

Deadline of Submission of Comments: 8-May-23

Document Number: ANSI/ASB Std 014

Document Title: Standard for Friction Ridge Examination Training Program

#	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
1	5.1	T	In our initial comments we noted that this section appears to eliminate any minimum requirements for education; not clear why? We received no response to this and the edlined version doesn't seem to address it so are including it again.	Add what the minimum required education is for an examiner, such as hours of training or equivalence to a bachelors etc. - Even if a bachelor's isn't required (which we assume is the reason for the redline), it shouldn't be left entirely up to each lab (what if a lab decided no education were needed?)	Reject: This portion of the document was not redlined. The previously provided comments on this section were all addressed and the resolutions were approved by the consensus body.
3	7.3.6		7.3.6 I feel training in statistics can be highly misleading since most agencies do not have experts to train in this area.	Change to a should statement.	Reject: This portion of the document was not redlined.
3	7.3.6.1		7.3.6.1 These statistical terms are not used in the discipline and therefore should not be a 'shall' statement.	Change to a should statement.	Reject: This portion of the document was not redlined.
4	7.3.6.12		7.3.6.12 examiners cannot properly assess statistics without proper training, which is not available within the discipline at this time.	Change to a should statement.	Reject: This portion of the document was not redlined.
5	7.3.6.14		7.3.6.14 Support for using FP's as a form of identification is based on persistency, and variability, not on statistical models.	Remove statement or minimally change to a should statement.	Reject: This portion of the document was not redlined.
2			I feel that many of the statistical aspects are overstated	If probabilities are subjective probabilities that should be stated.	Reject: This portion of the document was not redlined.
6	Comments not considered due to no resolution or due to not a redlined Previous comments: 7, 16, 11, 3, 4, 17, 12 and 13		Writing a resolution is not required for CB members votes, but I do not believe they should be disregarded over a technicality. Voting no on a document, based on non-redlined portions is also allowed. I feel that comments should be seriously considered for all CB members.	Seriously consider previous comments without a resolution.	All comments are considered by WG and CB members, even if a proposed resolution is not included. If the comment does not include an actionable resolution, the WG/CB may not be able to provide a resolution to a comment.