

Deadline for comments 25-Apr-22

Document Title: ASB TR 016, Terminology Related to Friction Ridge Examination

| # | Section | Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical) | Comments | Proposed Resolution | Editor or Working Group Review |
|-----|----------------|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | | | I do not feel the document has been reviewed sufficiently to be approved. I sent my comments in via public comments. | None Provided | Accept with comment. Thankyou for submitting improvements to the document. |
| 2 | Foreward | E | Paragraph 1 and 3 are duplicated (from Amy Watroba) | Delete 1st paragraph | Accept. |
| 93 | Add section 2 | E | The document is not consistent with other ASB documents (no normative references section). | add a section for normative references (see ASB TR 097). | Accept. |
| 120 | New definition | | Should define suitable if the word is going to be used in other phrases. Can you say an impression is suitable to arrive at a conclusion? Or is that only sufficiency? What about suitable for processing or suitable for capturing/recording/retaining? | Add a definition for suitable since the term is used different than the standard meaning (in FR it only applies to utility). | Accept with comment. Suitability definition added as a synonym for utility. |
| 122 | New definition | | Define sufficient / sufficiency since it is different from suitable. | Define sufficient / sufficiency since it is different from suitable. | Reject with comment. Sufficiency used in 012 and 013 but general english meaning. |
| 129 | | T | needed - definition for Incomplete. issue still remains that incomplete does not mean the same thing as inconclusive; incomplete is the lack of a comparison being completed while inconclusive is a complete comparison but support for a conclusion is lacking. | define Incomplete in document as "A determination that the observed data in the latent impression cannot be fully compared to an exemplar due to a lack of data present within the exemplar to complete the examination. A conclusion cannot be reached until additional exemplars are submitted for examination | Reject with comment. The definition of 3.42 "Inconclusive" states "The conclusion that the observed data do not provide more support for one proposition over the other." Refer to the body section 4.4 of STD 013 for specific reference to incomplete "or there is no support for either proposition (such as when more complete exemplars are requested, often called "incomplete")." Incomplete is included in the broad scope of the "inconclusive" definition. STD 013 should be the reference for all discussion on conclusions |
| 145 | | T | major case prints is not included in the document and needs to be defined as it is a term used in the discipline but not a standard term | add a definition for major case prints | Accept. |
| 57 | 2.2 | E | ACE definition could be a little more descriptive and be consistent with other acronym definitions | Change ACE definition to "ACE (an examination process) - The acronym for Analysis, Comparison and Evaluation. A generic term used to describe a visual comparative examination process. " | Reject with comment. Definition edited to "An acronym used to refer to the Analysis, Comparison and Evaluation phases of an examination process." |
| 69 | 2.2 | E | Technically, ACE is not "[a]n examination method used to refer to Analysis, Comparison and Evaluation"; it is an acronym used to refer to the "method." | Define ACE as "An abbreviation used to refer to the steps known as analysis, comparison, and evaluation.used to come to in friction ridge examinations. | Reject with comment. Definition edited to "An acronym used to refer to the Analysis, Comparison and Evaluation phases of an examination process." |
| 3 | 2.2 | T | Full CB meeting held 04/05/22 had a straw poll taken to replace method with "process" | replace "method" with "process" (twice) | Accept with comment. Definition edited to "An acronym used to refer to the Analysis, Comparison and Evaluation phases of an examination process." |
| 131 | 2.2 | T | ACE has long been determined to not be specific enough to be defined as a method | reword to say something like "an acronym used to describe the visual examination process" | Accept with comment. Definition edited to "An acronym used to refer to the Analysis, Comparison and Evaluation phases of an examination process." |
| 132 | 2.6 | T | two definitions are provided. Is the definition a simple observation of data or is it the adding up of features? One definition is passive while the other is active | pick one of the two sentences or reword | Accept with comment. Definition now reads: "An accumulation of observed similarities in pattern type, ridge flow, and friction ridge features in sequence, of the same or similar type, in the same relative position to each other, with associated intervening ridge counts, which suggests overall conformity." |
| 70 | 2.6 | E | Technically, the terms do not refer to observations. They refer to patterns. | Delete "Observation of" in front of "pattern type, ridge flow, and friction ridge features " | Accept with comment. Definition now reads: "An accumulation of observed similarities in pattern type, ridge flow, and friction ridge features in sequence, of the same or similar type, in the same relative position to each other, with associated intervening ridge counts, which suggests overall conformity." |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|
| 117 | 2.6 (correspondence) | T | The definition seems to be saying that correspondence is a source identification. The definition should clarify if agreement and correspondence can result in an inconclusive with similarities conclusion. If it is only for source identifications then this needs to be stated. | Clarify when these words can be used. | Accept with comment. Overall conformity would only support a Source Identification not an Inconclusive with Similarities. Definition now reads: "An accumulation of observed similarities in pattern type, ridge flow, and friction ridge features in sequence, of the same or similar type, in the same relative position to each other, with associated intervening ridge counts, which suggests overall conformity." |
| 36 | 2.6 agreement correspondence corresponding friction ridge detail | E | This definition would be better if it described the utility of, or what we do with, that correspondence. | Add as a last sentence: "...and used to support the proposition that the two impressions originated from the same source rather than different sources." | Accept with comment. Definition now reads: "An accumulation of observed similarities in pattern type, ridge flow, and friction ridge features in sequence, of the same or similar type, in the same relative position to each other, with associated intervening ridge counts, an accumulation of similarities between two impressions which suggests overall conformity." |
| 92 | 2.6 and others compared to 2.17 and others | E | Some entries have multiple titles while others say 'refer to...'. For example, 2.6 has 3 titles, while 2.17 says to refer to 'examiner (friction ridge)'. If entries are going to be listed separately (as with 2.17 and 2.34), then entries with multiple titles should be entered separately. | Enter those with multiple titles separately so they can be found when searching alphabetically (e.g., so that 'correspondence' is in the 'c' section and not the 'a' section). | Accept with comment. The additional terms are synonyms and added as such. Style guide does not suggest one way or another to list synonyms. Where references are made to other terms that is because they are different terms and are to be contrasted for clarification. |
| 71 | 2.7 | T | An amended report is an amended report regardless of whether the amendments are major or minor. But is the definition necessary? Is there any special usage of the lay terms "amended" and "report"? | Delete this term and its definition. | Accept. |
| 4 | 2.8 | E | remove capitalization of examination (from BPR 165 (Pete)) | replace "Examination" with "examination" | Accept. |
| 5 | 2.8 | T | Full CB meeting held 04/05/22 had a straw poll taken to replace method with "process" | replace "method" with "process" | Accept. |
| 58 | 2.8 utility | E | If the Utility definition is to be combined with the term Suitability (per other suggestion), then the term "Utility" will not appear in this document under "U", but rather under "S". | Update the definition to state "... to categorize its suitability/utility". This will allow the reader to locate the definition for suitability/utility within the document. | Reject with comment. Definition for suitability now reads "The usefulness of an impression for a further step in the examination process, such as comparison or Automated Biometric Identification System (ABIS) entry." |
| 6 | 2.9 | T | Suggested that we add being blind to the "identity" of the verifier as well as other considerations for "blind verification" (from BPR 165 (Pete)) | Change definition to read "A type of verification in which the subsequent examiner(s) has no knowledge of any other examiner's identity, decisions, conclusions or observed data used to support the conclusion." | Reject with comment. Definition now reads: "A type of verification in which at a minimum the subsequent examiner(s) has no knowledge of any other examiner's suitability decisions, conclusions or documented data used to support the conclusion." |
| 59 | 2.9 | T | FROM BPR 165 Comments --- The definition of blind verification does not account for FSP policies that bias the verification process (i.e., FSP policy that only identifications must be verified) and does not consider the bias that arises from the verifier knowing the identity of the original examiner. See, e.g., Mattijssen et al, Cognitive bias in the peer review of bullet and cartridge case comparison, Science and Justice 60 (2020) 337-346. | FROM BPR 165 Comments --- Include in the definition that to be truly blind verification, this phase requires FSPs to adopt measures to ensure the subsequent examiner has no knowledge of the other examiner's identity, and cannot infer decision or conclusions from the fact that verification is taking place. | Accept with comment. Agree that for truly blind, examiner must be operating under FSP SOPs that allow for blind verification under a number of circumstances, however we cannot mandate FSP's SOPs. Definition now reads: "A type of verification in which at a minimum the subsequent examiner(s) has no knowledge of any other examiner's suitability decisions, conclusions or documented data used to support the conclusion." |
| 72 | 2.9 | E | The definition of "blind verification" is "A type of verification in which the subsequent examiner(s) has no knowledge of any other examiner's decisions, conclusions or observed data used to support the conclusion." But the verifier does, in fact, have access to all the data that the original examiner did (see suggested change). Also, not clear to reader what the difference is between "decisions" and "conclusions"? | Change to: "A type of verification in which the subsequent examiner(s) has no knowledge of any other examiner's work." | Reject with comment. Not intended to suggest that the subsequent examiner doesn't have access to the data aka "the prints" but the "documented data" of the previous examiner. Changed "observed" to "documented" for clarification. Definition now reads: "A type of verification in which at a minimum the subsequent examiner(s) has no knowledge of any other examiner's suitability decisions, conclusions or documented data used to support the conclusion." |
| 94 | 2.11 | E | The definition for 'chain of custody' has 2 references, however, the note is only in regard to one of the references. | If the note will remain, then remove the reference to OSAC Preferred Terms, otherwise the reference is incorrect. | Accept. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| 91 | 2.12 | E | Definition of clarity refers to 'the Hicklin paper'. This is not an appropriate reference. | Reference appropriately. | Accept with comment. Reference to Kalka, Hicklin paper removed. Definition now reads: "Assessment of the quality of a friction ridge impression, describing an examiner's opinion as to how easily the friction ridge features are visually observed in an impression. Sometimes referred to as an examiner's confidence in the presence of an observed feature, that can be discerned from the background." |
| 138 | 2.12 | T | definition is needlessly complicated | reword to simplify definition | Accept with comment. Definition now reads: "Assessment of the quality of a friction ridge impression, describing an examiner's opinion as to how easily the friction ridge features are visually observed in an impression. Sometimes referred to as an examiner's confidence in the presence of an observed feature, that can be discerned from the background." |
| 139 | 2.12 | T | reference is inaccurate; paper's first author is not Hicklin and is disrespectful to the first author while also being an incorrect way of citing a source | either remove or give credit to first author Kalka | Accept with comment. Reference to Kalka, Hicklin paper removed. Definition now reads: "Assessment of the quality of a friction ridge impression, describing an examiner's opinion as to how easily the friction ridge features are visually observed in an impression. Sometimes referred to as an examiner's confidence in the presence of an observed feature, that can be discerned from the background." |
| 73 | 2.13 | T | "Cognitive bias" is defined as "A set of influences that may affect the reliability and validity of one's observations and conclusions." Including cognitive bias is laudable but this definition is too broad (for example, the examiner's training influences reliability and validity - is all knowledge cognitive bias?). | Consult the psychology literature for a more fitting definition. | Reject with comment. The CB voted during a 4/10/2025 meeting to use the definition in ISO 21043-1. |
| 7 | 2.14 | E | remove capitalization of examination (from BPR 165 (Pete)) | replace "Examination" with "examination" | Accept. |
| 8 | 2.14 | T | Full CB meeting held 04/05/22 had a straw poll taken to replace method with "process" | replace "method" with "process" | Accept. |
| 95 | 2.17 | E | The reference to a similar phrase is redundant and unnecessary. | remove ' (refer to examiner-friction ridge)' | Accept with comment. Definition deleted. |
| 143 | 2.17 | T | not needed as there is already a definition for competent and a definition for examiner | remove definition | Accept. |
| 9 | 2.18 | T | Simon Cole: These definitions don't really explain that the "attributes" of the impression that make it "complex" have to do with the difficulty of analyzing or comparing it. A reader might think that an "attribute . . . That may require addition quality assurance" might be that the print was found in an especially incriminating location. | Make clear that "complexity" derives from the difficulty or quality of the impression. | Accept with comment. Additional sentence added "Usually refers to the quality and clarity of at least one of the impressions in the comparison set, affecting the difficulty of the comparison" and Note added to refer to BPR 166 for further explanation. |
| 37 | 2.18 complexity (of a comparison) | E | Complicated and obscure definition. It would help to add some context or example. | Add as a last sentence something like: "Usually refers to the clarity of at least one of the impressions in the comparison set." | Accept with comment. Additional sentence added "Usually refers to the quality and clarity of at least one of the impressions in the comparison set, affecting the difficulty of the comparison" and Note added to refer to BPR 166 for further explanation. |
| 34 | 2.18-2.19 | T | These definitions don't really explain that the "attributes" of the impression that make it "complex" have to do with the difficulty of analyzing or comparing it. A reader might think that an "attribute . . . That may require addition quality assurance" might be that the print was found in an especially incriminating location. | Make clear that "complexity" derives from the difficulty or quality of the impression. | Accept with comment. Additional sentences added to both definitions and Notes added to refer to BPR 165 and BPR 166. |
| 38 | 2.19 complexity (of an impression) | E | Complicated and obscure definition. It would help to add some context or example. | Add as a last sentence like: "Usually refers to the clarity the impression being analyzed." | Accept with comment. Additional sentence added "Usually refers to the quality and clarity of the impression being analyzed, having the potential to affect the difficulty of a subsequent comparison" and Note added to refer to BPR 166 for further explanation. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| 10 | 2.19 | T | These definitions don't really explain that the "attributes" of the impression that make it "complex" have to do with the difficulty of analyzing or comparing it. A reader might think that an "attribute . . . That may require addition quality assurance" might be that the print was found in an especially incriminating location. | Make clear that "complexity" derives from the difficulty or quality of the impression. | Accept with comment. Additional sentence added "Usually refers to the quality and clarity of the impression being analyzed, having the potential to affect the difficulty of a subsequent comparison" and Note added to refer to BPR 166 for further explanation. |
| 11 | 2.20 | T | consider changing "personal judgment" to "professional judgment" (from Comment #87 in WG013 (Simon)) | replace "personal judgment" with "professional judgment" | Accept. Refer to definition of "Source Conclusion" |
| 12 | 2.20 | T | From Simon Cole: 2nd sentence is not really part of a definition. | Delete 2nd sentence | Accept with comment. The third sentence has been deleted. Refer to definition of "source conclusion". |
| 35 | 2.20 | T | 2nd sentence is not really part of a definition. | Delete 2nd sentence | Accept with comment. The third sentence has been deleted. Refer to definition of "source conclusion". |
| 74 | 2.20 | E | "Conclusion" is a broader term than "source conclusion." It can refer to a conclusion about anything. | Define "source conclusion" only--that is, eliminate the single word "conclusion" as the word being defined. | Accept. |
| 75 | 2.20 | T | A "source conclusion" is defined as "Opinion stated by an examiner after interpretation of observed data. The opinion is the personal judgment that the observed data can offer support for one proposition over another. A conclusion is distinct from a "proposition." What if the examiner's opinion is that the data are in equipoise--they are equally probable under both source hypotheses? Is this not a conclusion about the data? A source conclusion is a statement about the truth or falsity (or probability thereof) of a source hypothesis. It should not be defined as a statement about the strength of the evidence. An examiner who only addresses the strength of the evidence -- which is a good thing to do -- does not reach a source conclusion. | Define "source conclusion" as "a belief or a partial belief that two or more prints did or did not originate from the same source." | Reject with comment. Authors prefer the definition as written to the proposed alternative. Your example of equipoise would be rendered as an "inconclusive" conclusion. Hence, the inclusion of the permissive adjective "can" |
| 140 | 2.20 | T | the second sentence is not needed | remove second sentence | Accept with comment. The third sentence has been deleted. Refer to definition of "source conclusion". |
| 76 | 2.22 | E | A "conflict" is defined as "A condition in which two or more examiners disagree on a suitability decision or source conclusion." It is simply a disagreement. | Define as "A disagreement between two or more examiners on a suitability decision or source conclusion." | Reject with comment. Consensus Body prefers the definition as written to the proposed alternative. Your example adds further issues as we already have a definition for disagreement |
| 60 | 2.23 | E | BPRs 142 & 144 removed "Consensus Opinion" from this definition as the definition describes the type of examination (i.e., review) and not the product of that examination (i.e., opinion). | Remove "consensus opinion" from the terms or define "consensus opinion" separately (if needed) | Accept with comment. The process is defined under "consensus review" |
| 77 | 2.25 | T | "Contextual bias" is defined as "A deviation in human judgment caused by exposure to information that is either irrelevant to the judgmental task or inappropriate for consideration." Under this definition, contextual bias is not present unless the a "deviation" results from the biasing information. Is that limitation intended? | | Reject with comment. No proposed resolution provided, contextual bias is an OSAC Preferred Term. |
| 141 | 2.26 | T | four definitions are given | remove the second sentence or combine with the first sentence; positive control and negative control should be their own defined terms | Accept with comment. Separated into four distinct definitions: control (material); control (test); positive control; negative control |
| 39 | 2.26 control | E | The second sentence starts with "Or" which isn't grammatically connect | add a comma between "comparison" and "or." | Accept with comment. Separated into four distinct definitions: control (material); control (test); positive control; negative control |
| 96 | 2.27 and multiple areas | | The reference has been changed and therefore the FRCB definition is different from the reference and there is no need to reference the definition. | Remove the reference since it is not accurate or necessary. Do the same for all applicable entries. | Accept with comment. Reference is included to avoid potential copyright infringement with ISO term. Believe it is listed correctly. |
| 97 | 2.28 | | It's cleaner to keep the 'the' in the definition rather than note that the 'the' was deleted. | Keep the actual definition of the reference and remove the parenthetical. | Accept. Relates to definition of "customer" |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|---|--|
| 98 | 2.29 (disagreement) | | <p>The definition of dissimilarity says not to confuse dissimilarity with disagreement, yet disagreement is defined as a dissimilarity, making this very confusing.</p> <p>Additionally, according to the definition of disagreement, disagreement results in nonconformity. This is circular reasoning because labeling something as dissimilarity or disagreement is dependent on the final conclusion (according to how it is currently written).</p> | <p>Define dissimilarity so that the definition can be replaced for the word 'dissimilarity' in the definition of disagreement below. Currently, if you replace the word 'dissimilarity' in the definition below, it does not make sense.</p> <p>Disagreement: A dissimilarity, or an accumulation of dissimilarities, that is deemed to be outside of expected variations in the appearance of impressions from the same source, resulting in overall nonconformity</p> | Accept with comment. Dissimilarity is a single observed difference or multiple differences, but disagreement is a condition of overall non conformity. Definitions disagreement re-worded to include "decision". |
| 61 | 2.29 | E | The text for this definition seems to have a white background unlike the other defintions. | Remove the white background from the text. | Accept |
| 142 | 2.29 | T | definition of disagreement states that it is a dissimilarity which conflicts with 2.31 definition that tells people not to confuse the terms | reword to be less contradictory | Accept with comment. Dissimilarity is a single observed difference or multiple differences, but disagreement is a condition of overall non conformity. Definitions disagreement re-worded to include "decision". |
| 13 | 2.33 | E | remove capitilization of examination (from BPR 165 (Pete)) | replace "Examination" with "examination" | Accept. |
| 14 | 2.33 | T | Full CB meeting held 04/05/22 had a straw poll taken to replace method with "process" | replace "method" with "process" | Accept. |
| 62 | 2.35 | E | FROM BPR 165 Comments --- Section 3.7 [sic] states: "The deliberately recorded images or impressions from the friction ridge skin of an individual." If exemplars are always derived from known individuals, then this could be stated explicitly. Also, the accompanying note has an extra comma. | FROM BPR 165 Comments --- Add "known" before "individuals"; remove extra comma from note | Reject with comment. Adding known to refer to a person's identity is not deemed necessary here. Exemplars are not always derived from known people, sometimes they are the questioned impressions like in a tenprint search. |
| 78 | 2.35 | E | A note reads "NOTE Examples may include, but are not limited to, inked tenprints, inked palm prints, Livescan prints, powder and lift prints, casted/moulded prints, or photographs of friction ridge skin." The words "but are not limited to" are unnecessary. | Delete "but are not limited to". | Accept. |
| 100 | 2.35 | | No need to use so many words in the title, 'exemplar' is sufficient. | Change title to exemplar. | Reject with comment. Synonyms included for completeness and cross referenced. |
| 15 | 3.39 forensic process | T | Suggested addition from Full CB Meeting held 04/05/22 - Straw poll taken and "process" won out over "method" | <p>Insert definition of "forensic process" as modified from ISO 21043-1.</p> <p>forensic process</p> <p>Set of interrelated or interacting forensic activities including methods, techniques and processes used to establish conclusions and/or opinions, facts and findings, which can be used for legal proceedings.</p> <p>NOTE The forensic process can include item handling and control, examination, reporting and testimony.</p> <p>modified from ISO 21043-1</p> | Accept. |
| 40 | 2.37 friction ridge detail friction ridge features | T | Friction ridge detail/features are characteristics of the skin, not the impression. The features are inherent in the friction ridge skin and may or may not be reproduced in the impression. The impression is dependent on the quality of the FRD that is reproduced. | Reword: "The combination of ridge flow, ridge characteristics, and ridge structure of friction ridge skin. When sufficiently reproduced and observed in an impression, the observed data is used to compare and interpret similarity or dissimilarity between impressions." | Reject with comment. Friction ridge detail can refer to the structure of the skin and detail observed in an impression also. Definition slightly edited. Refer to other definitions for 'friction ridge skin' and 'friction ridge impression' for clarity. |
| 101 | 2. 39 | | High 'quality' has nothing to do with quantity, you can have a 'high quality impression' with only 3 features if the pores and edges are visible. It appears this definition is stating a criteria, not a definition. | <p>Replace with:</p> <p>High quality impression</p> <p>An impression that is extremely clear.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>do not define 'High quality impression'. It is self defined as an impression with high quality.</p> | Accept with comment. High quality impression deleted as "impression" covers the need. |
| 41 | 2.39 high quality impression | E | If you are going to define "high quality impression" please also define "low quality impression" | Add a definition. How do we define a low quality impression? "An impression with observed data that are ambiguous and not self-evident due to low clarity and quantity?" | Accept with comment. High quality impression deleted as "impression" covers the need. |
| 28 | 2.41 | E | Working Group 013 received the following comment on this definition: data is plural | Change "does" to "do" | Accept. |

| | | | | | |
|----|--|-----|---|--|--|
| 29 | 2.41 | E | Working Group 013 received the following comment on this definition: Abbreviation is confusing and unnecessary | Remove abbreviation | Accept. |
| 79 | 2.41 | T E | According to 2.20, a "conclusion" is "a personal judgment that the observed data can [do you mean "does"?] offer support for one proposition over another." If "inconclusive" is a judgment "the observed data does not provide more support for one proposition over the other," then it cannot be a conclusion. other. | Define "inconclusive" as "the belief that the observations do not support one proposition more than the other." | Reject with comment. Section 2.20 uses "professional judgment" instead of "belief." One possible instance of inconclusive is when the evidence is equally supporting both propositions, on this occasion the data do not support one proposition more than the other, hence the use of "can" instead of "does" or "do" |
| 42 | 2.41 inconclusive INC | E | The definition of "propositions" found in 2.61 does not help define this conclusion statement because the definition in 2.61 is confusing. | Clarify and make less complicated the definition of "propositions" in 2.61 | Reject with comment. Comment appears directed at definition of propositions (3.67) |
| 43 | 2.42 inconclusive with dissimilarities | E | The definition of "propositions" found in 2.61 does not help define this conclusion statement because the definition in 2.61 is confusing. | Clarify and make less complicated the definition of "propositions" in 2.61 | Reject with comment. Comment appears directed at definition of propositions (3.67) Definition of propositions is acceptable. |
| 44 | 2.42 inconclusive with dissimilarities | T | Inconclusive was already been defined as not supporting one proposition over another. This shows that there is now a lean towards one end over the other, therefore it is not a neutral conclusion | Change to "Indications of non-association" | Reject with comment. This conclusion is not meant to be a true inconclusive where there is equal support for both propositions. This is one of the 5 conclusion scale where there is support for the different source proposition. |
| 16 | 2.42 | E | WG013 suggested deleting the abbreviation as unnecessary and confusing Accept with Comment. I believe the intent was to have abbreviations listed for each source conclusion to standardize how the conclusions would be recorded in shorthand on the exemplar. Examiners are not going to write "inconclusive" on the exemplar for every conclusion and I believe it is best practice to record the conclusion rendered on three locations in the case record (latent, exemplar and case notes worksheet). | I believe how conclusions should be recorded on exemplars is outside the scope of the document so suggest deleting. abbreviation deleted | Accept. |
| 80 | 2.42 | T E | If "inconclusive" has definition 2.41, nothing can be inconclusive and yet give more support to one source hypothesis than another one. Is this category supposed to pertain to hypotheses rather than evidentiary weight? There should be definitions for statements of the degree of support for sourcew hypotheses and statements for beliefs (classifications, in statisticts and data science) about the source of the evidence. | Define the labels for a scale that grades the degree of belief in source hypotheses and define the labels for a separate scale for the weight of evidence. Do not mix the two. | Reject with comment. The labels for the categories of the 5 conclusion scale have been decided by numerous consensus body wide votes. Definitions are using "professional judgment" not degree of belief. Having two separate scales would add to confusion unnecessarily. |
| 45 | 2.43 inconclusive with similarities | E | The definition of "propositions" found in 2.61 does not help define this conclusion statement because the definition in 2.61 is confusing. | Clarify and make less complicated the definition of "propositions" in 2.61 | Accept with comment. ISO 21043-1 defition used. Definition now reads "statement that is either true or false, the truth of which is uncertain." |
| 46 | 2.43 inconclusive with similarities | T | Inconclusive was already been defined as not supporting one proposition over another. This shows that there is now a lean towards one end over the other, therefore it is not a neutral conclusion | Change to "Indications of association" | Reject with comment. This conclusion is not meant to be a true inconclusive where there is equal support for both propositions. This is one of the 5 conclusion scale where there is support for the same source proposition. |
| 81 | 2.43 | T E | If "inconclusive" has definition 2.41, nothing can be inconclusive and yet give more support to one source hypothesis than another one. Is this category supposed to pertain to hypotheses rather than evidentiary weight? There should be definitions for statements of the degree of support for sourcew hypotheses and statements for beliefs (classifications, in statisticts and data science) about the source of the evidence. | Define the labels for a scale that grades the degree of belief in source hypotheses and define the labels for a separate scale for the weight of evidence. Do not mix the two. | Reject with comment. The labels for the categories of the 5 conclusion scale have been decided by numerous consensus body wide votes. Definitions are using "professional judgment" not degree of belief. Having two seprate scales would add to confusion unnecessarily. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|---|---|
| 102 | 2.45 | | An interpretation is not an explanation, you can have an explanation for an interpretation but this is not a correct definition. I do not agree with adding all OSAC preferred terms, if they are not correct. | Remove definition or create a correct definition. I think there is a standard meaning and therefore a definition is not needed. | Accept with comment. The OSAC preferred term has been replaced with the recently approved term from ISO 21043. |
| 47 | 2.48 latent impression, latent or unknown fingerprint (as opposed to fingerprint) | E | The current wording includes impressions of an unknown source usually deposited unintentionally. The "unintentionally" feels unnecessary. | Amend to: "An impression from an unknown source of friction ridge skin. Latent impressions are not readily visible and are typically developed or enhanced by optical, physical, and/or chemical processing techniques." | Accept. |
| 48 | 2.48 latent impression, latent or unknown fingerprint (as opposed to fingerprint) | E | The term "latent" means that it can't be readily observed by the human eye without development and/or lighting changes. | Amend to: "An impression from an unknown source of friction ridge skin. Latent impressions are not readily visible and are typically developed or enhanced by optical, physical, and/or chemical processing techniques." | Accept. |
| 49 | 2.50 minutia | E | Would help to tie the definition up, and connect the beginning sentence to the ending sentence, by adding "friction ridge skin" in front of the final word, "impressions" | Add "friction ridge skin" in front of the final word, "impressions" | Reject with comment. The proposed resolution adds words that are unnecessary for this definition. |
| 17 | 2.50 minutia | T | Suggestion made from commenter in BPR 165 to add "or combination thereof" to be inclusive of other types of minutiae used such as hooks, spurs, crossovers, lakes etc. When it comes to "counting" of minutiae for combinations such as crossovers, hooks etc each ridge event is considered (eg. hook is a ridge ending and a bifurcation = 2 features) | change definition to read: "minutia The point where a friction ridge terminates, or splits into two or more ridges. A subset of the friction ridge detail/features traditionally consisting of ridge endings, bifurcations, and dots, or any combination thereof, used to compare and interpret similarity and dissimilarity between two impressions." | Accept. |
| 103 | 2.51 | | The definition of nonconforming work is restating the obvious 'does not comply'. | Remove the definition as it is unnecessary. Examples of non-conforming work can be given in documents if others need to know what non-conforming work is. | Accept. |
| 104 | 2.52 | | An observation is a noun. The definition given is for a verb (the negative part of adding the definitions of others). | The definition of observation is the standard meaning and therefore a definition is unnecessary. Remove the definition. | Accept. |
| 146 | 2.52 | T | standard term and not needed | remove from document | Accept. |
| 63 | 2.53 | T | FROM BPR 165 Comments --- Section 3.12 [sic] begins: "Any information seen within an impression that an examiner relies upon to reach a decision, conclusion, or opinion." This definition restricts "observed data" to that data on which the examiner relies, which seems too narrow | FROM BPR 165 Comments --- Revise to "of the type that an examiner could rely upon" | Accept with comment. "examiner may rely upon..." |
| 82 | 2.53 | T E | "Observed data" is defined as "Any information seen within an impression that an examiner relies upon to reach a decision, conclusion, or opinion." What if an examiner observes "information" but does not recognize it as such and does not rely on it? | Do not define "observed data." Simply refer to "observations." | Reject with comment. Observed data has specific meaning in the friction ridge discipline that is not captured by the definition of observation. |
| 18 | 2.53 | T | Suggestion made from commenter in BPR 165 to add "may rely" upon when defining "observed data" to be encompassing of all observed data looked at in analysis rather than only that which is used for decision making process. | definition should now read: "observed data Any information seen within an impression that an examiner may rely upon to reach a decision, conclusion, or opinion. This not only includes minutiae, but attributes such as clarity, scars, creases, edge shapes, pore structure, and other friction ridge features." | Accept. |
| 83 | 2.54 | E | Because "observed data" is defined as observations on which an examiner has relied to reach a conclusion, the phrase "used to support their conclusion" in this definition is redundant. Also, the word "and" is problematic. If the verifier knows the identity of the first examiner, the verification is not fully blind. | Break down the "blind" and "open" definitions according to the information as to the verifier is exposed. A verification can be blind with respect to A, or B, or C, etc., or blind to all this information, or blind to any subset of it. | Reject with comment. Leaving the definitions as is allows the requested subset to be detailed if required. The intended definition of blind verification was meant to be inclusive of all, ie truly blind to all aspects. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| 105 | 2.54 | | The definition (open - non-blind) is adding new terms that are unnecessary which only serves to complicate a simple concept. There is verification and blind verification. If some choose to use 'open' or 'non-blind', it seems ok but the ASB should not (and cannot) state every alternative word that can be used. | The verification document should use standard language. Adding these new terms is unnecessary. Remove definition. | Reject with comment. The terminology document is the correct location for new terms to be defined. Adding the term open (non-blind) verification adds clarification, otherwise we would require multiple definitions of "verification." |
| 50 | 2.54 open (non-blind) verification | T | Having "access" to another examiner's conclusions is a very open statement and could negate small agencies from claiming they do blind verifications. Just because someone has "access" to the conclusions doesn't mean they reviewed the conclusions prior to an independent ACE. At my lab there are two examiners. We always know who the other examiner is, but we don't access their case notes until after our independent ACE. Is that an open verification? Blind verification? Pseudo-blind verification? | Change "access" to "knows" or "has reviewed"...their decisions, conclusions, etc...OR create a "pseudo-blind" verification definition, OR just leave small agencies without the ability to claim they do blind verifications if this is truly how you want to cleave it. | Accept with comment. Definition now reads: "A type of verification in which the subsequent examiner knows the identity of the other examiner(s) and has been provided with their decisions, conclusions and/or documented data used to support their conclusion." |
| 84 | 2.55 | T | "Opinion" is defined as "View, judgment, belief – takes into consideration other information in addition to observations, data, calculations and interpretations." An interpretation is an explanation. What information is there other than "observations, data, calculations and interpretations"? An opinion is simply a belief, and beliefs depend on other beliefs and on case-specific data. For example, an examiner may have an opinion that the features support one hypothesis more than the other. What is the extrinsic information in that situation? | Define "opinion" as a belief. | Reject with comment. Term deleted based on comments #106 and #144 |
| 106 | 2.55 | | The standard meaning is used and therefore adding this definition is unnecessary. Additionally, by saying that an opinion considers "other information" is really saying that there is no process to diminish bias, it's almost encouraged. | Remove all OSAC Preferred Terms as most of them are unsupportable. If the ASB has better terms then it would be better for the OSAC to use the ASB terms (instead of the ASB rubber stamping or blindly accepting the OSAC preferred terms). | Accept. |
| 144 | 2.55 | T | standard meaning is used; by saying it considers "other information" it encourages use of biasing and other irrelevant information | remove definition as it's use is standard and not needed in this document | Accept. |
| 51 | 2.56 Pattern Force Area | T | I don't think it is truly a "theory" and would avoid a colloquial use of the term in our documents. | Remove "in theory" | Accept. |
| 85 | 2.59 | T | "Probability" is defined as "An expression of the chance that a particular event occurs." Does this mean that hypotheses, which are not events, cannot have probabilities? Does it mean that odds such as 3:1 that pertain to events are probabilities. | The standard mathematical definition of "probability" should be used. | Accept with comment. Definition now reads "An expression of the chance that a particular event occurs. A probability may be empirically, classically, or subjectively derived." |
| 107 | 2.59 | | Since subjective probabilities are being used in this discipline, the definition should be more specific to state that the probability is subjective. | Modify the definition to be: An expression by an examiner of the perceived chance that a particular event may occur. | Accept with comment. Where subjective probabilities are being used they can be explained as such. Definition now reads "An expression of the chance that a particular event occurs. A probability may be empirically, classically, or subjectively derived." |
| 108 | 2.60 | | PTs are not measured "against pre-established criteria by means of interlaboratory comparisons." They are measured against ground truth. Again, the OSAC preferred terms are weak at best. | Remove all OSAC Preferred Terms. | Reject with comment. Definition now reads "Evaluation of participant performance against pre-established criteria." |
| 147 | 2.6 | T | accrediting bodies allow for internal proficiency testing when no applicable test is available | reword definition to not be specific to "interlaboratory comparisons" | Accept with comment. Definition now reads "Evaluation of participant performance against pre-established criteria." |

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| 52 | 2.61 propositions | E | This definition is not clear and is very confusing. When I read the definitions given for conclusions earlier in the document and then come here to get clarification on what, exactly, is meant by a "proposition" in this context, this definition does not answer that question. Possibly if you created a definition that directly applied to what we do, it would be clearer. I understand that a proposition is a hypothesis, but what is an "event" as it relates to finger/palm prints? | Create a definition that applies to friction ridge skin impression comparisons like how you have done with other, more main-stream words like "rarity" or "observed data" | Accept with comment. ISO 21043-1 defition used. Definition now reads "statement that is either true or false, the truth of which is uncertain." |
| 30 | 2.61 | E | Working Group 013 received the following comment on this definition: Use of "hypotheses" might be considered incorrect. "Statements" is probably a safer term. | Change "hypotheses" to "statements" | Accept with comment. ISO 21043-1 defition used. Definition now reads "statement that is either true or false, the truth of which is uncertain." |
| 31 | 2.61 | E | Working Group 013 received the following comment on this definition: 2nd sentence is unnecessary and may invite confusion. | Delete 2nd sentence | Accept with comment. ISO 21043-1 defition used. Definition now reads "statement that is either true or false, the truth of which is uncertain." |
| 109 | 2.61 | | A proposition is not a hypothesis, it is an assertion. | Change definition to be "An assertion about the actual state an event, when the ground truth cannot be established." | Reject with comment. ISO 21043-1 defition used. Definition now reads "statement that is either true or false, the truth of which is uncertain." |
| 130 | 2.61 | T | the definition of "proposition" is inaccurate and conflicts with it's use in the document. Propositions and hypotheses are different concepts but the definition implies that they are similar and can be used interchangeably. The definition as written conflicts with the work in the friction ridge discipline as we do not deal with states of nature. definition still is not in line with what a proposition is; a proposition is not the same thing as a hypothesis and changing the definition to be used interchangeably goes against the generally accepted distinction within science. A proposition is an indirectly tested relationship stated as a declarative statement derived at through deductive or inductive reasoning and should be stated as such. | reword definition to be in line with how it's used in science and logic and in order to not conflict with document. Proposed wording would be "a conjectural relationship between concepts that is stated in a declarative form. Propositions cannot be tested directly and are instead tested indirectly by examining the relationship between observed data. Propositions are generally arrived at through deductive or inductive reasoning and must be able to be empirically tested through data." | Reject with comment. ISO 21043-1 defition used. Definition now reads "statement that is either true or false, the truth of which is uncertain." |
| 19 | 2.61 | T | Change "Hypotheses" to "Statements" (from Comment in WG013 (Simon)) | Change "Hypotheses" to "Statements" | Accept with comment. ISO 21043-1 defition used. Definition now reads "statement that is either true or false, the truth of which is uncertain." |
| 20 | 2.61 | T | Request to delete this second sentence as it might invite confusion. There was clearly confusion between people conflating these two terms when they were introduced to the readers of document STD 013. | Delete 2nd sentence | Accept with comment. ISO 21043-1 defition used. Definition now reads "statement that is either true or false, the truth of which is uncertain." |
| 64 | 2.63 | E | FROM BPR 165 Comments --- The two clauses are confusing- if a questioned impression is an impression "whose source is unknown" how can it include impressions from "a known source"? | FROM BPR 165 Comments --- Remove "or a known source" from final clause. | Accept with comment. Definition now reads "An impression or image of friction ridge skin whose source or identity is unknown" and note added for clarification of exceptional circumstances. |
| 65 | 2.63 | T | In order to avoid confusion over the usage of "known source" at the end of the definition, I recommend a modification to the definition. | Modify definition as follows: "...whose source or identity is either unknown or requires confirmation; ..." | Accept with comment. Definition now reads "An impression or image of friction ridge skin whose source or identity is unknown" and note added for clarification of exceptional circumstances. |
| 53 | 2.63 questioned impression | E | The definition includes impressions from a known source, which is the opposite of the first sentence: "an impression...whose source or identity is unknown." This makes a the definition anopposite of itself. Even an impression from a John/Jane Doe is a "known" impression because we know where it came from; we have the ground truth friction ridge skin. We just dont know who that John/Jane Doe is. The decedent is unknown, not the impression. | Remove "or a known source" from the last sentence | Accept with comment. Definition now reads "An impression or image of friction ridge skin whose source or identity is unknown" and note added for clarification of exceptional circumstances. |
| 21 | 2.63 questioned impression | E | Confusion from BPR 165 commenter as how this can occur. | I believe it was intended for tenprint to tenprint comparison or prints taken from a known body number of an unknown deceased person for instance. Suggest leaving as is | Accept with comment. Definition now reads "An impression or image of friction ridge skin whose source or identity is unknown" and note added for clarification of exceptional circumstances. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|---|---|--|---|
| 110 | 2.65 & 2.10 | | It is unnecessary to define 'case record' and 'record' unless there is a difference. There appears to be no difference and therefore a 'record' is an abbreviated term for 'case record'. | Remove definition as it is unnecessary (or remove the definition of 'case record' because a 'case' record is simply a record for a case (a record for a specific situation). | Reject with comment. Definitions from ISO 21043-1 WG suggests keeping both terms as 'record' and 'case file' are ISO terms and have a forensic specific definition rather than general dictionary use. Case file could be deleted if determined to be dictionary use. |
| 66 | 2.66 | E | For consistency, should this be listed as "reliability (evidentiary/legal)"? | List as "reliability (evidentiary/legal)" | Reject with comment. Term deleted from TR016 |
| 111 | 2.66 | | "RELIABILITY -Credibility and trustworthiness of proffered EVIDENCE." Evidence is not being judged in court for the FR discipline, the reliability of the "opinion" is being judged. Therefore, the OSAC definition does not apply to the FR discipline. | Remove the definition as it is not relevant to the FRCB documents. | Accept. |
| 67 | 2.67 | E | For consistency, should this be listed as "reliability (statistical)"? | List as "reliability (statistical)" | Reject with comment. Term deleted from TR016 |
| 112 | 2.67 | | Statistical consistency is known as Statistical Significance, it is not known as reliability. Additionally, reliability in statistics is only in regard to reproducibility (not repeatability) and therefore the definition is incorrect. Since the ASB has a statistician on the board, Jay Kadane should be asked for the statistical meaning if a definition is desired. | Remove the OSAC definition. | Accept. |
| 22 | 2.69 | E | c' in communication is not capitalized (from Amy Watroba) | Capitalize "Communciation" | Accept. |
| 113 | 2.69 | | I do not see the need for this definition. Has anyone ever asked what a report is? | Remove definition as it is the standard definition. | Accept. |
| 114 | 2.70 | | Reproducibility is important for the same conditions, not under different conditions. If the conditions are different, the lack of agreement (reproducibility) may be acceptable. | Remove the definition (or improve it). | Accept with comment. Definition now reads: "Extent of agreement between repeated results determined under any combination of different conditions." |
| 137 | 2.71 | T | this is not a definition and basically reads that it can mean anything | remove from document or actually define it | Accept. |
| 86 | 2.73 | E | "Sample" is defined as "Portion drawn from a whole or population for the purpose of examination/testing, not necessarily representative of the whole." If "examination/testing" is limited to friction ridge examination/testing, the definition is too narrow. A research fingerprint database, for example, is sample. A set of examiners taking part in an experiment to test reliability or validity is a sample. | Define as "A set of items drawn from a larger population. NOTE: Samples are not necessarily representative of the population." | Accept. Definition of "Sample" removed from TR016. |
| 115 | 2.73 | | Samples, in the context given, are not a part of the FR discipline and do not apply to FR documents. Copying all the definitions of others makes you not see the irrelevance. The note supports that this is not relevant. Samples are used in FR for statistical variation and populations, if 'sample' is going to be defined, it should be defined as it is used within the FR documents. | Remove the definition as it is not relevant. | Accept. Definition of "Sample" removed from TR016. |
| 148 | 2.73 | T | note provides a second definition of sample | split 2.73 into two terms "population sample" and "biological sample" | Reject with comment. Definition of "Sample" removed from TR016. |
| 116 | 2.74 | E | This is slang and unnecessary to be defined. | Remove the definition, as it seems like filler and is irrelevant to the FR documents and does not need to be defined. | Accept. Definition of "scene" removed from TR016. |
| 23 | 2.75 | E | From Comments in BPR 166 suggest using agreement throughout document instead of correspondence as is the converse of disagreement and is meant to signify conformity being reached | change "correspondence" to "agreement" | Accept. |
| 68 | 2.76 | E | This definition seems to cite The Fingerprint Sourcebook, but The Fingerprint Sourcebook does not appear in the bibliography | Either remove the reference to The Fingerprint Sourcebook or add it to the Bibliography (or as a footnote) | Accept with comment. Added as Footnote and also added as an informative reference in the Bibliography |

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|-----|--|--|---|
| 118 | 2.76 | E | This is an old school philosophy however it is not what the courts want to know. They are asking about a person, not a card. | Update the definition to be what is needed by the customer (the person, not the card). | Reject with comment. In the ASB documents and for fingerprint comparisons and conclusions the source of the impression must be linked to the actual area of friction ridge skin not just the person or donor. |
| 32 | 2.77 | E | Working Group 013 received the following comment on this definition: Abbreviation is confusing and unnecessary | Remove abbreviation | Accept. |
| 87 | 2.77 | T E | "Source exclusion" is defined as "The conclusion that the observed data provide substantially stronger support for the proposition that the questioned impression originated from a different source than the exemplar impressions compared." The definition describes an opinion about the weight of evidence. "Source exclusion" should be reserved for a belief or a partial belief that two or more prints did not originate from the same source. Statements about the extent to which evidence supports such a conclusion should be identified with some other term. | Define "source exclusion" as "an assertion that two or more prints did not originate from the same source." | Accept with comment. New definition now reads: "Source exclusion is the conclusion that two friction ridge impressions did not originate from the same source." From full CB meeting on 03092023 incorporates the idea of rejection of the possibility using "incompatible" in the extended text in body of document STD 013. |
| 136 | 2.77 | T | this definition conflicts with the definition of proposition and is needlessly technical; our conclusions say nothing about the state of nature | reword to remove references to "propositions" and keep wording of "the conclusion that the observed data supports the determination that the two impressions did not originate from the same source" | Accept with comment. New definition now reads: "Source exclusion is the conclusion that two friction ridge impressions did not originate from the same source." From full CB meeting on 03092023 incorporates the idea of rejection of the possibility using "incompatible" in the extended text in body of document STD 013. |
| 54 | 2.77 source exclusion | E | Same issue with the definition of proposition | Clarify and make less complicated the definition of "propositions" in 2.61 | Accept with comment. New definition now reads: "Source exclusion is the conclusion that two friction ridge impressions did not originate from the same source." From full CB meeting on 03092023 incorporates the idea of rejection of the possibility using "incompatible" in the extended text in body of document STD 013. |
| 128 | 2.77 and 2.78 | T | use of the word "source" in front of conclusions, exclusion, and identification conflicts with the limitation of not asserting source attributions. The inclusion of the word "source" in front of conclusions, exclusion, and identification is misleading. | remove the word "source" from in front of the terms "conclusion", "exclusion", and "identification" throughout entire document | Reject with comment. The comment conflates the prohibition of asserting "same source attributions" with "single source conclusions," a conclusion is an opinion/professional judgement, and does not assert or imply to the exclusion of all others. |
| 55 | 2.78 source identification | E | Same issue with the definition of proposition | Clarify and make less complicated the definition of "propositions" in 2.61 | Reject with comment. We have simplified the definitions as much as possible whilst still maintaining accurate meaning. Comparing and contrasting the definitions against each other will be detailed in STD 013. |
| 24 | 2.78 | E | WG013 suggested deleting the abbreviation as unnecessary and confusing Accept with Comment. I believe the intent was to have abbreviations listed for each source conclusion to standardize how the conclusions would be recorded in shorthand on the exemplar. Examiners are not going to write "source exclusion" on the exemplar for every conclusion and I believe it is best practice to record the conclusion rendered on three locations in the case record (latent, exemplar and case notes worksheet). | I believe how conclusions should be recorded on exemplars is outside the scope of the document so suggest deleting. abbreviation deleted | Accept. |
| 33 | 2.78 | E | Working Group 013 received the following comment on this definition: Abbreviation is confusing and unnecessary | Remove abbreviation | Accept. |
| 88 | 2.78 | T E | "Source identification" is defined as "The conclusion that the observed data provide substantially stronger support for the proposition that the two impressions originated from the same source rather than different sources." The definition describes an opinion about the weight of evidence. "Source identification" should be reserved for a belief or a partial belief that two or more prints originated from the same source. Statements about the extent to which evidence supports such a conclusion should be labeled with some other term. | Define "source identification" as "an assertion that two or more prints originated from the same source." | Reject with comment. Definition of source identification to remain as it reads: The conclusion that the observed data provide substantially stronger support for the proposition that the two impressions originated from the same source rather than different sources." |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|-----|--|---|--|
| 135 | 2.78 | T | this definition conflicts with the definition of proposition and is needlessly technical; our conclusions say nothing about the state of nature | reword to remove references to "propositions" and keep wording of "the conclusion that the observed data supports the determination that the two impressions originated from the same source" | Reject with comment. Definition of source identification to remain as it reads: The conclusion that the observed data provide substantially stronger support for the proposition that the two impressions originated from the same source rather than different sources." The use of 'proposition' and 'conclusion' are accurate in this definition, please refer to those definitions to compare and contrast their meanings. |
| 25 | 2.78 | E | WG013 suggested deleting the abbreviation as unnecessary and confusing Accept with Comment. I believe the intent was to have abbreviations listed for each source conclusion to standardize how the conclusions would be recorded in shorthand on the exemplar. Examiners are not going to write "source identification" on the exemplar for every conclusion and I believe it is best practice to record the conclusion rendered on three locations in the case record (latent, exemplar and case notes worksheet). | I believe how conclusions should be recorded on exemplars is outside the scope of the document so suggest deleting. abbreviation deleted | Accept. |
| 89 | 2.81 | T E | "Strength of the evidence" is defined as "A means of describing the relative support the evidence lends to one proposition over another." The strength of evidence is not a means of describing support. It is the extent to which evidence tends to prove what it is offered to prove. In other words, it is the support that the evidence provides for an assertion about a proposition. | Define as "Probative value. The extent to which evidence supports one proposition as opposed to a different proposition." | Reject with comment. Definition now reads: "The relative support or extent to which the evidence supports one proposition over another. It may be described verbally or numerically." |
| 119 | 2.81 | | The strength of the evidence cannot be stated numerically. Only a persons likelihood ratio can be state (not THE strength, it is the persons assessment of strength). | Remove how the strength can be articulated so that the definition is not incorrect or misleading. Also, the definition be more generic so it applies to all methods of assessing strength. Make the definition be: A means of describing the relative support the evidence lends to the conclusion. | Reject with comment. Definition now reads: "The relative support or extent to which the evidence supports one proposition over another. It may be described verbally or numerically." |
| 56 | 2.81 strength of the evidence | E | Same issue with the definition of proposition | Clarify and make less complicated the definition of "propositions" in 2.61 | Reject with comment. We have simplified the definitions as much as possible whilst still maintaining accurate meaning. Comparing and contrasting the definitions against each other will be detailed in STD 013. Possible to add definition of Likelihood Ratio from ISO 21043-1 |
| 121 | 2.83 and 2.84 | T | Define suitable instead of the current definitions. Additionally, everything is suitable for AFIS these days (no need to define this). | Define suitable instead of the current definitions. | Accept with comment. Definition for 'suitability' now reads "The usefulness of an impression for a further step in the examination process, such as comparison or Automated Biometric Identification System (ABIS) entry." |
| 26 | 2.84 | E | Commenter from BPR 165 suggests adding "suitability" as a synonym for utility | suitability added as a synonym for utility | Accept. |
| 90 | 2.88 | E | Definition of trainee states, 'usually still in training'. Isn't a trainee ALWAYS still in training? | Remove 'usually still in training'. | Accept with comment. Removed definition from document. |
| 99 | 2.88 | E | Apprentice is a more appropriate term to use since training should include studying as well as actual casework experience. | Change the term trainee to apprentice. | Reject with comment. Removed definition from document. |
| 134 | 2.88 | T | some training programs sign staff off in stages and therefore would not fit the definition of trainee. | remove the first part of the definition and define as "an individual not yet fully signed off on all areas of friction ridge examinations for the FSP" | Accept with comment. Removed definition from document. |
| 123 | 2.89 | E | This definition for utility seems the same as the definition for suitability decisions and ABIS suitability. Are suitability and utility the same? It is unclear. | Please clarify if suitability and utility are the same or different. I cannot tell from the definitions. | Accept. |
| 133 | 2.89 | T | this term is not generally accepted and is not needed as it seems to mean the same thing as suitability (a generally accepted term) | remove "utility" from definitions and all of it's uses | Reject with comment. Synonym of "suitability" |
| 124 | 2. 90 | | The definition for validity seems like it's really the definition for a performance check, not a definition of validity. | Please clarify the difference between a validation study and a performance check because the current definition seems to confuse the issues instead of clarifying the issues. | Reject with comment. The OSAC preferred terms have been agreed upon through cross disciplinary consensus at OSAC and don't mention 'performance check.' |

| | | | | | |
|-----|------|---|---|---|--|
| 125 | 2.91 | | Note 1 adds a new term that causes confusion over clarification (open verification). | Note 1 - remove 'open' | Reject with comment. Open (non-blind) verification is defined as: "A type of verification in which the subsequent examiner knows the identity of the other examiner(s) and has been provided with their decisions, conclusions and/or documented data used to support their conclusion." |
| 126 | 2.91 | | Note 3 seems to define independent. Since it is defining a word, it should be listed as a definition. | Define independent and remove note 3. | Accept. Added definition for "independent examination" |
| 27 | 2.91 | T | Suggested addition from Full CB Meeting held 04/05/22 - Straw poll taken and "process" won out over "method" | <p>Insert definition of "forensic process" as modified from ISO 21043-1.</p> <p>forensic process</p> <p>Set of interrelated or interacting forensic activities including methods, techniques and processes used to establish conclusions and/or opinions, facts and findings, which can be used for legal proceedings.</p> <p>NOTE The forensic process can include item handling and control, examination, reporting and testimony.</p> <p>modified from ISO 21043-1</p> | Accept. |
| 127 | 2.92 | | If this definition is not used in the FR documents then it is causing more confusion to add this definition to the list, rather than clarifying anything. | Remove this definition. | Accept. |