




Date of Report: 2 Dec

PHOTO COMPARISON ANALYSIS RESULTS: Christmas 1969 No. 19

1. (U) Summary of request: (Date received: Dec 70)
 - a. Please compare the attached 1 pre-capture photographs of CPT DONALD L. HARRISON with the Christmas 1969 film obtained by Representative Zion, especially prints numbered DIA 2017, USN 22,25 USAF _____.
 - b. See attached overlay for exact location of image to be compared.

2. (U) Summary of comparison performed:
 - a. The following frames were chosen for comparison with the photographs submitted: _____
 - b. 2 technicians working independently of each other analyzed the identifiable features listed below.

3. I  Results of analysis:
 - a. (U) Quality of pre-capture photographs submitted: Adequate inadequate for analysis of recognizable features.
 - b. (U) Quality of frames in Christmas film: Adequate/inadequate for analysis of recognizable features.

- I c.  The following features were considered similar:
 - (1) _____
 - (2) _____
 - (3) _____
 - (4) 

1. (U) Summary of request: (Date received: Dec 70)

a. Please compare the attached 1 pre-capture photographs of CPT DONALD L. HARRISON with the Christmas 1969 film obtained by Representative Zion, especially prints numbered DIA 2017, USN 22,25 USAF _____.

b. See attached overlay for exact location of image to be compared.

2. (U) Summary of comparison performed:

a. The following frames were chosen for comparison with the photographs submitted: _____

b. 2 technicians working independently of each other analyzed the identifiable features listed below.

3. I [redacted] Results of analysis:

a. (U) Quality of pre-capture photographs submitted: Adequate inadequate for analysis of recognizable features.

b. (U) Quality of frames in Christmas film: Adequate/inadequate for analysis of recognizable features.

I c. [redacted] The following features were considered similar:

- (1) _____
- (2) _____
- (3) _____
- (4) _____

I [redacted]

APPROVED FOR RELEASE
DATE 26 FEB 1987

[REDACTED]

I

- (5) _____
- (6) _____
- (7) _____
- (8) _____
- (9) _____

d. [REDACTED]

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 precapture photographs of _____ Air Force, _____ Navy _____ Marine, _____ Army, and _____ civilian personnel.

I [REDACTED]



I

4 I [redacted]

WARNING: This photo comparison analysis was performed utilizing the best techniques believed to be available. 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 results. Therefore, the above conclusion is not sufficient evidence for basing legal or administrative action involving rights of missing or captured personnel, or their next of kin.

ATTACHEMENTS:

- (a) Overlay or questioned photo
- (b) Precapture photo

I