

#	Section	Updated Section	Type of Comment	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
8	3.2		T	Using the word personal does not give weight to the professional skill associated with a conclusion decision	Update word "personal" to "professional"	Reject. Definition from TR016 is used.
4	3.9 REDLINE VERSION		E	Addition of "peer" in front of review not consistent with 3.8 defined term	replace "peer" with "technical"	Accept with modification. Definition edited for consistency with TR016. Now contains neither "peer" nor "technical."
10	4.1		T	If the conflict includes a potential erroneous ID by one of the examiners, and it is pointed out by the other examiner, it appears that as long as the two people agree in the end, then this only needs to be tracked in the case file (4.1.2.2 "and is documented in the case file"). It does not appear that the recommended BP is to make management aware of potential erroneous ID's. I feel notifying management is an essential item and therefore I cannot vote yes on this recommendation.	Add "all potential erroneous IDs shall be reported to management and investigated to determine if they are errors".	Reject. Corrective action is not within the scope of this document.
1	4.1.2.1	4.1.3.1	T	The added language of "The FSP shall initiate..." is problematic in its wording. It implies that management alone determines when there's conflict. Anyone at any level who has the technical skills to perform examinations at their agency should know when to initiate the conflict resolution policy of their agency.	Reword statement in 4.1 to say something like: Conflict resolution is initiated when examiners disagree on the support underlying a suitability decision or a conclusion.	Accept
5	4.1.2.1 REDLINE VERSION	4.1.3.1	E/T	Given the new insertion of "shall" in 1st sentence would it not require "shall" in last sentence for consistency?	replace "should" with "shall" in last sentence?	Accept with modification. Consistency achieved by changing "shall" to "should."
6	4.1.2.3.1 REDLINE VERSION	4.1.3.3.2.1	E/T	The redline change in the 3rd line from "should be done blindly" to "shall" now impacts other "shoulds" in this entire section and although not technically part of this round of comments since not previously redlined must now be considered due to this redlined change for consistency of meaning, especially the next "should" in the same sentence "should be shielded...". If this part indicating the info to be blinded isn't a "shall", it can't be considered as blind. Blind verification is a Best Practice Recommendation, but the how it's done seems like "shalls".	Line 2: replace "should" examine with "shall" examine. Line 4: replace "should" be shielded with "shall" be shielded. Line 7: replace "should" be reviewed with "shall" be reviewed.	Reject with modification. Agree section should be consistent throughout, but "should" more appropriate than "shall." Change "shall" to "should."
7	4.1.2.3.1 REDLINE VERSION	4.1.3.3.2.1	E/T	Due to the redline change in 4.3 about documentation of "should" to "shall" the last line of 4.1.2.3.1 must be also be changed from "should be recorded" to "shall" be recorded for consistency.	replace "should" with "shall" in last sentence	Reject with modification. Agree section should be consistent throughout, but "should" more appropriate than "shall." Change "shall" to "should."
2	4.1.2.3.1.2		T	this is a bad practice and is not needed from a practical standpoint. FSPs should have criteria on supported conclusions and if the initial examiners agrees with the verifier and consultant it is more practical to have them finish the case since they did the bulk of the work being reported on and the basis of what is being reported would be the position held by the examiner. If the examiner is in agreement they would be able to articulate the reasons for the agreement so reassignment simply isn't needed when there is agreement.	Reword statement to say "If the third examiner agrees with the suitability decisions or source conclusions of the second examiner and the first examiner is still in disagreement, the case should be transferred to a supervisor/technical lead for review to determine additional testing as needed."	Reject. The document as written does not preclude retention of the case by the original examiner in cases in which the original examiner joins the consensus opinion. Section 4.1.2.3.1.1 states that the examiner retains the case if they share the consensus opinion.
9	4.1.2.3.2		T	No reference as to whether the "described as a majority opinion" will be documented in the case record or in the report to the customer	Update to state "described as a majority opinion in the case record"	Reject. Intent is that it be documented in report to the customer. We believe current language states this. According to ISO 17025 sec. 7.5.1 the report is part of the case record.
3	4.2		T	The "should" in the sentence: the FSP should determine how the results of the examination are reported..." wouldn't reflect the practice of any agency. If work was performed a report will need to be sent out so someone would need to make a decision on what gets report when conflict on a print can't be resolved.	Update the "should" to be "shall" so it's clear that at some point the FSP has to make a decision on what gets reported to a customer.	Accept with modification. Sentenced edited.

#	Section	Updated Section	Type of Comment	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
11	4.1-4.4		T	<p>4.1-4.4 all say that the FSP should or shall have a policy, 4.1 FSP should have a policy on conflict resolution. 4.2 FSP should determine how to report out. 4.3 "The level of documentation...will vary...according to...FSP policy" 4.4 "FSP management should have processes in place to track..."</p> <p>The main headings should state a BP (by ASB definitions, a BP would be the 'optimal way' of performing a task). Stating that an agency shall have a policy is not stating the 'optimal way'. Therefore, this document does not follow ASB requirements by giving an 'optimal way' of performing a task.</p>	<p>State the 'optimal way' to perform the task. If an 'optimal way' cannot be determined then the document should not move forward as it does not adhere to the ASB written rules for content of documents.</p>	<p>Reject with modification. Changes have been made to make the document more consistent with ASB style for a BPR. "Shall have a policy:" changed to "should have a policy." A Recommendation that a FSP should (or shall) have a policy is acceptable in an ASB document per recent guidance from the ASB. A BPR need not state a single "optimal way." As the ASB Manual states, "A BPR may include choices and the variants between them as a means of demonstrating optimal choices in different circumstances."</p>
12				<p>I vote yes, because I think the comments are fairly addressed.
 I am not comfortable with 5-option reporting, but I gather that's in another, already accepted document.</p>		<p>No resolution proposed.</p>