



REQUIREMENTS

When evaluating **Continuous Alcohol Monitoring (CAM)** technologies, it's important to understand what's required for a technology to truly be **CAM**. Only systems that meet all of these requirements—like **SCRAM Continuous Alcohol Monitoring**[®]—would be considered court-validated.

CAM Requirement	What This Means	Why It's Important	SCRAM CAM [™]
Alcohol Measurement Process and Source Distinction	The alcohol measurement process must produce a quantifiable TAC (Transdermal Alcohol Concentration) curve and distinguish between consumed and external/ environmental alcohol.	 Allows judges to make accurate and enforceable rulings. Substantially minimizes the possibility of false positives. 	 SCRAM CAM has been ruled as court-admissible for several reasons: It employs an active, controlled sample delivery system. It uses industry-validated fuel cell technology. It employs a thorough data analysis and review process using professionally trained analysts who review and confirm every confirmed event.
Consistent Device Calibration	This ensures that all devices have a consistent response to the various levels of alcohol being measured.	 Ensures consistency in readings across a broad range of offender variables. Ensures accurate readings and data on which to base analysis and interpretation. 	 SCRAM CAM is calibrated using the same court-accepted methodology as evidential breath testing equipment. Calibrating the bracelet to known standards produces consistent, quantifiable alcohol measurements and reliable TAC curves that are indicative of actual drinking levels.
BAC-Like Measurement	Readings from the device must be expressed in terms of a BAC (Blood Alcohol Concentration)-like measurement.	 Provides a quantifiable result on which to base sanctions and rulings. BAC is the de facto standard worldwide for measuring a person's level of intoxication. 	SCRAM CAM results are reported as a TAC, which is correlated to BAC.
Single-Source Admissibility	The ability to confirm a drinking event from the primary testing method—in this case, the Continuous Alcohol Monitoring. If the monitoring protocol requires a secondary test to confirm consumption for the court, it is not single-source admissible.	 The rapid metabolism of alcohol means evidence of intoxication rapidly deteriorates. Requires enormous staff resources to ensure someone is available to immediately track down an offender and administer a supervised test. 	SCRAM CAM data has been deemed single-source admissible and reliable based on the Daubert standard, the most stringent judicial standard.

CAM Requirement	What This Means	Why It's Important	SCRAM CAM
Court Support	A CAM system that is court- admissible must provide court support when requested to ensure officials are able to accurately evaluate admissibility if challenged.	Many drug and alcohol testing technologies provide court reports but do not stand behind their data in court. This leaves officials vulnerable to challenges and leaves clients vulnerable to false positives.	 The SCRAM CAM Court Support Program provides: PowerPoint presentations for direct examination. SCRAM CAM case law. State-specific Frye and Daubert pleadings. State-specific briefs. Written and proposed orders. Court orders on SCRAM CAM testimony and evidence. An electronic library of supporting literature, including scientific studies on transdermal transport, SCRAM CAM laboratory studies, and SCRAM CAM field studies. Expert testimony either live or via video or audio conferencing. 2nd chair prosecutors on request.
Published, Verifiable False Positive Rate	A CAM system manufacturer needs to be able to provide a verifiable, published False Positive Rate of .08% or less.	The majority of alcohol testing technologies positioned as "CAM" do not provide any kind of official confirmation of a drinking event and do not provide nor testify in court to a verifiable false positive rate. If a technology will not confirm test results for the court, then essentially there is a 0% false positive rate. But that should not be mistaken for an error-free system. In fact the technology's inability to confirm a drinking event is why they won't provide court documentation and why they cannot provide a false positive rate.	Courts have consistently ruled SCRAM transdermal monitoring as reliable and admissible, based in large part on the published, verifiable false positive rate of .074%. To compare, most drug testing used in the judicial system has a false positive rate of 5%.

For more information on SCRAM Continuous Alcohol Monitoring, please contact us at: scramsystems.com/cam • 800.557.0861



