written guidance on this subject is limited to paragraph 3-3a, CIDR 195-28, which states that a PDD examination will not be given when, in the opinion of the examiner, a person cannot respond due to any of the following conditions. Sub-paragraph a.(3) specifically identifies "extreme emotional stress" as one of the conditions.
3. This center cannot adequately address potential sets of investigative circumstances individually characteristic to any homicide investigation(s), which may be generally applicable to the conduct of a PDD examination of a suspect related either by blood, marriage or emotionally to the victim. The proper application of common sense, logic, evaluation of case facts, and evaluation of the individual to be tested

must remain the primary, if not the sole, factor regarding the propriety of the timeliness of an examination

under these circumstances. As such, no formal policy can nor should be formulated.

4. As a general rule, such examination(s) should be delayed until after the funeral of the deceased. Of

paramount concern is whether or not the potential examinees demeanor, under the given circumstances,

permits testing by PDD. As such, the final decision regarding the timing of the PDD examination must rest

with the examiner who is to conduct the examination.

5. The foregoing guidance on this subject is consistent with that of other Department of Defense and

federal agencies.

// SIGNED //

PHILLIP J. MCGUIRE

Director, Crime Records Center

APPENDIX C

INTERN PROGRESS EVALUATION

Authorization # Date of Exam

ROI/MPR/SEQ# Location

Intern Examiner Examinee

1. The following observations pertain to the pre-instrument phase:

a. Calibration (Was the instrument properly calibrated to ensure pressure integrity, component functionality, etc.):

b. Introduction of Examiner (rapport): _____

c. Rights/Consent Forms: _____

d. Biographical Data (evaluated suitability, control foundation):

e. Explanation of Instrument and Physiology: _____

f. Discussion of Case Facts: _____

g. Question Formulation (relevant target selection, control target selection, technique utilization):

h. Review of Questions:

(1) Relevants _____

(2) Comparisons _____

(3) Irrelevants _____

(4) Symptomatics _____

2. The following observations pertain to the in-test phase:

a. Instructions: _____

b. Placement of components (location and ease of placement):

c. Operations/Instrumentation (ease/speed into operation, chart notations, timeliness, legibility, etc.): _____

d. Voice Inflections: _____

e. Chart Evaluation: _____

3. The following observations pertain to the post-instrument phase:

a. NDI Exam (proper post-test): _____

b. NO/INCL Exam (explanation of need to retest): _____

c. DI Exam (transition into interrogation, confrontation, theme development, controlling denials, handling objections, presenting alternatives): _____

4. Documentation (Review prior to mailing to CRC):

a. Admin Data Sheet _____

b. Numerical Analysis _____

c. DA Form 2801 _____

d. PDD Report _____

e. Examiner Comments _____

f. PDD Folder _____

g. Other _____

5. Monitors additional remarks: _____

This is the ____ test by this intern that I have monitored.

6. Intern examiners remarks: _____

This is the ____ test I have conducted during my internship.

Interns Monitors Name and
Initials Certificate Number

**APPENDIX D
POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION REPORT**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
1ST MILITARY POLICE DETACHMENT (CID)
THIRD MILITARY POLICE GROUP (USACIDC)
FORT STEWART, ALABAMA 12345-6789**

CIRMP-CFC
17 July 2002

(195-6)

MEMORANDUM FOR

Director, United States Army Crime Records Center, United States Army Criminal Investigation
Command, 6010 6th Street, Fort Belvoir, VA 20060-5585
Special Agent In Charge, 1st Military Police Detachment (CID), 3rd Military Police Group
(USACIDC), Fort Swampy, Alabama 12345-6789

SUBJECT: Polygraph Examination Report

INVESTIGATIVE CASE REFERENCE: 0000-02-CID000-00000-7F1

AUTHORIZATION NUMBER: 02-0000, 15 July 02

DATE(S) OF EXAMINATION: 16 July 02

LOCATION OF EXAMINATION(S): Fort Swampy, Alabama

SUBJECT EXAMINED: PUBLIC, John Q; E-4; 000-00-0000; Z Battery, 1/1st Field Artillery,
Fort Swampy, Alabama; 4 Jan 61; Cullman, Alabama

OFFENSE(S): Larceny and Damage to Government Property

PURPOSE OF EXAMINATION: Criminal Investigation

INVESTIGATIVE/OPERATIONAL SUMMARY: Investigation determined that between 1-2 Mar 02, unidentified person(s) gained entry into the motor pool administrative office, 1/1st FA, Ft. Swampy, AL, by breaking a window. Once inside the office, the perpetrator(s) stole two Toshiba laptop computers and a HP printer, collectively valued at \$5,000.00. A crime scene examination failed to note any other items of

evidentiary value. During the canvass interviews, PUBLIC was identified as a potential suspect after it was determined that he was seen near the motor pool during the time frame of the offense. It was further determined that PUBLIC works in the motor pool office and is pending administrative punishment for AWOL. As a result, on 3 Mar 02, PUBLIC was advised of his legal rights and interviewed. PUBLIC provided a sworn statement denying any knowledge or involvement in the theft of the two laptop computers or printer. PUBLIC did admit that on the evening of 2 Mar 02, he stopped by the motor pool office to pick-up his coat and gloves. During the interview, PUBLIC maintained that he had no knowledge or involvement in the incident and agreed to undergo a polygraph examination to verify the truthfulness of his sworn statement.

INSTRUMENTATION: This examination was conducted using an Axciton computerized polygraph instrument, Serial Number 00-00, last calibrated on the date of the examination.

OBSERVATIONS: Unusual physiological/psychological reactions were not observed during this examination.

EXAMINER'S CONCLUSIONS: During the pre-instrument phase, PUBLIC stated that on the evening of 2 Mar 02, he stopped by the motor pool office to retrieve his coat and gloves. PUBLIC stated that he found the front door to the motor pool office unlocked, so he went inside and retrieved his coat and gloves.

PUBLIC stated that just before leaving the office, he stole the printer, which he later pawned at EZ Pawn Shop, Enterprise, AL. PUBLIC stated that he locked the motor pool office door when he left and denied stealing either of the laptop computers or breaking the office window.

Based upon the information provided by PUBLIC, polygraph testing of the remaining issues were deemed appropriate.

An analysis of the polygrams collected during Series I, determined PUBLIC was being deceptive when

answering the relevant questions.

During the post-instrument interview, PUBLIC admitted that later in the evening on 2 Mar 02, he returned to the motor pool office, broke a window and stole the two laptop computers. PUBLIC stated that he sold the two laptop computers to Fred's Computer Shop, Enterprise, AL. Upon completion of the interview, PUBLIC provided a sworn statement detailing his involvement in this investigation. On 16 Jul 02, the two laptop computers and printer were recovered by USACIDC personnel.

Series I:

RELEVANT QUESTIONS USED:

Q: Did you steal either of those laptop computers?

A: No.

Q: Did you steal either of those laptop computers from that office?

A: No.

Q: Did you break that window to the motor pool office?

A: No.

WITNESS, MONITOR OR INTERPRETER: SA Jimmy JONES, 1st Military Police Detachment (CID), 3rd Military Police Group (USACIDC), Fort Swampy, Alabama

EXAMINEE NATIVE LANGUAGE: English

LANGUAGES(S) USED DURING THE EXAMINATION: English

EXHIBITS: Four polygrams, the polygraph consent form and allied documents are on file with the original report at the U.S. Army Crime Records Center, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

B.C. DAVENPORT
Polygraph Examiner, 202

**APPENDIX E
POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION REPORT**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
1ST MILITARY POLICE DETACHMENT (CID)
THIRD MILITARY POLICE GROUP (USACIDC)
FORT STEWART, ALABAMA 12345-6789**

CIMP-CFC
17 July 2002

(195-6)

MEMORANDUM FOR

Director, United States Army Crime Records Center, United States Army Criminal Investigation
Command, 6010 6th Street, Fort Belvoir, VA 20060-5585
Special Agent In Charge, 1st Military Police Detachment (CID), 3rd Military Police Group
(USACIDC), Fort Swampy, Alabama 12345-6789

SUBJECT: Polygraph Examination Report

INVESTIGATIVE CASE REFERENCE: 0000-02-CID000-00000-7F1

AUTHORIZATION NUMBER: 02-0000, 12 July 2002

DATE(S) OF EXAMINATION: 14 July 02

LOCATION OF EXAMINATION(S): Fort Swampy, Alabama

SUBJECT EXAMINED: PUBLIC, John Q; E-4; 000-00-0000; Z Battery, 1/1st Field Artillery,
Fort Swampy, Alabama; 4 Jan 61; Cullman, Alabama

OFFENSE(S): Larceny and Damage to Government Property

PURPOSE OF EXAMINATION: Criminal Investigation

INVESTIGATIVE/OPERATIONAL SUMMARY: Investigation determined that
between 1-2 Mar 02,

unidentified person(s) gained entry into the motor pool administrative office, 1/1st FA, Ft. Swampy, AL, by breaking a window. Once inside the office, the perpetrator(s) stole two Toshiba laptop computers and a HP printer, collectively valued at \$5,000.00. A crime scene examination failed to note any other items of evidentiary value. During the canvass interviews, PUBLIC was identified as a potential suspect after it was determined that he was seen near the motor pool during the time frame of the offense. It was further determined that PUBLIC works in the motor pool office and is pending administrative punishment for AWOL. As a result, on 10 Mar 02, PUBLIC was advised of his legal rights and interviewed. PUBLIC provided a sworn statement denying any knowledge or involvement in the theft of the two laptop computers or printer. PUBLIC did admit that on the evening of 2 Mar 02, he stopped by the motor pool office to pick-up his coat and gloves. During the interview, PUBLIC maintained that he had no knowledge or involvement in the incident and agreed to undergo a polygraph examination to verify the truthfulness of his sworn statement.

INSTRUMENTATION: N/A

OBSERVATIONS: N/A.

EXAMINER'S CONCLUSIONS: During the pre-instrument phase, PUBLIC admitted he had broken into the motor pool office on the evening of 2 Mar 02 and stole the two laptop computers and printer. PUBLIC admitted he pawned the printer at EZ Pawn Shop, Enterprise, AL. Further, PUBLIC stated that on 2 Mar 02, he sold the two laptop computers to Fred's Computer Shop, Enterprise, AL. Upon completion of the interview, PUBLIC provided a sworn statement detailing his involvement in this investigation. On 17 July 02, the two laptop computers and printer were recovered by USACIDC personnel.

Based upon the information provided by PUBLIC, polygraph testing of this issue was deemed inappropriate.

As no polygrams were collected, no technical opinion could be made regarding the truthfulness of
PUBLIC.

WITNESS, MONITOR OR INTERPRETER: SA Jimmy JONES, 1st Military Police Detachment (CID),
3rd Military Police Group (USACIDC), Fort Swampy, Alabama

EXAMINEE NATIVE LANGUAGE: English

LANGUAGES(S) USED DURING THE EXAMINATION: English

EXHIBITS: The polygraph consent form and allied documents are on file with the original report at the
U.S. Army Crime Records Center, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

B.C. DAVENPORT
Polygraph Examiner, 202

**APPENDIX F
POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION REPORT**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
1ST MILITARY POLICE DETACHMENT (CID)
THIRD MILITARY POLICE GROUP (USACIDC)
FORT STEWART, ALABAMA 12345-6789**

CIMP-CFC
14 Jul 2002

(195-6)

MEMORANDUM FOR

Director, United States Army Crime Records Center, United States Army Criminal Investigation
Command, 6010 6th Street, Fort Belvoir, VA 20060-5585
Special Agent In Charge, 1st Military Police Detachment (CID), 3rd Military Police Group
(USACIDC), Fort Swampy, Alabama 12345-6789

SUBJECT: Polygraph Examination Report

INVESTIGATIVE CASE REFERENCE: 0000-02-CID000-00000-5L6

AUTHORIZATION NUMBER: 02-0000, 12 Jul 2002

DATE(S) OF EXAMINATION: 14 Jul 2002

LOCATION OF EXAMINATION(S): Fort Swampy, Alabama

SUBJECT EXAMINED: PUBLIC, John Q; E-4; 000-00-0000; Q Battery, 1/st Field Artillery,
Fort Swampy, Alabama; 4 Jan 61; Huntsville, Alabama

OFFENSE(S): Wrongful Possession and Use of Cocaine

PURPOSE OF EXAMINATION: Criminal Investigation

INVESTIGATIVE/OPERATIONAL SUMMARY: Investigation determined that on 1 Jan 02, PUBLIC was administered a command directed urinalysis at his unit on Fort Swampy, AL. A subsequent laboratory

analysis of PUBLIC's urine sample revealed the presence of cocaine. On 10 Feb 02, PUBLIC was advised of his legal rights, which he invoked and requested legal counsel. On 11 Feb 02, PUBLIC retained CPT John T. JONES, TDS, Ft. Swampy, AL. CPT JONES indicated that PUBLIC has denied using any cocaine prior to the urinalysis and has requested the opportunity to undergo polygraph testing for exculpatory purposes.

INSTRUMENTATION: This examination was conducted using an Axciton computerized polygraph instrument, Serial Number 00-00, last calibrated on the date of the examination.

OBSERVATIONS: Unusual physiological/psychological reactions were not observed during this examination.

EXAMINER'S CONCLUSIONS: During the pre-instrument phase, PUBLIC made no comments or statements contrary to those previously provided.

An analysis of the polygrams collected during Series I, determined PUBLIC was being deceptive when answering the relevant questions.

A post-instrument interview was not conducted as PUBLIC has retained legal counsel in this matter.

Series I:

RELEVANT QUESTIONS USED:

Q: Did you use any cocaine, between 1 December 01 and 1 January 02?

A: No.

Q: Did you use any cocaine, between 1 December 01 and 1 January 02, while assigned to Ft. Swampy?

A: No.

Q: Did you know why your urine sample tested positive for cocaine?

A: No.

WITNESS, MONITOR OR INTERPRETER: SA Jimmy JONES, 1st Military Police Detachment (CID), 3rd Military Police Group (USACIDC), Fort Swampy, Alabama, and CPT JONES.

EXAMINEE NATIVE LANGUAGE: English

LANGUAGES(S) USED DURING THE EXAMINATION: English

EXHIBITS: Four polygrams, the polygraph consent form and allied documents are on file with the original report at the U.S. Army Crime Records Center, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

B.C. DAVENPORT
Polygraph Examiner, 202

**APPENDIX G
POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION REPORT**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
1ST MILITARY POLICE DETACHMENT (CID)**

**THIRD MILITARY POLICE GROUP (USACIDC)
FORT STEWART, ALABAMA 12345-6789**

CIMP-CFC
14 Jul 2002

(195-6)

MEMORANDUM FOR

Director, United States Army Crime Records Center, United States Army Criminal Investigation
Command, 6010 6th Street, Fort Belvoir, VA 20060-5585
Special Agent In Charge, 1st Military Police Detachment (CID), 3rd Military Police Group
(USACIDC), Fort Swampy, Alabama 12345-6789

SUBJECT: Polygraph Examination Report

INVESTIGATIVE CASE REFERENCE: 0000-02-CID000-00000-5L6

AUTHORIZATION NUMBER: 02-0000, 12 July 2002

DATE(S) OF EXAMINATION: 14 Jul 2002

LOCATION OF EXAMINATION(S): Fort Swampy, Alabama

SUBJECT EXAMINED: PUBLIC, John Q; E-4; 000-00-0000; Q Battery, 1/st Field Artillery,
Fort Swampy, Alabama; 4 Jan 61; Huntsville, Alabama

OFFENSE(S): Wrongful Possession and Use of Cocaine

PURPOSE OF EXAMINATION: Criminal Investigation

INVESTIGATIVE/OPERATIONAL SUMMARY: Investigation determined that on 1 Jan 02, PUBLIC was administered a command directed urinalysis at his unit on Fort Swampy, AL. A subsequent laboratory analysis of PUBLIC's urine sample revealed the presence of cocaine. On 10 Feb 02, PUBLIC was advised of his legal rights, which he waived and provided a sworn statement denying he had used any cocaine. During the interview, PUBLIC provided no explanation for his positive urinalysis results. Upon completion of the interview, PUBLIC agreed to undergo a polygraph examination to verify the truthfulness of his sworn statement.

INSTRUMENTATION: This examination was conducted using an Axciton computerized polygraph

instrument, Serial Number 00-00, last calibrated on the date of the examination.

OBSERVATIONS: Unusual physiological/psychological reactions were observed during this examination, but sufficient data was present to conduct a numerical evaluation.

EXAMINER'S CONCLUSIONS: During the pre-instrument phase, PUBLIC made no comments or statements contrary to those previously provided.

An analysis of the polygrams collected during Series I, determined PUBLIC was being deceptive when answering the relevant questions.

During the post-instrument interview, PUBLIC admitted he possess and used cocaine the prior to the unit urinalysis. Upon completion of the interview, PUBLIC provided a sworn statement documenting his use of cocaine prior to the urinalysis.

Series I:

RELEVANT QUESTIONS USED:

Q: Did you use any cocaine within the 30 days prior to that urinalysis?

A: No.

Q: Did you use any form of cocaine within the 30 days prior to that urinalysis on 1 Jan 02?

A: No.

Q: Did you possess any cocaine within the 30 days before that urine test?

A: No.

WITNESS, MONITOR OR INTERPRETER: SA Jimmy JONES, 1st Military Police Detachment (CID), 3rd Military Police Group (USACIDC), Fort Swampy, Alabama

EXAMINEE NATIVE LANGUAGE: English

LANGUAGES(S) USED DURING THE EXAMINATION: English

EXHIBITS: Four polygrams, the polygraph consent form and allied documents are on file with the original report at the U.S. Army Crime Records Center, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

B.C. DAVENPORT
Polygraph Examiner, 202

**APPENDIX H
POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION REPORT**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
1ST MILITARY POLICE DETACHMENT (CID)
THIRD MILITARY POLICE GROUP (USACIDC)
FORT STEWART, ALABAMA 12345-6789**

CIMP-CFC
14 Jul 2002

(195-6)

MEMORANDUM FOR

Director, United States Army Crime Records Center, United States Army Criminal
Investigation
Command, 6010 6th Street, Fort Belvoir, VA 20060-5585
Special Agent In Charge, 1st Military Police Detachment (CID), 3rd Military Police
Group

(USACIDC), Fort Swampy, Alabama 12345-6789

SUBJECT: Polygraph Examination Report

INVESTIGATIVE CASE REFERENCE: 0000-02-CID000-00000-5L6

AUTHORIZATION NUMBER: 02-0000, 12 March 2002

DATE(S) OF EXAMINATION: 14 Jul 2002

LOCATION OF EXAMINATION(S): Fort Swampy, Alabama

SUBJECT EXAMINED: PUBLIC, John Q; E-4; 000-00-0000; Q Battery, 1/st Field Artillery, Fort Swampy, Alabama; 4 Jan 61; Huntsville, Alabama

OFFENSE(S): Wrongful Possession and Use of Cocaine

PURPOSE OF EXAMINATION: Criminal Investigation

INVESTIGATIVE/OPERATIONAL SUMMARY: Investigation determined that on 1 Jan 02, PUBLIC was administered a command directed urinalysis at his unit on Fort Swampy, AL. A subsequent laboratory analysis of PUBLIC's urine sample revealed the presence of cocaine. On 10 Feb 02, PUBLIC was advised of his legal rights, which he waived and provided a sworn statement denying he had used any cocaine. During the interview, PUBLIC provided no explanation for his positive urinalysis results. Upon completion of the interview, PUBLIC agreed to undergo a polygraph examination to verify the truthfulness of his sworn statement.

INSTRUMENTATION: This examination was conducted using an Axciton computerized polygraph instrument, Serial Number 00-00, last calibrated on the date of the examination.

OBSERVATIONS: Unusual physiological/psychological reactions were observed during this examination, which resulted in the charts being unsuitable for numerical evaluation.

EXAMINER'S CONCLUSIONS: During the pre-instrument phase, PUBLIC made no comments or statements contrary to those previously provided.

An analysis of the polygrams collected during Series I, determined that insufficient criteria was present to form a conclusive decision regarding the truthfulness of PUBLIC.

During the post-instrument interview, PUBLIC continued to deny using any cocaine and terminated the interview after requesting legal counsel.

Series I:

RELEVANT QUESTIONS USED:

Q: Did you use any cocaine within the 30 days prior to that urinalysis?

A: No.

Q: Did you use any cocaine within the 30 days prior to that urinalysis on 1 January 02?

A: No.

Q: Did you have any cocaine in your hands within the 30 days before that urine test?

A: No.

WITNESS, MONITOR OR INTERPRETER: SA Jimmy JONES, 1st Military Police Detachment (CID),
3rd Military Police Group (USACIDC), Fort Swampy, Alabama

EXAMINEE NATIVE LANGUAGE: English

LANGUAGES(S) USED DURING THE EXAMINATION: English

EXHIBITS: Four polygrams, the polygraph consent form and allied documents are on file with the original report at the U.S. Army Crime Records Center, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

B.C. DAVENPORT
Polygraph Examiner, 202

**APPENDIX I
COUNTERMEASURES WORKSHEET**

**Polygraph Examination
-Countermeasures-**

Approval Number: _____
Date of Exam: _____
Offense(s): _____
Examinee Native Language: _____
Language(s) Used During the Examination: _____
Location of Exam: _____
Agency: _____

Reason for Exam:

Criminal Issue _____
CI Screening _____
Applicant _____

Previous Exam(s):

When: _____

Where: _____

Number of Series: Type Formats: Number of Charts:

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

CM Confirmed (Examinee Admission):

Type CM (Anal Sphincter/Toe press/ Mental,
other): _____

How Employed (what question(s) CM used): _____

Where Obtained: CM Info _____

Time Trained/Practiced: _____

Training/Assistance Received (From whom): _____

Examiner's Observations (Movements, eyes closed, etc): _____

Why CM Employed (To avoid detection, NDI Results, No Opinion Results, etc):

Generic Description of Info Subject Tried to Conceal: _____
