

[REDACTED]

Date of Report: 13 November 1972

PHOTO COMPARISON ANALYSIS RESULTS:

1. (U) Summary of request: (Date received: \_\_\_\_\_)
  - a. Please compare the attached 1 pre-capture photographs of Capt. Glenn D. McCubbin with the post-capture photographs DI-365-5-72 #82
  - b. The exact images to be compared have been identified as follows: \_\_\_\_\_
2. (U) Summary of comparison performed:
  - a. The following photographs were compared: pre-capture \_\_\_\_\_; post-capture \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_ technicians working independently of each other analyzed the identifiable features listed below.
3. [REDACTED] Results of analysis:
  - a. (U) Quality of pre-capture photographs submitted: Adequate/inadequate for analysis of recognizable features.
  - b. (U) Quality of post-capture photographs submitted: Adequate/inadequate for analysis recognizable features.
  - c. [REDACTED] The following features were considered similar:
    - (1) \_\_\_\_\_
    - (2) \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED FOR RELEASE  
Date 13 Nov. 78

- [REDACTED]
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (4) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (5) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (6) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (7) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (8) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (9) \_\_\_\_\_

d. (C) The following features were considered dissimilar:

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_

e. [REDACTED] Conclusion:

- (1) In view of the similarity in general appearance and significant number of similar features, \_\_\_\_\_ could be the subject of the questioned photographs.
- (2) In view of the significant number of differences in distinguishable features, \_\_\_\_\_ probably is not the subject of the questioned photographs.
- (3) In view of the quality of photography and the small number of distinguishable features which could be compared, no conclusion can be reached.

f. (U) The same image has been compared with pre-capture photographs of \_\_\_\_\_ Air Force, \_\_\_\_\_ Navy, \_\_\_\_\_ Marine, \_\_\_\_\_ Army, and \_\_\_\_\_ civilian personnel.

[REDACTED]

g. Comments: Experience has shown that there are not enough distinguishable features in unidentified photo #82 to permit comparison, even with a photo taken in nearly the same pose.

4.  WARNING: This photo comparison analysis was performed utilizing the best available techniques; however, the quality of the photographs in question precluded positive identification. There may be other overriding factors concerning the individual's case which could confirm or invalidate the photo comparison analysis.

Attachments:

- (a) Post-capture photographs, with overlay or other exact identification of image to be compared: \_\_\_\_\_
- (b) Pre-capture photographs: 1