Public Comments Deadline: May 9, 2022
ASB Best Practice Recommendation 142, Best Practice Recommendations for the Resolution of Conflicts in Friction Ridge Examination

#	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
1	3.9	T	This section, as rewritten, suggests that the decision whether to use blind, open or consensus verification is entirely up to the discretion of the lab and that there are no best practices in this regard. We realize this document is only about conflict resolution and not verification but it could be confusing in court and may suggest that non-blind verification is equally valid under all circumstances.	Rewrite to add at end of defn of verification: "This section is not intended to endorse open verification. Please refer to other standards on verification for best practices on when blind versus non-blind verification is acceptable or recommended."	Reject. This is a definition. For ASB to recommend blind verification would require a change to Section 4.3 of BPR 144 "Best Practice Recommendations for the Verification Component in Friction Ridge Examination."
2	4.1.3.3.2.3	T	The redlined version simply states that the lab should have a policy, but not what best practices are as to what the documentation policy should be (like 4.4.1 does).	Add at end: "The policy should require that the fact of transfer be clearly documented in the report."	Reject. The recommendation that the FSP have a policy is in line with requirements imposed by accrediting bodies (e.g., ISO & ANAB) which require the existence of a policy but are not prescriptive about the content of that policy. Section 4.4.1 clearly recommends that the existence of a conflict be included in the report, the CB finds this sufficient notice to the end-users of the report.
3			The definitions are directly related to this document and need to be consider IN THIS DOCUMENT. Telling people to comment on another document is not resolving the issues, is it it shirking your responsibility. Therefore I do not agree with the resolutions.		Comment was discussed by the working group, however as a recommendation was not proposed the WG is unable to respond to this comment.
4			I am uncomfortable with the rejections that state that matters that were not changed from a previous review are not "generally" accepted. What are the exceptions ? Shouldn't such a rejection include why the particular suggestion offered in the comment should not be considered ?		Comment was discussed by the working group, however as a recommendation was not proposed the WG is unable to respond to this comment.