

Ballot Name: Approval of ASB 088

Submission of Public Comments:	24-Dec-18
CB Ballot Closing Date:	24-Dec-18
Document Number:	ASB Std 088
Document Title:	General Guidelines for the Training, Certification, and Documentation of Canine Detection Disciplines.

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

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
157	general comments/questions		1. Thank you for the opportunity to comment		REJECT Comment is appreciated but has no relevance to the content of the document.
158	general comments/questions		2. I assume the task of ASB/AAFS is mainly concerned with HRD/narcotics/explosives. Will this group also address other search dog disciplines?		REJECT Comment is appreciated but has no relevance to the content of the document. This document serves as a base-line for all other discipline specific documents.
159	general comments/questions		3. Is this effort independent of NIST? Or designated by NIST?		REJECT Comment is appreciated but has no relevance to the content of the document. NIST sponsors the efforts of OSAC which is currently formulating documents, that once complete, are submitted to the ASB.
160	general comments/questions		4. Can we have the resumes of the committee members?		REJECT ASB does not include acknowledgments in documents.
34	FORWARD	E	KEYWORDS' typo 'official' instead of 'official'	correct mis-spelt word	ACCEPT
35	Scope		Take out: assessments and the basis for.	The certification is the assessment.	REJECT The certification is one element of the assessment process. Assessments of the canine teams proficiency should be conducted on a recurring basis, as outlined within these guidelines.
133	1 Scope	general	1. Because it is a critical part of the development and success of the Canine team, I feel that statements should be made concerning the selection of the K9. There has been much discussion on breeding and selecting working K9s. In my experience one of the primary causes of poor performance or lack of success (training and/or deployment) is the selection of a K9 not suitable for the discipline.		REJECT Canine selection is currently being addressed in a separate document that will provide applicable guidelines for this important process.
14	3.1	E	Better said "...and organization- or program-required continuing canine detection education. (organization is consistent with the remainder of the document and the canines are not the ones needing the education.	edit text	ACCEPT
36	3.1		Sustainment through field applications, maintenance training, recertification		REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
37	3.1		As directed agency policy. Delete required continued education. The description of field applications, maintenance training and cert/recert are the sustain		REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
69	3.1	E	typical language in the document is "department, agency, or organization"	change agency to "department, agency, or organization"	ACCEPT
134	3.2	general	"canine handler error – I would add "decision" defined as a "mental error"		REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
15	3.4 and throughout	E	odor/scent not scent/odor	substitute edited text	ACCEPT
38	3.6		delegated by	add: By the certification authority	REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
135	3.6	general	Certifying official/assessor – I feel that merely being “delegated” is not a sufficient statement. I feel that there should be an emphasis on education, experience and training (to be a “certifying official/assessor”).		REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
39	3.8		This person would normally	add: Assess and provide guidance to the handlers to conduct/perform	REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
40	3.8		instruction - at the end of paragraph	And validate prior to certification	REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
41	3.10		parameters	add: Search protocols	REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
136	3.10	general	“controlled search” – I would add the word deployment		REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
42	3.12		title - record	Recommend that this is one in the same. While deployed the handler should be utilizing the same system to enter training and operational data. During deployments and during down time the teams continue to train and evaluate data to improve detection.	REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
137	3.13	general	“in the evaluation of a dog”. Are we not evaluating the “team”? An assessment should be scoring the team not just the dog.		PARTIAL ACCEPT
66	3.14		false alert:	should be a term used during training or evaluation when the trainer and/or evaluator are 100% sure there is no form of target odor left behind. Not a term to be used in an operational environment as it is unknown whether target odor is present or left behind as residual.	REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
16	3.15	E	add to the list of active alerts (...scratch, attack, etc.) since some dogs are trained to attack.	add text	REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
138	3.15	general	I’ll put his here – I feel that we must be clear about “alert”, ‘change of behavior” and “final response”. In the SAR world (particularly) there are cultural differences in the words “indication” and “alert”. Generally on the east coast an “alert” is “interest’ or “change of behavior”. On the west coast an “alert” means a “final response”.		REJECT This is a universal definition.
17	3.22	E	Better said " ...desired tasks in an operational environment." so that it relates back to the definition	add text	REJECT Cannot use term in the definition.
43	3.22		tasks - end of paragraph	add: Or as part of pre-deployment	REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
44	3.22		odor	Are final response and positive alert considered the same action by the dog.	REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
70	Deleted -was 3.26	E	This is not the standard definition of white noise and the only place it is used in the document is in the terms and definitions section. Natural distractors is also referenced.	Delete 3.26 white noise and remove reference to white noise in 3.26	ACCEPT
1	4.1	T	he standard does not explain how the canine handler will demonstrate competency in areas that do not involve the handling of the dog.	A new standard needs to be added to this section requiring the canine handler to demonstrate competency in scent/odor dispersion, relevant case law, legal preparation, courtroom testimony, and cognitive bias through written examination and moot court testing.	PARTIAL ACCEPT This comment will be addressed by another group that will eventually develop this document. (Note for CB locate the SWIG Dog document at OSAC)
139	4.1.1	general	I hope that future specific documents will address how a "competent trainer" is defined.		REJECT These comments will be provided to TR 025 WG to be considered when this TR is revised sometime soon.
140	4.1.3.1 ?	general	I would limit this to only knowledge of preserving a scene (forensic or not). Collecting evidence by the handler is what caused the problem in the Sande Anderson case!!!	I would add additional training – Learning theory and selection of working K9}}}} I find that in seminars that I have presented that less than 50% have even heard the words "operant conditioning"! I have been told this also holds true in police dog seminars.	PARTIAL ACCEPT This comment will be addressed by another group that will eventually develop this document. (Note for CB locate the SWGDOG document at OSAC)
18	4.1.5.1 has become 4.1.2.8.1	E	Clarify "Effect of odor/scent dispersion"	add text	ACCEPT
45	4.1.5.1 has become 4.1.2.8.1		dispersion	Recommend adding introduction to explosive components. Understanding the components will assist the handler is performing the initial assessment of a device and be better able to brief EOD/Bomb squad as they execute render safe protocols.	PARTIAL ACCEPT This comment will be addressed by another group that will eventually develop this document. (Note for CB locate the SWIG Dog document at OSAC)
73	4.1.5.1 has become 4.1.2.8.1	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
4	4.1.5.2 has become 4.1.2.8.2	E	The standard only cites one case as relevant case law for all canine detection disciplines. Florida v. Harris addresses the argument of law enforcement's responsibility to first establish reliability of a dog's alert or if a dog's alert is enough to establish probable cause for a search. While this case is very relevant to the training of canine teams, it is not the only case that handlers should deem as relevant. As the standard is written, we sense that practitioners will limit their knowledge of case law to this one case.	Additional cases should be added to standard 4.1.5.2 (e.g. United States v. Burgos-Montes, The People of the State of Illinois v. Rolando Cruz, etc.). Probable cause for a search is not the only circumstance that canine teams can be used for and this standard is meant to address all canine detection disciplines. Handlers should know of case law where canine evidence was presented, especially those cases where the court admitted canine testing results that were later proven to be erroneous.	REJECT The relevant case law is agency/organization specific and we removed the example provided in this section as it is included in the bibliography.
74	4.1.5.2 has become 4.1.2.8.2	E	[1] in super script looks like it is a footnote reference. This should be change so that you know it is a bibliography reference	either make the footnotes characters or change the bibliographic reference to a normal (non-superscript) format to alleviate confusion	ACCEPT
19	4.1.5.3 has become 4.1.2.8.3	E	Clarify "Preparation of Legal Documentation" Legal Preparation could include requirements to go to law school.	edit text	ACCEPT
75	4.1.5.3 has become 4.1.2.8.3	E	Preparation should be lowercase P	change to lowercase p in preparation	ACCEPT
20	4.1.5.4 has become 4.1.2.8.4	E	Clarify "Preparation for Courtroom Testimony"	edit text	ACCEPT

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
76	4.1.5.4 has become 4.1.2.8.4	E	Testimony should be a lowercase T	change to lowercase t in testimony	ACCEPT
71	4.1.3 and 4.1.7 has become 4.1.4	E	The two statements are redundant.	Delete 4.1.3 (4.1.7 is written better)	ACCEPT
72	4.1.4 has become 4.1.2.3	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
141	4.1.3 is now 4.1.2.2	general	Add - training on how K9 acquires and processes scent/odor		PARTIAL ACCEPT New section added as 4.1.3/which was deleted and is now 4.1.2.2
2	4.1.5 is now 4.1.3.1.4	T	Cognitive bias education and training should be mandatory for all canine handlers.	A standard requiring cognitive bias training should be added to section 4.1. If "relevant legal aspects" is removed from standard 4.1.5, then it can be added as 4.1.5.5.	PARTIAL ACCEPT 4.1.3.1.4 added. Also the definition for "cognitive bias" was added in section 3.
3	4.1.5 is now 4.1.3.1.1	E	Scent/odor dispersion should not be classified as a "relevant legal aspect."	The sentence can be changed to "Canine handler training shall include:" If you want to keep "relevant legal aspects" in the sentence, scent and odor dispersion needs to be made into an independent standard within section 4.1.	REJECT Odor/scent dispersion is a relevant aspect for the handler/expert to discuss in court.
77	4.1.7 is now 4.1.5	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
121	4.1.7 is now 4.1.5	T	add specific topics in bulleted style	After existing statement include: "Topics include: 4.1.7.1 canine handling techniques; 4.1.7.2 voice inflection; 4.1.7.3 lead handling; 4.1.7.4 rewarding the canine; 4.1.7.5 first aid for canine and handler; 4.1.7.6 fitness for canine and handler."	PARTIAL ACCEPT List/bullet points added under 4.1.2
142	4.1.7 is now 4.1.5	general	Change to acquiring, storing, handling, and disposing of training odors. See 4.1.3 above		PARTIAL ACCEPT This statement is in reference to evidence and not to training odors.
21	4.1.8 is now 4.1.6	E	Simplify: delete tactics which are covered by search techniques.	delete text	ACCEPT
12	General & 4.1 and 4.2	T	The standard does not address any circumstances where a dog or possibly a handler would need to undergo retraining. For example, a dog could experience a traumatic situation where either the dog or handler are injured, prompting the dog to not respond as it once did or a handler could give erroneous statements in court.	Standards should be added to sections 4.1 and 4.2 that account for possible retraining of a handler or a dog.	PARTIAL ACCEPT Please refer to section 7.
13	General and 4.2	T	There is no information given on how canines are rewarded during the training process. What protections are built into the standard to ensure canines are not rewarded for false alerts during the training process?	More information on how dogs are rewarded during training should be added to section 4.2	REJECT A competent trainer determines canine's reward.
5	4.2	T	If successful certification requires the canine team to achieve at least a 90% positive alert rate, the initial training of the canine team should require a positive alert rate equal to or higher than 90%. The standard does not indicate what is necessary for a dog to pass training to move on to certification. In fact, 4.2.1.9 allows the training process to go on indefinitely.	A new standard needs to be added to this section detailing the expectation for the positive alert rate during the canine training phase. This section should require documentation of all positive alerts and misidentification/false alerts.	REJECT Canine training is an indefinite process.
6	4.2.1	T	Will another standard define what "competent canine trainer" is? What qualifications are needed to be deemed competent? Can an individual that has just been certified conduct a training?	A standard can be added to section 4.1 that explains the qualifications of a competent canine trainer.	REJECT Defined in TR 025

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
22	4.2.1.1	E	Add "...operate safely and effectively..."	add text	ACCEPT
122	4.2.1.1	T	add bolded word - to include "safe" to statement	4.2.1.1 Initial training shall include sufficient obedience training to ensure the canine will operate safely and effectively based on mission requirements.	ACCEPT
123	4.2.1.2	T	add bolded word - to include "safe" to statement	4.2.1.2 Initial training shall include sufficient control training to ensure the canine will operate safely and effectively based on mission requirements.	ACCEPT
7	4.2.1.3	E	In addition to training a dog to perform a pre-determined specific final response, handlers should pre-specify what the final response is going to be. Handlers can specify the final response in training documents that are initial and dated in advance of the start of training.	The sentence can be changed to "The canine shall be trained to perform a pre-determined specific final response (active or passive alert) upon locating the trained scent/odor. Canine handlers shall document the pre-determined specific final response at the start of training."	REJECT Please refer to assessment section #5.
78	4.2.1.3	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
79	4.2.1.5	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
80	4.2.1.6	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
143	4.2.1.6	general	Add visual distractors		ACCEPT
124	4.2.1.7	T	add bolded word - to include "safe" to statement	4.2.1.7 The canine shall be trained to perform a safe , effective, and controlled search.	ACCEPT
23	4.2.1.9	E	Clarify: "...until the required level of..."	edit text	ACCEPT
46	4.2.1.9		and 7...	Recommend adding canine first aid training, vets and vet techs may not always be available to execute basic medical procedures	PARTIAL ACCEPT Please refer to 4.1.2.6
125	5.1	T	In section 5, modify 5.1 to the following statement (statement was found in 7.4, delete from there and move to 5.1)	5.1 The canine team shall perform periodic proficiency assessments throughout the certification period as outlined in Section 5 - Canine Team Assessments, including a variety of scent recognition assessments, operational assessments, single and double-blind assessments.	REJECT 5.1 better depicts all stages of the assessment process.
8	5.4	E	"Desired outcome" or "desired outcome of the search" should be added section 3 terms and definitions. In addition, the definition of the "desired outcome" should include minimization of false identifications (false positive alerts) or misidentifications made by the canine team.	Standard 5.4 should be removed since you are defining a term which could be added to section 3. The standard as is does not adequately describe the process of the assessment and does not address false identifications or misidentifications made by the canine team.	PARTIAL ACCEPT Word defined removed.
81	5.4	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
144	5.4	general	add with no "false negatives" or false positives"		REJECT Having no false positives or false negatives is in conflict with the formula that is already established in this paragraph.

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
9	5.5	T/E	The default testing method for operational proficiency in canine detection should be double blind assessment. Single blind testing should only be used for the evaluation of prospective dogs that are being considered for training in canine detection disciplines.	Section 5.5.2 should be moved ahead of 5.5.1 in the standard. Operational proficiency assessments that are performed single blind must be accompanied with documentation explaining the need for such an assessment.	REJECT The document provides a sequential listing of the types of assessments that can/should be conducted. Single-blind assessments, when conducted properly, are a useful tool to assess a canine team's performance. The only difference between a double-blind assessments is that neither the canine handler, nor the assessor, nor any individual present with the canine team shall know the correct outcome of any portion of the assessment, including whether the search area(s) is a blank or includes a trained odor/scent. A combination of the two is considered a standard practice.
10	5.5	T/E	The standard is not clear in specifying if double blind testing is mandatory in order to meet the training and certification requirements. Double blind testing seems more optional.	The NOTE under standard 5.5.2 should be changed to "When double-blind assessment is conducted, it shall be conducted with consideration for safety". Standard 6.9 should be changed to "At least once certification component, if not all, shall be double blind assessments."	PARTIAL ACCEPT 5.5.2 changed to: "When double-blind assessment is conducted, it shall be conducted with consideration for safety".
82	5.5.1.1	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
83	5.5.1.1.1	E	should be odor/scent (2 instances)	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
84	5.5.1.1.7	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
67	5.5.1.1.7.2		Disagree.	Unless training for a specific issue and therefore part of the overall training objection, the handler should never know the amount of training aids hidden. Although, the handler could possibly estimate on the minimum amount of target odors used, the handler shouldn't be provided the exact number of target odors.	PARTIAL ACCEPT This sentence was modified.
24	5.5.1.1.7.5	E	Change to "...assessing organization may..." to make this consistent with the rest of the document	edit text	REJECT Assessor is used appropriately here.
145	5.5.1.1.7.5	general	I would change to that the "comparison" be made only at the conclusion of all testing. "Comparisons" made during the assessment can potentially lead to "assessor bias" or "information to the handler". It is good practice on single blind testing exercises that the assessor not be allowed to speak to the handler except in cases of safety concerns.		REJECT This comment is addressed within this paragraph in this document.
85	5.5.1.1.7.6	E	scent should be odor/scent (2 instances)	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
126	5.5.1.1.7.6	E	Add odor/scent in both occurrences within statement	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
47	5.5.1.1.7.7		discipline	Detection capability. Specific for dual, single purpose explosive, narcotics, search and rescue, cadaver and any other specialty dog we've identified.	The paragraph stands as is. Other detection capabilities will be detailed in other discipline documents.
86	5.5.1.1.7.7	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
48	5.5.1.1.7.8		discipline	Detection capability. Specific for dual, single purpose explosive, narcotics, search and rescue, cadaver and any other specialty dog we've identified.	REJECT The paragraph stands as is. Other detection capabilities will be detailed in other discipline documents.

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
87	5.5.1.1.7.8	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
68	5.5.1.1.7.9		How does an assessor that has never seen the dog before determine whether the dog is not working without using target odors?	I feel it is better said that if the Assessor feels the handler is employing the canine in a non-effective manner and the team appears to be ineffective, the Assessor can fail the team.	REJECT The existing language used explains well the evaluation strategy used.
49	5.5.1.2		following	Operational tests will be conducted in a single blind scenarios	REJECT Please note this is the single blind section as already addressed in 5.5.1.
88	5.5.1.2.1	E	should be odor/scent (2 instances)	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
146	5.5.1.2.6	general	Add interpretation of the dog's "change of behavior"		REJECT The handler's detection of change of behavior is important, but the final response is the appropriate term. See section 5.5.1.2.4.
50	5.5.1.2.7.1		shall not....	Evaluation criteria will be in single blind scenarios.	REJECT The handler needs to be aware the parameters of the search.
51	5.5.1.2.7.3		assessment	Who will determine the basic scenarios to be evaluated. Recommend as per the agency certification protocols. Some agencies do open area, some do not, some work on and off leash other do not. Vehicle searches,	REJECT The basic scenarios to be evaluated will be aligned to discipline specific documents.
147	5.5.1.2.7.4	general	I would change to "at least one" blank area. Comment here...We have found that a "random" selection of type, number (or absence) of testing odors provides a test much closer to the "deployment environment".		ACCEPT
25	5.5.1.2.7.5	E	Clarify "...assessment operational environment..."	add text	REJECT Mission oriented assessment covers the operational environment.
148	5.5.1.2.7.6	general	See 5.5.1.2.7.5 above		REJECT The existing language used explains well the evaluation strategy used.
89	5.5.2.1	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
52	5.5.2.2			Does this constitute a single blind test?	REJECT No, this is the double blind section. Single blind parameters are listed in section 5.5.1.
90	5.5.2.2	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
26	5.5.2.5	T	It is unclear that the yearly certification double-blind assessment should trump the 6-monthly requirement	resolve technical question	PARTIAL ACCEPT Sentence was revised.
91	5.5.2.5	E	month should be months	update text to months	ACCEPT

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
161	5.5.2.5	Submitted through the CB Ballot	The canine team should be required to complete a double-blind assessment every six month unless there is a double-blind assessment as a component of the certification.	I believe there should be an 's' after month in this sentence.	ACCEPT
149	6.2	general	the canine team shall perform regular (add documented here)....		ACCEPT Documented added in this section. Also, please refer to section 9 that explains the documentation requirements.
150	6.3	general	As "assessor bias" is a concern, I would somehow strengthen this.		REJECT "Shall not" implies this is a requirement.
53	6.4		rate....	Does this codify 90% for all capabilities of canine? Explosive, narcotics, S&R?	REJECT This section does include "at least a 90 % positive alert rate, unless otherwise dictated by the specific discipline".
92	6.4	E	sub-disciplines should be disciplines	update text to disciplines	ACCEPT
151	6.4	general	I would provide a mathematical formula and explanation to make this clear.		REJECT Please refer to section 6.4.2.1.
93	6.4.1	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
94	6.4.2	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
95	6.4.2.1	E	sub-disciplines should be disciplines	update text to disciplines	ACCEPT
96	6.4.2.1	T	Example should be expanded to ensure that there is no confusion that the 10% is overall in the certification	For example, if the certification test involves searching a set of 20 pieces of luggage and 4 vehicles in which 2 pieces and 2 vehicles contain targets and 20 are non-target objects/vehicles, and the canine team exhibits one false alert on a non-target, then the team's false alert rate is calculated as 1/20, or 5%.	ACCEPT
152	6.4.2.1	general	1 I know that I am in the minority here – I would especially penalize "False positive" responses (which are usually due to the handler's performance/training) and not allow any "false positive" responses. False positives are a huge reason for the lack of confidence and failure in search K9s.		REJECT This in not a best practice.
27	6.4.2.2	E	Better said: "...sub-disciplines where certification..."	edit text	REJECT The verbiage sub-disciplines have been removed throughout this document.
54	6.5 a		canine....	Recommend removing leading to safety issues.	PARTIAL ACCEPT Modified sentence to include may lead to safety issues.
97	6.5.b	E	missing the	...outside of the search area	ACCEPT
153	6.6	general	6 I feel that the assessor must not communicate during the testing with the handler except for safety concerns. Too easy to introduce "assessor bias" into the testing.		REJECT This section limits bias on the overall evaluation. It is already addressed.

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
28	6.7	E	Clarify: "...mission-oriented operational environment..."	add text	PARTIAL ACCEPT The word "test" was removed. Mission oriented environment covers the operational environment.
55	6.8		and a scent/odor.....	Consisting of, scent/odor recognition...etc.	REJECT Odor/Scent is used consistently throughout the document.
98	6.8	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
99	6.9	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
154	6.9	general	I would make most (60-75%) of the test double blind. Assessments of basic skills of the K9 team can be made in the single blind portions of testing (or in a separate "basic skills" test) including during a "staged" odor recognition/discrimination (includes "distractor" odors) test much like the "NORT" for explosives dogs.		REJECT Please refer to discipline specific documents. This suggestion is not logistically feasible.
100	6.11.1	E	Statement sentence structure is confusing	Replace with "Certifying official(s) should identify the performance deficiency and work with canine team's trainer to determine a minimum amount of time for that deficiency to be remediated before another certification attempt. "	PARTIAL ACCEPT See revision per comment #127
127	6.11.1	T	the certifying official does not work with canine team hence the statement should be modified to reflect that the trainer is the one who works with deficiency remediation	6.11.1 Certifying official(s) should identify the performance deficiency to the canine handler so that the trainer can determine the minimum amount of time for that deficiency to be remediated before another certification attempt.	ACCEPT
56	6.13		stringent	Formal reviews will be conducted every 3 years. Interim guidance may be provided annually	PARTIAL ACCEPT Sentence was modified.
155	7.1	general	Add "documented" (training)		REJECT This information is already contain within section 9 of this document Record Keeping.
57	7.1 j			Will concealment be performed in high finds.	REJECT The concealment is inclusive of a varying degree of heights.
58	7.1 k			Should also include mandatory exposure to gun fire (primary noise threat to police and the military)	REJECT It will be covered in a specific document related to Patrol Dogs.
30	7.1 k)	E	Clarify: "...variety of audible noise distractors..." since white noise distractors is defined and completely different	edit text	REJECT The term "white noise" was removed from this document.
29	7.1, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7, 9.8	E	It is unclear why this section has alphabetical listing	edit text	REJECT This is accepted format of ASB.
101	7.1.f	E	should be odor/scent (2 instances)	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
102	7.1.i	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
59	7.3			Mandatory hours of training vary by demo's dog competency. May also include as assessed by the unit trainer based on training scenarios	REJECT A minimum of sixteen hours of training per month is a standard amongst the law enforcement and professional canine communities. This does not mean that a team that requires additional proficiency training cannot exceed this threshold.
60	7.4			Recommend training validations every 2,3,4 months. Part of systemic performance evaluation adding to the ability of the canine to successfully pass certification or identify significant training shortfalls	REJECT The way this is written provides flexibility to organizations based on the canine team proficiency levels.
103	7.4	E	scent should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
104	8.1	E	odor should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
128	8.1	E	Add odor/scent within statement	8.1 Handling and storage of training aids shall be conducted in a manner that prevents odor/scent contamination.	ACCEPT
156	8.1.1	general	Documented training on acquiring, handling, storing and disposing of target odors.		PARTIAL ACCEPT See 8.4 added to this document.
105	8.1.2	E	odor should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
106	8.1.3	E	Not supposed to be a sub bullet of 8.1	should be 8.2	ACCEPT
107	8.1.4	T	Recommend monthly inventory by 2 people	Add: 8.1.4.1 Training materials should be inventoried monthly by two persons.	ACCEPT
108	8.1.4	T	Recommend training aid sign out and sign in by 2 people	Add: 8.1.4.2 Controlled training materials (e.g. narcotics, explosives, etc.) should be signed in and out by two persons.	ACCEPT
109	8.1.4	E	Not supposed to be a sub bullet of 8.1	should be 8.3	ACCEPT
61	8.1.3			Identification of the handling of training aids to avoid cross-contamination.	REJECT Please refer to point 8.1.1 that addresses this comment.
110	8.1.3	E	Not supposed to be a sub bullet of 8.1	should be 8.4	PARTIAL ACCEPT It was recategorized to 8.1.3.
111	8.1.5	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
62	8.1.6			add 8.1.6 Generates the requirement for canines to go outside of traditional odors and be imprinted on current threats (HMTD, TATP)	REJECT This area is covered under discipline specific documents.
129	9.5	T	Delete non-blind from bullet d as operational assessments should not have a non-blind, and add type of search area in bullet l	d. Operational assessment design (single blind, double-blind), i. Type and size of search area	ACCEPT
11	9.5e	E	Race should not be used as an example of a target descriptor.	Remove race as an example.	PARTIAL ACCEPT "Ethnicity" was used to replace "race". Change made on 9.6.e, and 9.7 e as well.
130	9.6	T	Delete non-blind from bullet d as operational assessments should not have a non-blind, and add type of search area in bullet l	d. Operational assessment design (single blind, double-blind), i. Type and size of search area	ACCEPT The same was updated on sections 9.5, 9.6 and 9.7
131	9.7	T	add type of search area in bullet l	i. Type and size of search area	ACCEPT The same was updated on sections 9.5, 9.6 and 9.7
132	9.8	T	add type of search area in bullet g	g. Type and size of search area	ACCEPT

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
31	9.8 e)	E	Better said "... (GPS coordinates are recommended but are optional)..."	edit text	ACCEPT
115	9.8.d	E	numerical agreement	update text to "Name(s) of organization(s)..."	ACCEPT
112	9.10.	T	non-productive response is used but not defined	define non-productive response	ACCEPT Non productive response will be added to section 3.
32	9.10.1	E	Better said: "...be present but are below..."	edit text	ACCEPT
113	9.10.1	E	should be odor/scent (2 instances)	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
114	9.10.2	E	should be odor/scent	update text to odor/scent	ACCEPT
33	9.12	E	Clarify "...back up storage) versus..."	edit text	ACCEPT
116	9.12	E	versus or vs. consistency	update text to versus	ACCEPT
117	9.13	T	should non-productive response be added to the list	once defined add to the list	ACCEPT Non productive response will be added to section 3.
63	9.14		canine....	Recommend that handlers maintain probable cause folders.	REJECT Probable Cause Folders are unique to the Department of Defense. Each organization should have a pre-determined procedure that ensures all documents that provide for probable cause are accurately documented, reviewed and maintained according to organizational policies.
118	9.16	E	capitalization issue with Aid Records	replace with "Training aid records."	ACCEPT
64	9.17		records	Recommend input from an agency vet. Veterinarians will assess canines for operational utilization/deployment. Vets will have the responsibility to assess the safety and health of canine teams. Canine teams will deploy with team medical records. More specific requirements determined by an agency VET.	REJECT This information does not pertain to documentation and will be covered in forthcoming document.
119	9.17	E	capitalization issue with Records	replace with "Veterinary records."	ACCEPT
120	Annex A	E	[#] use agreement. Since the first reference is sited in the document, the formatting should be consistent	change to [1]	REJECT This reference is now only included in the Bibliography
65	annex A bibliography			Recommend that we add specific source documents that identify the requirements that drive AAFSB standardization. I.e.. PPD 17 and HR 302.	REJECT PPD17 is not a publicly available document. HR 302 is not used as a reference to develop this document.
162			Approval is based on receipt and incorporation of OSAC Dogs and Sensors Sub-committee edits and adjudication of public comments. Thanks - Dave		ACCEPT

	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
163			Attached comments were sent by a member of the discipline for consideration of changes.		<p>PARTIAL ACCEPT</p> <p>All comments submitted by Mr. Dotson were considered and resolved.</p>
164			<p>In relation to your "General Guidelines for Training, Certification, and Documentation of Canine Detection Disciplines" My book "K9 Teams - Beyond the Basics of Search and Rescue and Recovery" published by Brush Education, provides a lot of the information you are requesting. The information is from 27 years experiences, research and comments from K9 teams, handlers and instructors around the world. For some of the reviews please visit my webpage www.k9vihummelshaffer.com I believe you will find the information in the book extremely helpful.</p>		<p>REJECT</p> <p>Thank you for your suggestion however the book you suggested was not used to develop this document.</p>