

Deadline of Submission of Comments: 16-Mar-20

ASB Standard 027: Crime Scene/Death Investigation - Dogs and Sensors - Patrol Dogs: Tracking/Trailing/Area Search/Building Search/ Evidence Search for One or More Persons Based on Last Known Position

Note: a specific Proposed Resolution must accompany each comment or it cannot be considered.

#	Section	Type of Comment	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
1		E	I have reviewed the Document D&S Patrol Dogs and have a lot of concerns regarding this document. Let me start by saying this document should NOT address any apprehension phases of patrol work it should only cover the topics listed in the title.		Reject: Apprehension phases are integral to the patrol canine discipline.
2			This document dictates a lot of "SHALLS" and follows guidelines of one particular National Organization or certifying body. It does NOT take into account existing patrol certifications from other National Organizations whose rules may vary from this document. ALL National Organizations have one thing in common, the recall and the bite release. Both of which are extremely vague in this document.		Reject: Multiple national organizations existing patrol certifications were consulted for the development of this standard. Table-1, in Section 6, was added to clarify the certification requirements. Also, an editorial change was made in section 5.7.3.3.8 to clarify the "shall" statement. Section 7.5 was updated as well to include non-double blind assessments. Also, Section 6.3 was edited to clarify certification needs.
3			This document provides ONE method for a recall and each National Organization has different ideas on how to achieve their Patrol certification recall. Some are VERY inclusive on their rules and others are straight forward either the team does it or not. Both meet standards that are court approved. The SHALLS indicate that if the organization "of their choice" differs from this document it does not meet this standard. Regardless of the vagueness of this document in these main areas. (Recall & Bite and Bite Release) A lot of important factors in evaluating a police service dog for patrol are not even address, for example competent solid bite, weak bite, re-bites and gun fire. Yes there is a remark in this document that says with or without gun fire but it does not provide any clear acceptance of the dogs behavior when exposed to gun fire. Gun fire should NOT be included in any bite scenario or evaluation. It should only be done during control (obedience) phases.	Add detention and handler protection.	Accept with modification: Section 5.7.2 was modified to clarify commenter's concerns.
4			One of my SERIOUS concerns is there is absolutely NO INCLUSION of tactical assessments at all in this document and as a result Officer Safety is NON-Existent or evaluated. There is no assessment regarding the apprehension phase of patrol work and only ONE method of obtaining a recall.	Add a minimum of caliber of length or a decibel. Conducted with a xx length round.... "At this time, a shot from a .38 caliber blank gun or the audible equivalent will be fired by a helper who is out of sight and at least one hundred (100) feet and no more than one hundred-fifty (150) feet from the starting line." 5.6.2.5 The team can fail the recall but still can pass the assessment.	Reject: Certifications for officer safety are outside of the scope of this document.
5			The name of the document says PATROL DOG and lists only DETECTION disciplines. In my opinion, any guidelines in this document regarding control of aggression should be removed.	Update the pass and failure criteria. (WG to determine the right spot for this recommendation)	Accept with Modification: The title of this document was simplified. Control assessments are within the scope of the document. Pass and failure criteria was updated throughout the document.
6			Keep it focused on the detection side of patrol work not the aggression side		Reject: Control assessments and obedience are within the scope of this document. Pass and failure criteria was updated throughout the document.
7			Tactics are not addressed.	TOTALLY DISAGREE WITH ANY THING TO DO WITH AGGRESSION DUE TO INADEQUATE AND INCOMPLETE BITE WORK Guidelines	Reject: Control assessment and pass fail criteria was updated throughout the document. Tactics were not updated as recommendation was not submitted by the commenter.
8				Guidelines	Reject: See updated forward. This document is a standard because it contains requirements (Shalls) not a guideline.
169	?	E	While law enforcement usually has a industry standard of certifying on an annual basis, although that may be marked by the calendar year and not the actual test date, therefore allowing for more than 12 months. Their agency bears the burden of the workdays taken to do so, as well as the travel and testing cost associated with testing. The Civilian SAR, on the other hand, has an industry standard of every two years. Given the costs of testing and traveling for the test, days off work, room and board, etc. are the burden of the unpaid professional volunteer, as well as often the low frequency of testing available within a reasonable distance. Additionally, the evaluators putting on the tests are also unpaid professional volunteers who give of their time, vacation days and money to conduct these tests. Therefore, I think that some further consideration should be given to this as an annual requirement.	Civilian SAR have a 2 year Certification	Commenter is retracting this comment.
9	General	T/E	TR025 is filled with multiple terms associated with training methods and techniques yet a fraction of them are seen in this document. Terms like operant conditioning, coercion training, avoidance training, escape training, extinction training, proofing, etc. very well may be a part of initial training, maintenance training, or routine training, but this standard gives no indication. The standard is not good in giving a complete picture of all the training methods and techniques in practice.	The initial training of the canine section of the document should be updated with greater detail of the training involved. Additionally, it should be stated if the canine needs dual purpose training.	Reject: The initial training of the canine handler and canine (section 4) were written so that individual programs can develop their own training. The trainers would be responsible for designing an adequate training regimen to fit their needs.

#	Section	Type of Comment	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
33	General Comment	E	The Terms and Definitions section is excessively long. Many of these terms are defined in the General Guidelines Standard. Only terms unique to this document are needed.	Include only terms unique to tracking/trailing	Accept with modification: Several terms were deleted and the reference to TR 025 was added.
34	General Comment	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	The term match and target are currently used almost interchangeably in the document. In truth, the scent of the article and target person can be <i>associated</i> by the dog.	Accept with modification: Terms were edited to replace match with associate and also the term match was updated throughout the document to read associate.
35	General Comment	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Paranthenetically define agency, entitiy, department, organization, individual as 'organization' or 'organization/individual' and consistently use that term throughout.	Accept with Modification: The consistent term used is "organization" and the appropriate term remains as "assessing agency".
36	General Comment	E	The Bibliography (Annex B) is excessively long and mostly contains citations that are not germane to Tracking/Trailing Searches. Provide the reader with focused reference documentation and they might read them.	Winnow the Bibliography down to canine tracking/trailing documents.	Accept with Modification: The bibliography represents an overarching collection of patrol canine foundational references.
10	Title	T/E	The title of the standard does not indicate that this is a training/certification standard.	Change the title to indicate that this is a training/certification standard.	Accept with Modification: The documents in this group are not titled for certification. However, the title of this document was edited for clarification.
11	Foreword	T/E		Something similar to the passage below should be added to the foreword to describe the work being performed by the canine. "Prior to the start of the search, the canine is "scented" on an object (scent article) containing the target's scent. The canine works from an article to either a person or a location associated with that person. The goal is for the canine to detect and use a specific person's scent on a scent article to either search for and follow a matching scent trail to this specific person or a location associated with this person while discriminating from all nonmatching scent trails, or to correctly demonstrate the absence of a matching scent trail. Canines used in this discipline are typically deployed in search and rescue and forensic investigative functions, and typically not in immediate apprehension functions." The passage should be tailored to the specific requirements of this standard. Additionally, a sentence should be added that states "Failure to train canines to the requirements outlined in this document is expected to increase inaccuracy and inconsistency."	Reject: The foreword was modified to maintain consistency with ASB's guidelines. The goal of this document was added to the forward. ASB guidelines suggest the following "[First part of the Foreword should include the scientific and/or operational underpinnings for the requirements laid out in the standard or best practice recommendation. When writing this section, the authors should keep in mind that this need not be a full scientific treatise, but rather a general overview of the principles. The forward cannot include recommendations or requirements. Each revision of the standard shall include a summary of the substantive changes to the previous edition.]".
12	3	T/E	This document does a better job of listing the relevant terms that are found in the body of the body of the document. However, there are still a bunch of terms that are not used anywhere in the document besides section 3. Terms are linked to one another, but these linked terms don't provide additional clarity on the content in the body of the document.	Eliminate all terms from section 3 that are not found in the body of the document or provide clarity on concepts covered in the body of the document.	Accept with modification: Several terms were deleted and the reference to TR 025 was added. Also, the use of odor/scent was edited as appropriate throughout the document to read as "scent".
13	3.1-3.3	T/E	Neither of these terms are used in the document. The document does not indicate who or what should be accredited or a standard that should be used for accreditation purposes.	Accreditation is important, and this should be communicated somewhere within the document. If additional clarity on accreditation is not added to a section of the standard these three definitions should be removed from the document.	Accept
14	3.4	T/E	The definition given for active alert does not convey a positive response that a handler or investigator would want to see at a crime scene. The idea of disruption to the environment or evidence does not seem like a positive attribute a canine would be trained to have. This definition contradicts situations where the term is used throughout the document. Additionally, what is the canine responding to with an active alert? For example: 4.2.1.2 The canine shall be trained to perform a pre-determined specific final response (active or passive alert) upon locating the trained scent (positive alert).	The definition of active alert needs to be reconsidered since the potential for destruction, alteration, or contamination of the evidence from some of this behavior (scratch, dig, etc.), it should be considered whether these should be noted as disfavored alerts.	Reject: This comment will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon. This definition is appropriate for its use in this document.
37	3.4	E	This definition needs work. The idea that a demonstrative display of an alert "may disturb the environment and/or forensic evidence" is not related to a definition and is only a consequence of the active alert. This information is a 'note.'	Write a real definition. Distrubing forensic evidence is a consequence and should be a note.	Reject: This comment will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon. This definition is appropriate for its use in this document.
38	3.9	E	Missing period	Add period at end of definition.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
39	3.12	E	Is the search 'interior OR exterior' or potentially both?	Add ...exterior and/or both ...	Accept
153	3.13	T	species name should be italicized	<i>Canis familiaris</i>	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
40	3.14	E	Agency? Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Choose a consistent term like <i>organization</i> or <i>organization/individual</i>	Reject: This comment will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.

#	Section	Type of Comment	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
41	3.21	E	Bad form: definition relies on an I.e.,	Replace with ...separately from <i>training, assessments, or discipline -related records</i> ...	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
42	3.23	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Choose a consistent term like <i>organization</i> or <i>organization/individual</i>	Reject: This comment will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
154	3.24	E	Not sure that "trained odor" is the correct verbiage here. Technically we don't train the odor, we train a dog to recognize a target odor.	...target odor to which the dog is trained.	Accept with modification: The word "odor" was removed because this discipline is only training on scent.
157	3.24	E	There is a tendency in this document to trade off between the use of "trained odor" and "target odor" .	I would suggest sticking with "target odor" since we don't technically train odor, we train to recognize a target odor. But either way the document should use only one descriptor "trained odor" or "target odor".	Reject: The word scent is the appropriate term for this document. This comment will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
43	3.28	E	This is not a good definition, which descibes <i>consistent measures</i> not <i>consistency</i> .	How about "A <i>measure of the conformity of a stimulus and response</i> ."	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
44	3.30	E	Since when do definitions start with 'when?'	How about "A <i>condition where an odor/scent</i> ..."	Accept with modification: The first sentence was modified to read "An odor/scent is inadvertently or purposefully introduced."
155	3.30	E	Not all contamination is "inadvertently" introduced. During training, contamination is often purposefully introduced as a distractor to proof the dog to the target odor.	omit 3.30 and keep 3.29	Accept with modification: 3.30 was kept. This comment will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
45	3.32	E	What is 'something?'	Substitute <del>something</del> with <i>...where a stream, path, or other obstacle</i> ...	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
46	3.33	E	This is NOT a definition, only a discussion which uses the term in the definition.	Try this: "A <i>person or persons used to present non-target odors in a tracking/trailing exercise</i> ."	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
15	3.33-3.35	E	The term decoy is defined three different ways and appears 61 times in this standard. 43 times the decoy shows up as decoy/suspect. As a reader, how would one know which definition of decoy is being used throughout the standard? There are not enough specifics on the training being performed to know which definition of the term applies.	Specify which definition of decoy is being used throughout the document. There wouldn't be a suspect in a training or certification assessment. Change suspect to target.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
47	3.34	E	Not a definition, only a discussion of principles that should be incorporated into the body of the Standard.	Strike out entire definition add as a note about this issue in the body of the Standard.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
48	3.35	E	Not a definition, only a discussion of principles that should be incorporated into the body of the Standard.	Strike out entire definition add as a note about this issue in the body of the Standard.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
49	3.37	E	Bad form: definition relies on an I.e.,	Replace <del>other records</del> with <i>...separately from training, assessments, or discipline -related records</i> ...	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
50	3.38	E	Wrong term "subject"	Replace <del>subject</del> with <i>target</i>	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
51	3.39	E	Bad form: definition relies on an I.e.,	Replace <del>other records</del> with <i>...separately from training, assessments, or certifications</i> .	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
156	3.43	E	Distractibility is not always "easy". Thus the use of the qualifiers "easily distracted" or "not easily distracted".	The ease of eliciting a loss of focus/attention from the current task.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
52	3.45	E	"Works": is an ill-defined, non-specific, colloquial term and adds nothing - could the dog be pulling a sled? Refer only to 3.14	Refer to 3.14	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
53	3.46	E	The "scientific usage" definition adds nothing.	Delete entire scientific usage statement. Revise thusly: <del>Operational usage: In the The evaluation of a canine team where neither...</del>	Accept
54	3.47	E	"Works: is an ill-defined, non-specific, colloquial term and adds nothing - could the dog be pulling a sled?"	Replace <del>work</del> with <i>search</i> or <i>detect</i> (all instances)	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
55	3.48	E	Poorly said	Replace with <i>...experience in the discipline being evaluated, who assesses...</i> with <i>...experience in the discipline-related assessment of the...</i>	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
56	3.49	E	Belief? Is this religion?	Replace <del>belief</del> with <i>hypothesis</i> or <i>theory</i>	Accept, revised to "theory." Comment will also be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when the TR is revised.
57	3.50	E	New term "non-specific"	Use existing terms. Replace <del>non-specific</del> with <i>non-targeted</i>	Accept. Comment will also be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when the TR is revised.
58	3.54	E	Two sections say the same thing	Revise to: <i>...scent; a situation in which the canine exhibits the trained final response in the absense of the odor on which he/she that the dog was trained to find.</i>	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
158	3.56	E	In other documents this is defined as a "false alert", which makes sense. Would not a "false response" be both a false negative or a false positive? Why is it defined as only a false poistive?	Either omit "false response" or define as: In a controlled environment, the canine responds as if a trained substance was present when it is known that it is not; or not present when it is known that it is.	Accept: Definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
159	3.61	E	why classify this as "human" scent behavior, would this not just be "scent behavior" true of any specific scent of interest in the environment?	rename as "scent behavior" and remove "human" from the definition.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
60	3.62	E	Better said	<i>...person's scented article</i> ...	Accept
59	3.68	E	Inconsistent distractor usage: person or persons	Add: <i>...person or persons...</i>	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.

#	Section	Type of Comment	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
160	3.68	T	Technically these are not the same thing. A last known position/place is more of an assumed position, for example it may be where a person left his/her car or where they signed in at a trail head, or where they "said" they were going. Where as the point last seen is an actual sighting of the individual. Someone can place them at that spot because they saw them there.	split these and give correct definitions	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
61	3.70	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Define: <del>matching target scent trail</del>	Reject with modification: Terms were edited to replace match with associate and also the term match was updated throughout the document to read associate.
62	3.70	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Change to: ...scent is associated with the...	Accept with modification: Terms were edited to replace match with associate and also the term match was updated throughout the document to read associate.
63	3.71	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Define: <del>matching to sample</del> as <i>associating samples</i>	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
64	3.72	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Pick a term and stick with it	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
65	3.73	E	Only currently (manged by NIST)	Delete: <del>{managed by NIST}</del>	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
66	3.74	E	More complete statement needed	Add: <i>These may include: a nimal...</i>	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
161	3.76	E	A "negative response" does not necessarily mean an alert/indication. For example, a drug dog does not give an "alert/indication" if no drugs are present, he/she simply does not give a positive alert. The same is true of some trailing dogs, they simply do not take a trail if the target scent is not present, while others have been trained to give a specific behavior to indicate no scent is present. This definition should be inclusive of both. Or leave as is and change this to a definition of "Trained Negative Response". As is, it implies that a negative response must have an alert/indication.	Behavior exhibited by a canine showing no match to odor/scent, i.e., no matching trail, no substance present, etc. This may be a specifically trained negative response behavior or the absence of a positive behavior.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
168	3.76	E	A negative response does not necessarily mean an alert/indication. For example, a drug dog does not give an "alert/indication" if no drugs are present, he/she simply does not give a positive alert. The same is true of some trailing dogs, they simply do not take a trail if the target scent is not present, while others have been trained to give a specific behavior to indicate no scent is present. This definition should be inclusive of both.	Behavior exhibited by a canine showing no match to odor/scent, i.e., no matching trail, no substance present, etc. This may be a specifically trained negative response behavior or the absence of a positive behavior.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
67	3.77	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Change to: non- <del>matching</del> <i>tartget</i> scent trail	Reject with modification: Terms were edited to replace match with associate and also the term match was updated throughout the document to read associate.
68	3.77	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Change to: ... <del>does not match</del> is not associated with...	Accept with modification: Terms were edited to replace match with associate and also the term match was updated throughout the document to read associate.
69	3.77	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Change to: ...absence of a <del>matching an</del> <i>target</i> scent...	Reject with modification: Terms were edited to replace match with associate and also the term match was updated throughout the document to read associate.
162	3.80	E	I would disagree that "scent" is traditionally just related to "human". I would however agree that it has been traditionally related to "live" beings.	Omit: "Scent" has traditionally referred to canine detection of humans.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.

#	Section	Type of Comment	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
70	3.84	T	"Concentrated" is misleading. Scents/odors are rarely 'concentrated.'	Replace with ...of an elevated concentration of target...	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
71	3.89	E	Parentheses de-emphasize the importance	Revise to : ...conducted either single- or double-blind in...	Reject. Items in the parentheses are the two options.
72	3.90	E	Poorly said. Please diagram this sentence, it has too many subtended ideas to be easily understood.	Needs revision	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
73	3.92	E	Needs an and, not a comma	Change to: ...discipline <i>and</i> designed...	Accept
163	3.98	E	Not sure that "sample" is the best verbiage here, perhaps "representative"	A representative target scent.....	Accept. Comment will also be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when the TR is revised.
74	3.98	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Reword: ...to <del>match</del> - <i>associate</i> the scent article with the target..	Accept with modification: Terms were edited to replace match with associate and also the term match was updated throughout the document to read associate.
75	3.99	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Replace: ... <del>match</del> <i>associate</i> ...	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
164	3.99	E	I think that the verbiage should be the same for both 024: 3.106 and 3.107; 026: 3.88 and 3.89; 027: 3.98 and 3.99. "sample target scent" versus "sample target odor pad (scent article)". Also, all K9 are given a scent article prior to deployment so this doesn't really differentiate "scenting" the K9 versus "pre-scenting" the K9. What is meant here? Scenting the K9 prior to conducting a scent inventory or prior to putting on their gear or prior to giving a "search" command? I am unclear here, particularly since deployment is defined as "Assignment of a canine team in an operational environment." Which is very subjective as to when that occurs. So what I think you are calling "pre-scenting" is often just referred to as "scenting" the K9 in the field.	I my world a pre-scent is done prior to a scent inventory, which is conducted prior to scenting the K9 at the time the scent/search command is given.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
76	3.100	E	This is not a textbook definition. It is a description starting with what conditions "exist."	Replace with: <del>Probable cause exists when the facts</del> Facts and circumstances known to the officer <i>are sufficient</i> to warrant...	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
77	3.104	E	Second sentence needs a verb.	Add a verb.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
78	3.104	T	No measurement is free from random errors. Ask Heisenberg.	End Sentence: ...repeatable and consistent <del>and free from random errors</del> .	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
79	3.109	E	What kind of jeopardy? Like with Alex Trebeck?	Replace: ... <del>jeopardy</del> <i>physical harm</i> .	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
80	3.111	E	What task?	Replace: ... <del>to put the canine on task</del> <i>required to initiate tracking/trailing behavior</i> .	Reject: task is inclusive of track trailing, evidence searching, etc. and scent articles are not always required.
165	3.112	T	3.112 and 3.117 appear to be similar.	Omit 3.112	Accept with modification. 3. 117 removed.
81	3.113	T	What evidence do you have that the odor plume is funnel shaped - which implies it is expanding in the horizontal AND vertical dimension?	Replace: <del>becoming wider</del> <i>expanding</i>	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
82	3.113	T	Anywhere upwind?	Change to: by <del>moving upwind</del> <i>following the scent upwind</i> .	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
83	3.114	T	The scent cone does not disconnect when the target moves otherwise it would be impossible to follow.	Change to: ... <del>separate</del> <i>relocating</i> ...	Accept with modification. Entire second. sentence deleted. Comment will also be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when the TR is revised.
166	3.123	E	Change definition to match in all documents - 024: 3.130 and 3.137 should be the same. 026: 3.111 and 3.118 should be the same. 027: 3.123 and 3.131 should be the same	Omit "scent pathway left by a person" 024: 3.130. 026: 3.111. 027: 3.123 and use "The scent pathway left by an individual moving". (see scent trail)	Accept with modification: 3.123 was updated to read " Scent pathway left by an individual moving." This comment will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
167	3.127	E	A split trail does not have to be "straight line".	Refers to a training exercise in which two subjects walk together and then split into two different directions.	Accept with modification: This term was changed to "split trail". This definition's first sentence was updated to read "A training exercise in which two subjects walk the same pathway and then split into two different directions." This comment will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
84	3.127	E	Better said.	Change to: <del>Refers to a</del> <i>A training</i> ...	Accept. Comment will also be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when the TR is revised.
85	3.128	E	A non-standard definition	Find an accepted definition.	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.

#	Section	Type of Comment	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
86	3.130	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person by use of the scented article.	Replace with: ... <i>matches is associated with the target scent article</i> ...	Accept with modification: Terms were edited to replace match with associate and also the term match was updated throughout the document to read associate.
87	3.132	T	By definition, objects do not have scents, only odors.	Change to: ... <i>pre-scented on an object a target scent article</i> .	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
88	3.133	E	Better said.	Change to: ... <i>will get them to locate</i> ...	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
89	3.133	E	By definition, objects do not have scents, only odors.	Change to: ... <i>pre-scented on an object a target scent article</i> .	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
90	3.136	E	Better said, without the i.e., in a definition.	... <i>from other records, i.e., assessment</i> ...	Reject: Although this definition was removed, these comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
16	4.1	T	The section does not indicate how competency is established for the handler. Does this individual need to complete written and/or oral exams on the topics covered in 4.1.2? Does this individual need to perform a moot court? How does a handler demonstrate proficiency in these areas? Is competency related to dog handling in general, or to this particular task?	Another statement needs to be added to the section detailing how competency is established for the handler, if it's the parent organization or outside organization that determines competency, and how the handler demonstrates proficiency in any of the areas specified in the section.	Reject: This comment is not included in the scope of this document. The competent trainer designs the training plan specific to organization's needs.
17	4.1	T	The requirements of section 4.1 don't describe bonding between the handler and the canine or how a handler would go about rewarding a canine. The section is not clear in stating which learning objectives would be done with and without the canine. Since canine is being trained by someone besides the handler, how much hands-on training must take place between the actual canine team before they would be ready for assessment.	The objectives in the section need to be clear in stating which exercises are with and without the canine. Information on the bonding and rewarding system needs to be added. An approximation of bonding time needed between the canine and the handler should be given before the team is ready for assessment.	Accept with modification: Section 4.3 was added to this document. Bonding is described in 4.3.2. Rewarding the canine is covered in 4.1.2-e.
92	4.1.2 a)	E	Turn the colloquial phrase around.	Revision: <i>The ability to interpret the canine's change in behavior to particular stimuli, i.e. "read the canine"</i> .	Reject. This is previously approved language from ANSI/ASB Standard 088. "Recognizing" replaced "interpreting" for clarification in sections 4.1.2-a, 5.7.3.4.3, 5.7.3.4.5, 5.7.3.5.2., 5.7.3.5.4. and in Annex A.
18	4.1.2b	T	Comment: What "[c]anine handler training shall include . . . the acquisition and processing of scent by the canine" means is unclear.	Please elaborate.	Reject: The competent trainer designs the training plan specific to organization's needs.
19	4.1.2h	T	"[F]itness for canine and handler" needs more elaboration. Is this a matter of "physical fitness"? Fitness for a particular task? It should include knowledge about aging of canines, and how that affects reliability in the field.	Clarify these terms.	Reject: The competent trainer designs the training plan specific to organization's needs.
94	4.1.2 i)	E	Poorly said.	... <i>of legal documentation required for legal proceedings</i>	Reject: "Legal documentation" is appropriate for this section. Reference added to TR 084
20	4.1.2i	T	Legal aspects should also include standards for admissibility and discovery rules for scientific and nonscientific expert evidence. Handlers should understand that any expert evidence is likely to be subject to, at a minimum, some reliability analysis, and knowing the relevant rules in their jurisdiction will help them train appropriately and keep appropriate records.	Include "relevant laws and rules about admissibility discovery." The bibliography should include references and caselaw relevant to the presentation of scientific/technical evidence.	Reject: Relevant case law is constantly changing and it is different for each jurisdiction. Reference added to TR 084.
93	4.1.2 f)	E	Poorly said.	education on cognitive bias;	Accept
95	4.1.3	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Pick a term and stick with it	Reject: This is the first time the terms is used and defined for the remainder of this document. TR 025 definitions were used which is why they are multiple terms used for organization.
96	4.1.5	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	organizaton is OK	No request for modification
91	4.11	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Choose a consistent term like organization or organization/individual	Accept: Organization is term selected for use throughout the document.
97	4.2.1	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	entity is not	Accept: Organization is term selected for use throughout the document.
21	4.2.1.2	T/E	Based on 4.2.1.1, there is a difference between obedience and control training. Control training is not defined in section 3 or in TR025. Since the team is required to perform control assessments, it should be clear what that entails.	Define control training and included how it differs from obedience.	Accept: The term and definition for "control training" was added to section 3. (3.31).
98	4.2.1.3	E	These are examples but not comprehensive, so use an e.g., get rid of the parentheses.	... <i>reponse, e.g., detaining/...</i>	Accept with modification: Added (e.g.).
99	4.2.1.4	E	These are examples but not comprehensive, so use an e.g., get rid of the parentheses.	... <i>searches, e.g., track...</i>	Accept with modification: Added (e.g.).
	4.3		Based on review of the work ongoing on several documents, the consensus body proposes the following modification:	WG recommends to add a new section 4.3 that covers canine team training.	Accept
22	5	T		Specify if assessments are done on or off-lead.	Reject: The lead requirement for the assessment are found within the description of the assessment.

#	Section	Type of Comment	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
100	5.3	E	Better said.	...articulate the nature of ...	Reject: Proposed resolution adds ambiguity to this statement.
101	5.3	E	This e.g., should be an i.e., lose the parentheses.	...instances, (e.g., i.e., the decoy...	Accept with modification: Added (i.e.).
102	5.5.1	E	These are examples but not comprehensive, so use an e.g., get rid of the parentheses.	add a comma lose the parentheses	Reject: This document contains (e.g.) and (i.e.) in parenthesis.
103	5.5.2	T	This is bassackwards. The handler has no idea of the assessment in a single- or double-blind experiment.	The canine handler assessor shall confer with the assessor-handler ...	Accept
104	5.6	E	Use a 50 cent word.	...following ways manner .	Accept with modification: "Methods" replaced "ways".
105	5.6.1.3, 5.6.1.4, 5.6.1.5, 5.6.2.1	E	Using the term "be able" adds nothing to these elements and is not consistently used throughout. Dump then.	...shall be able...	Accept
106	5.6.3.1.3	E	These are examples but not comprehensive, so use an e.g., get rid of the parentheses.	...works, (e.g., urban,...	Reject: This document contains (e.g.) and (i.e.) in parenthesis.
107	5.6.3.2	E	Building Search was previously defined as indoors or outside the building	Add: A An indoor building...	Reject: The "building search" definition was updated. Comment will be provided to TR 025 WG to consider updating when the TR 25 is revised.
108	5.6.3.3.5	E	S.I. Units are required.	Add: ...feet (18 m x 18 m) .	Accept
109	5.6.3.3.9	E	S.I. Units are required.	Add: ...inches (5 cm to 8 cm) )	Accept with modification: we used 5 cm by 8 cm.
110	5.6.3.3.11	T	So 67% is passing? This is not consistent with other requirements.	???	Accept with Modification: Assessment was modified to be consistent with general guidelines. (Also, see updated 5.6.3.3.10.)
111	5.6.3.4.1	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and associate or link or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Replace: ...non-matching target	Reject with modification: Terms were edited to replace match with associate and also the term match was updated throughout the document to read associate.
112	5.6.3.4.2	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and associate or link or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Replace: ...matching target	Reject with modification: Terms were edited to replace match with associate and also the term match was updated throughout the document to read associate.
113	5.6.3.4.7. 1	E	S.I. Units are required.	Add: ...feet (5 m) .	Accept
114	5.6.3.4.7. 3	E	Whew, this one smells bad. It is hard to determine the parrenthesis and subtended sentence fragments start and stop.	Needs grammatically-correct revision..	Accept. Sentence was revised.
115	5.6.3.4.7. 6	E	Add an e.g.,	Revise: ...surfaces (e.g., dirt...	Accept
116	5.6.3.4.7. 9	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Agency? Please choose a term	Reject with modification: The term "assessing agency" was replaced with "assessor".
117	5.6.3.4.7. 14	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Agency? Please choose a term	Reject with modification: The term "assessing agency" was replaced with "assessor".
118	5.6.3.5.1	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Yea. Organization!	Accept
119	5.6.3.5.5. 1	E	S.I. Units are required.	Add: ...feet (5 m) .	can't find it in the document
120	5.6.3.5.5. 16	E	What happened to target track versus subject track ?	Did you ever have to finally decide, pick up on one and let the other one ride?	Accept with modification: The term "target" was selected for use.
121	5.6.3.5.5. 17	E	What happened to target track versus subject track ?	???	Accept with modification: The term "target" was selected for use.
122	5.6.3.5.5. 17.1	E	Now the subject is a suspect not a target	Choose a consistent term	Accept with modification: The term "target" was selected for use.
123	Figure 3	E	Now the subject is a suspect not a target	Choose a consistent term	Accept with modification: A figure note was added for clarification.

#	Section	Type of Comment	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
124	5.6.4.2	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Replace: ... a <del>scent-match</del> <i>an associated scent</i> .	Accept
23	5.6.4.5	T		The should in this sentence needs to be changed into a shall.	Reject: "Should" is the appropriate term.
32	6.1	T	Need to add language for dual purpose canines indicating that they need to certify in each area (patrol/EDC; Patrol/drug, etc.)	Add: If the canine is a dual purpose, then the canine team shall pass all parameters outlined in Section 5, Canine Team Assessments in both this document and the corresponding detection discipline document.	Accept with modification: This section was revised and certification assessments were clarified.
125	6.2	T	Two pieces out of how many?	Revise: ... <i>two out of three</i> ...	Accept with modification: This section was revised and 'successful certification was clarified.
24	6.5, 6.9	T	Day-to-day training is not defined in TR025 or this document. Clarify what is meant by the term.	If day-to-day training is the same as routine training, day-to-day should be replaced with routine. If day-to-day training is not routine training the term needs to be defined.	Accept with modification: "Day-to-day" was replaced with "(maintenance training, periodic proficiency assessments, double-blind assessment, etc.)". Also "decoy/suspect" was replaced by "target".
25	6.Ten	T		Specify who is responsible for writing the corrective action, the agency or the assessor.	Accept with modification: "developed by the canine team's trainer" was added for clarification.
26	6.11	T		The standard suggests there are many trainers involved in canine training. Which trainer is responsible for determining the remediation time, can it be the handler, or a certified trainer? This term needs specification.	Reject: The canine team's organization shall make this determination.
27	6.11.1	T		It shouldn't be optional for the of the handler/trainer to receive documentation showing that remediation has taken place. The sentence needs to be changed from a <i>should</i> to a <i>shall</i> .	Reject: Not all certifying agencies require training records. However, the records shall be maintained by the canine handler.
28	6.12	T	This is a standard and the phrase "recommended guidelines" should not be used in this document. Furthermore, there is only two one statement in this section which should be changed to shall statement, everything else is a requirement.	The sentence should be changed to "Organization(s) may enhance standard requirement in order to make organizational requirements more stringent."	Accept
126	6.12	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Good! Organization (s)	Accept
29	7.1f	E		Based on the current title of the document, tracks should be added to this statement.	Accept
127	7.1 f)	T	The term 'match' is a poor, colloquial term misused by the forensic community. A scented article of clothing and a human are NOT a match. In addition, the vapor signature of a scented article does not match the target individual. Odor uptake and release of the article is different than the target, so the two do not match. The dog is able to generalize the scent and <i>associate</i> or <i>link</i> or identify the target person buy use of the scented article.	Change to: non- <del>matching</del> <i>target</i>	Reject with modification: Terms were edited to replace match with associate and also the term match was updated throughout the document to read associate.
128	7.1 k)	E	Add an e.g.,	Add: ...articles ( <i>e.g.</i> , ...	Reject. Keeping etc. is appropriate therefore e.g. is not added.
129	7.1 l)	E	Add an e.g.,	Add: ...concealment ( <i>e.g.</i> , ...	Reject. Keeping etc. is appropriate therefore e.g. is not added.
130	7.1 m)	E	Add an e.g.,	Add: ...distractors ( <i>e.g.</i> , ...	Reject. Keeping etc. is appropriate therefore e.g. is not added.
131	8.4	E	"due to" is never good to use.	Change to: ...necessary <del>due to</del> <i>to prevent</i> odor...	Accept with modification: Section 8.4 was updated to reflect this comment.
132	8.4	E	Missing phrase	Add: ...and/or <i>account for</i> the...	Accept with modification: Section 8.4 was updated to reflect this comment.
133	9.4	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Pick a term and stick with it	Accept: Organization is term selected for use throughout the document.
134	9.5	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Pick a term and stick with it	Accept: Organization is term selected for use throughout the document.
135	9.5 d)	E	Convert i.e., to and e.g.,	... <del>i.e.</del> , <i>e.g.</i> , ...	Reject. Keeping etc. is appropriate therefore e.g. is not added.
136	9.5 e)	E	Add an e.g.,	Change to: ...design ( <i>e.g.</i> , ...	Reject. Keeping i.e. is appropriate therefore e.g. is not added.
137	9.5 e)	E	Add a comma after e.g.	<i>e.g.</i> ,	Accept with modification. Comma was added after i.e.
138	9.5 h)	E	Add an e.g.,	Change to: ...articles ( <i>e.g.</i> , ...	Reject. Keeping etc. is appropriate therefore e.g. is not added.



#	Section	Type of Comment	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
139	9.5 p)	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Pick a term and stick with it	Accept: Organization is term selected for use throughout the document.
140	9.6 d)	E	Convert i.e., to and e.g.,	<del>...i.e., e.g., ...</del>	Reject. Keeping etc., is appropriate therefore i.e./e.g. are not needed.
141	9.6 k)	E	Convert i.e., to and e.g., Add parentheses	<del>...i.e., (e.g., ...)</del>	Accept
142	9.6 p)	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Pick a term and stick with it	Accept: Organization is term selected for use throughout the document.
143	9.7 f)	E	Suspect(s)? Or targets	Replace: <del>.../suspect(s)</del> target(s)	Accept
144	9.7 g)	E	Add an e.g.,	Change to: ...descriptors (e.g., ...	Reject. Keeping etc., is appropriate therefore i.e./e.g. are not needed.
145	9.7 j)	E	Convert i.e., to and e.g., Add parentheses	<del>...i.e., (e.g., ...)</del>	Accept
146	9.7 p)	E	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Pick a term and stick with it	Accept: Organization is term selected for use throughout the document.
147	9.8 l) and j)	E	Now we have target/suspect	Revise: <del>...target/suspect...</del>	Accept
148	9.8 l)	E	Add an e.g.,	Add: ...search (e.g., ...	Reject. Keeping etc. is appropriate therefore e.g. is not added.
149	9.8 m)	E	Convert i.e., to and e.g., Add parentheses	<del>...i.e., (e.g., ...)</del>	Accept
30	9.9, 9.10	T	It is not appropriate to use confirmed operational outcomes as proof of a team's reliability or capability. Ground truth is not, and cannot, be known in operational settings; confessions, pleas, verdicts, and other evidence may all be wrong. Only training records, assessments, and certification can demonstrate capacity. It is particularly inappropriate when read in light of the following standard which states that non-confirmed shall <i>not</i> be used for canine proficiency. This could give a grossly misleading picture of a dog's reliability, as a dog might have one "confirmed" outcome and dozens of wrong unconfirmed outcomes. That unconfirmed outcomes might not be incorrect is true, and that is why field records are not appropriate proof of proficiency or reliability.	The standard should state that operational outcomes are not proof of a team's proficiency, because true outcomes (whether correct or incorrect) cannot be known.	Reject: Operational outcomes are just one factor to determine proficiency. The totality of training, certification and assessments determines the canine's true proficiency.
150	9.10	E	Add colon not period.	Change to: examples:	Reject: This list follows ASB's style.
151	9.10.1	E	Which is it - suspect or target?	Change to: <del>...Decoy/suspect target ...</del>	Accept with modification: "decoy" was removed as well. The word "target is used to be consistent with this document.
152	Annex A	T	Once again, organization, organization (s), agency, program, entity, professional organization, individual, individual(s) are used randomly throughout the document.	Chose or self-define a term for organization	Accept: "Canine organization" is used.
31	Bibliography	E	Additional case law needs to be added to give a full understanding of the rulings on the use of canines.	Consider adding United States v. Burgos-Montes, The People of the State of Illinois v. Rolando Cruz, Brafford v. State, State v. Storm, Brott v. State. We are willing to provide you with other cases.	Reject: Relevant case law is constantly changing and it is different for each jurisdiction, therefore not included in this document.