Document: ASB Standard 157, Required Components for a Proficiency Testing Program in Bloodstain Pattern Analysis
Public Comments Deadline: November 29, 2021

#	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
1	2	T	I do not think ISO/IEC 17043 is truly normative for this document. If this were the case, FSSPs would need to have a copy in order to understand ASB 157. ASB 157 doesn't require FSSP's to use agencies who are conforming with 17043.	Move ISO/IEC 17043 to the bibliography.	Reject: Section 4.2.1 states: "4.2.1 External providers shall be accredited by ISO 17043, for all accredited FSSP." So this is a normative reference.
2	3.3	E	Typo in the published year	Revise 2012 to 2010	Accept.
3	3	T	By defining a PT as an interlaboratory comparison (and citing 17043 as a normative reference), the sections within the document allowing an internally developed test will create confusion. ISO/IEC 17043 does not use the terms external or internal. An interlaboratory comparison requires labs with different mgmt systems (e.g., if a lab has 4 sites within a state and all 4 take a test - that is not an interlaboratory comparison). If you want FSSPs to have the ability to create tests for their own use then consider switching from 'PT' to 'monitoring'. If interlaboratory comparison is the goal, then you just need to shore up the term "internal" so FSSPs aren't confused.	Define interlaboratory comparison. Within the document revise all instances of 'internal' test to specify 'internally developed intralaboratory comparison'.	Accept with modification: definition for proficiency testing modified to "external proficiency testing" and defintion added for "internal proficiency testing" added for clarification
4	4.2.4	E	I think this is a typo.	Should be "see 4.1.4" instead of 4.1.3.	Accept.
5	5.1	T	4.1.1 says "whenever possible, PT should be acquired from externally accredited provider". 4.2.1 says if FSSP accredited, and they're using an external provider, then they must use an acredited 17043 provider. But 5.1 doesn't put any emphasis on the use of the results from the accredited provider. The term "should" allows the FSSP to completely ignore or revise expected results from an accredited PT provider (PTP). Why mention the use of an accredited PTP at all in the document if there is no weight put to the results from the PTP? The PTP's evaluator should be used when an accredited test is taken by the FSSP.	Revise section 5.1 to require the FSSP, when using a PT from an accredited PTP, to utilize the PTPs evaluator. (i.e., use the PTP consensus results)	Accept. "should" in the lead-in sentence to the list modified to a "shall"