Public Comments Deadline: 9/19/2022
ASB Std 145, Standard for Consultation during Friction Ridge Examination

#	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
8	3.4	T	Even the most minor questions ("Which way is up?") the case examiner asks a colleague regarding an exam would be consultations, but unsolicited comments by another examiner would not be considered consultations.	Reword: "A significant discussion or interaction between two examiners that changes the interpretation of an image or affects a conclusion." Or include the modifier used in 4.4 "in-depth."	Reject: Section 4.3 and the definition of "consultation" define what is in the consultation and does not need additional modifiers.
9	4.1	T	This could mean that I can't ask any questions ("Which way is up?") until I've actually recorded my preliminary observation ("I don't know which way is up.") - - - Or, alternatively, it could be interpreted as a major loophole that means everything we discuss is off the record as long as I haven't written anything down yet. - - - As written, this would almost seem to preclude a normal back and forth conversation("Which way is up?" / "I think this." / "Yeah, but then what about that?" / "Oh yeah. Well, what about this?" / "Uh, but then there's this other." / "Okay, how about now?" / "Yes, I like that better." Does every one of those back and forth comments have to be recorded before you can proceed to the next?	Don't be so restrictive that you prescribe every little possibility with no exceptions. Allow a little discretion and open conversation between professionals. Or include the modifier used in 4.4 "in-depth."	Reject: Section 4.3 and the definition of "consultation" define what is in the consultation and does not need additional modifiers.
4	4.2	T	Verifier as used in 4.2 has unclear significance and could benefit from a definition.	Define verifier.	Reject: dictionary definition of verifier is intended
10	4.3	T	In subsections a), b), and f) this section, as written, would almost require a written transcript of conversations previously considered "informal conversations." There is a subjective component to these decisions and there will always be latents on which two examiners may not see them the same way.	Don't be so restrictive that you prescribe every little possibility with no exceptions. Allow a little discretion and open conversation between professionals. Or include the modifier used in 4.4 "in-depth."	Reject: Section 4.3 and the definition of "consultation" define what is in the consultation and does not need additional modifiers.
1	4.5	E	Where is the word "technical" in front of "case record"? Item 10 in the CommentResolutionRound02 document states that 4.5 "has been amended to 'technical case record'."	Add the word "technical" in front of 'case record'.	Reject: Due to an oversight, the previously cited disposition for Comment #10 from the CommentResolutionRound02 document should have stated “Reject with modification: 4.5 has been amended to “case record”.” The current document defines the “case record” as the file which includes all documentation (as opposed to the report) including technical records such as may be generated during consultation. The use of “case record” here is appropriate.
7	4.5	T	Amend with language in all caps to say: A consultant who has viewed both known and unknown friction ridge impressions shall not be used as the verifier for that examination. AN INDIVIDUAL WHO HAS VIEWED BOTH THE KNOWN AND UNKNOWN FRICTION RIDGE IMPRESSIONS WHOSE DISCUSSIONS WITH EXAMINERS DO NOT RISE TO THE LEVEL OF BEING A “CONSULTANT” UNDER THIS STANDARD SHALL NONETHELESS NOT BE USED AS THE VERIFIER FOR THAT EXAMINATION.		Reject: Section 4.2, not 4.5, addresses this issue; ASB documents do not utilize all capitalization formatting.
5	4.6	T	As in § 4.4.d,. disclosure or documentation of any identified limitations.	Add required documentation of limitations in image quality to § 4.6	Reject: The requested addition is too prescriptive for the documentation requirements. Image effects may or may not be relevant/part of a consultation and are therefore not appropriate as a specific requirement. The requirement for “topic” may be inclusive of relevant considerations.

2	4.7	T	This is still confusing the way it is written. Do you mean that the consultant should be required to go beyond 4.6 a - d and provided actual analysis markups? If the consultant does, then, yes, the markups should be included in the technical case record. If the consultant does not, then 4.6 a - d should be sufficient.	Re-write to clarify.	Reject: the commenter is correct that the consultant does go beyond the requirements in 4.6, and the additional set of notes, annotations, and/or images are included in the case record.
3	4.7	E	There are two periods at the end of the sentence.	Remove one period.	Accept
6	4.7	T	Consultations should always be clearly documented and available.	Delete “where there is (per FSP policy) high complexity”	Reject: Section 4.6 outlines what is required for all consultations. Section 4.7 is additional documentation required for high complexity instances. High complexity is defined per FSP policy.
11			The most important aspect (and the most utilized by examiners) is consulting on the final conclusion. This is absent from the document and should be in any document on consulting. The other areas addressed (to search AFIS or not, simultaneous, etc.) are superfluous and not important to note. It's also not important that a consultant be the case verifier when consulting is performed in these situations. Add consulting for conclusions to section 4.3.		Accept: "comparison conclusion(s)" added to section 4.3.