

Public Comments Deadline: June 6, 2022

ASB Std 143, Standard for Technical Review in Friction Ridge Examination

#	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Proposed WG Resolutions
3		T	It's not clear why this was changed from a "best practices" document to a "standard." The document lacks specificity required to be a standard because it merely requires that FSPs have policies and procedures in place. The ultimate focus of a standard is not on the mere presence or absence of procedures but on the scientific supportability of the methods governing those procedures. Absent information about what is scientifically supportable, the standard has little meaning because there are in fact no specific criteria that would show the examiner or someone reviewing their work whether the procedures are adequate or produce reliable results.	This should remain "Best Practices Recommendations" rather than a "Standard."	Reject: Draft was changed from a BPR to a Standard as a result of multiple comments received during the first round of public comment. The standard specifies minimum requirements for a technical review process. Based on ASB definition, it is more appropriate as a standard than a BPR. The decision to change the previous draft from a BPR to a STD was also reviewed by the ASB board.
10			Lack of content and some of the content is redundant		Reject: WG does not find the content to be redundant (see resolution to comment 9 below). Comment not specific enough to address "lack of content" comment.
4	3.1 (now 3.3)	T	Not clear what "competent" examiner means (e.g. hours of training, proficiency results)	Define "competent examiner"	Accept: Added definition for "competent friction ridge examiner" from TR 016. Removed "as defined in 3.1."
11	3.4 (now 3.7)	E		Remove duplicate "technical review"	Accept: Removed duplicate "technical review"
12	3.5 (now 3.8)	E	Per vote of the FRCB, the term "process" is preferred over "method"	Update term wording to "Verification (phase of examination process)" to be in line with other FRCB documents	Accept: Changed "method" to "process"
5	3.5(note 1') (now 3.8)	T	Not clear why "open" verification is as legitimate as "blind	Change to require blind verification or justify special circumstances under which non-blind is sufficient and why, given the bias concerns	Reject: Outside of scope for this standard. See BPR 144 – Best Practice Recommendations for the Verification Component in Friction Ridge Examination for verification recommendations.
13	4	E	The majority of the requirements apply to the "case record"	Add "case record" as defined in TR016 to the Terms and Definitions section	Accept: Added definition for "case record" from TR 016
	4.1	T	Point of clarification noted by WG during comment adjudication discussion		Added "with friction ridge examination conclusions" to 4.1.
1	4.2	t	it is my understanding that definitions will be removed from documents once the terminology document is approved. Referencing definition for competent friction ridge examiner definition will lead to issues with this statement moving forward	remove "as defined in 3.1" from wording	Accept: Removed "as defined in 3.1"
7	4.2		Saying the TR'er needs to be competent is redundant since the definition of TR says the person must be qualified. Also, if definitions will be removed then referring to section 3.1 will be confusing when there is no section 3.1.	Remove section 4.2 as it is redundant.	Accept with modification: WG believes it is necessary to specify the requirement for technical reviews to be conducted by a competent examiner under the "Requirements" section of the standard. Removed "as defined in 3.1."
	4.3	T	Point of clarification noted by WG during comment adjudication discussion		Added "and administrative review" to 4.3.
2	4.5	t	this statement is not applicable in this document; this statement would be more applicable in a conflict resolution document	remove from this document and add to Conflict Resolution document	Reject with modification: nonconforming work can be detected during technical review. Added "detected during technical review" to 4.6 to clarify. Switched order of 4.5 and 4.6.
8	4.5		4.5 states 'The FSP shall have a policy to address nonconforming work.' This is not within the scope of the document.	Remove section 4.5 or modify the scope so that 4.5 is within the scope of the document.	Reject with modification: nonconforming work can be detected during technical review. Added "detected during technical review" to 4.6 to clarify. Switched order of 4.5 and 4.6.

6	4.6	T	Nonconforming work should be in the initial report sent to legal stakeholders engaged in plea negotiations and not only in the "case record" if that is different.	Require that nonconforming work be documented in the report as well as the case record (fine to cross-reference to the report writing standard for this purpose if that makes sense?).	Reject: Outside of scope for this standard. See STD 167 Standard for Reporting Written Results from Friction Ridge Examinations for reporting requirements. Cannot reference STD 167 because it is not yet published.
9	4.6		4.6 states 'Nonconforming work shall be documented in the case record.' This is redundant since section 4.4 states that 'Technical review shall be documented in the case record.'. If the TR is documented in the case record then the nonconformities will be in the case record.	Remove section 4.6 as it is redundant.	Reject: Documentation of nonconforming work is separate from documentation of technical review.
14			Two suggested additions to exam report section on checklist: checkbox regarding proper spelling and grammar, as well as a checkbox that confirms that report conclusions reflect the findings in the examination and as reported in notes and supported documentation. These are necessary measures in the report.		Reject: Annex A provides one example of how technical reviews can be documented. Because it is just an example, an FSP can add or delete elements as needed. Also, spelling and grammar in report falls under administrative review. Finally, support for conclusions is already addressed by question "Are the conclusion(s) appropriate based upon the data?"