<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Type of Comment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Proposed Resolution</th>
<th>Final Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>It states: A proficiency test program is intended to evaluate the following: the ability of a laboratory to adhere to national and international standards. Without national standards, it is impossible to test someone (or a laboratory) on the ability to adhere to national standards.</td>
<td>Create standards prior to making a recommendation to test for adherence to national standards. A PT program is intended to ensure a laboratory has an adequate proficiency test program and that all expectations of the program are available to those participating in the PT program.</td>
<td>Accept - (third bullet removed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>The forward says: &quot;Only FSSPs who are competent to perform independent casework are to be proficiency tested.&quot; There is no standard for competency therefore it is impossible to adhere to this recommendation. The forward has requirements within it which is not acceptable.</td>
<td>remove forward or move the requirements listed in the forward to the document itself. Clearly articulate who the FSSP is, the individual or the organization.</td>
<td>Accept: replaced FSSP with footwear and tire examiner to clarify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>The scope states, &quot;The guidance provided...&quot; is this guidance (a best practice) or is this a standard (requirements)? Shall is used 16 times, should and recommended is used 20 times which means there are more recommendations than requirements and therefore this document should be changed to be a best practice.</td>
<td>The title should be changed to a best practice document.</td>
<td>Reject: This document meets ASB's guidelines to be a standard as there are approximately 16 requirements throughout this document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>FSSP is not defined in the document, defining acronyms in the forward is not acceptable. It appears that 'individual FSSP' is different than an FSSP.</td>
<td>1) Define FSSP in the terms section. 2) Define 'Individual FSSP' in the terms section.</td>
<td>Reject: FSSP was changed to Footwear and Tire Examiner to clarify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>External Source</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>An external source is not someone who is accredited. An external source may or may not be accredited. Inaccurate definition. I think this is trying to require that proficiency test providers be accredited, this should be stated in the standard, not listed in a definition.</td>
<td>Add that external proficiency test providers shall be accredited by ISO 17043 in a section for providers, not in the terms or in the section on the proficiency plan.</td>
<td>Accept: External source deleted from definitions and explanation added to 4.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3 consultation</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>states, &quot;technical review or verification&quot; but these terms are not defined.</td>
<td>Define technical review Define verification</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3 consultation</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>states, 'consensus opinion' but does not define it. Is consensus a majority vote? Or is the term being used as science defines general consensus, which means that the conclusion has been debated and is no longer in doubt?</td>
<td>Define how consensus is being used.</td>
<td>Accept: word consensus was removed and the definition was slightly updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3 Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities to Be Tested</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4 is about the plan, not the test. 4.3 is discussing the test</td>
<td>move this to a section on the test itself, not the overall plan, or change the title of 4 to be about the plan and the proficiency test. However, the title of the document is about the program therefore 4.3 should be reworded to state &quot;the program shall include specific information to be included in a proficiency test and may include (then add everything that is listed).&quot;</td>
<td>Accept. The title of section 4 was changed from Program Plan to Program Plan and Testing Recommendations. Fully accepted the change but did not use suggested edits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>states, 'it is recommended'</td>
<td>change to words that are required for standards documents ('it is recommended' should be changed to 'should').</td>
<td>Accept: removed recommended and added should so it is now a requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10   | 4.5.1   | T    | *says ‘and include’. Is this a shall or a should?*  
says ‘shall be representative of casework’. Proficiency tests should test that an  
individual can meet a minimum level of proficiency independently. Casework may  
include very complex situations where an individual would be expected to consult with  
others. Highly complex situations should not be on a proficiency test because an FSSP  
should not ever arrive at a conclusion on these conclusions without consulting others.  
rephrase ‘and include’ to clarify if it is a should or shall statement.  
Rephrase to state that proficiency tests should be representative of basic and  
advanced comparisons, but not highly complex comparisons where consultation  
would be recommended. | Accept: Revised as suggested. |
| 11   | 4.6.1   | T    | states that tests SHALL be administered open or blindly. That is not a requirement  
(not a shall) since they are the only 2 options.  
Change to ‘proficiency tests MAY be administered in an open or blind format’.  
Or, since blind is being recommended, change the statement to ‘Tests should be  
administered blindly’. | Accept: Included type of open or blind testing as a first sentence to 4.6.1 and moved  
4.6.2 and 4.6.3 to Terms and Definitions. |
| 12   | 4.6.2 and 4.6.3 | T | open testing and blind testing are definitions, not requirements, and should be moved  
to section 3.  
move both of these to section 3. | Accept: moved 4.6.2 and 4.6.3 to Terms and Definitions. |
| 13   | 4.8.1   | T    | inferred is being used inappropriately  
Change ‘inferred’ to be ‘assumed’. | Accept: edits made as suggested. |
| 14   | 4.8.3   | T    | "undue time constraints should not be imposed"  
What is an undue time constraint? There is no means of applying this ‘should’  
statement. There should be an expectation of how long it takes to arrive at certain  
conclusions. Basic conclusions may take 5 minutes while more advanced conclusions  
may take an hour. A test should have a variety of complexity levels and an overall  
time estimate should be stated.  
Remove statement unless an estimated time can be given or state that the time limit  
for a test should consider the complexity and the number of comparisons within a  
test. | Partial Accept: a second sentence was added to provide clarification. |
| 15   | 4.8.4   | T    | states, "In open proficiency tests all conclusions shall be those of the FSSP without  
consultation."  
What this says is that you can talk to others during a test, about the test, as long as  
the interaction is not significant, but the document does not define significant.  
Define significant or reward to state that any conversation regarding a test shall not  
be permitted until all those participating in the test have submitted their results. | Accept: 4.8.4 includes now this clarification. |
| 16   | 4.9.1   | T    | This is about validating external tests. 4 is about the testing program, not about  
requirements of the test.  
Restate to be a requirement of the testing program, such as ‘The testing program shall  
only use tests that have been validated’.  
Or, make a section 5 for recommendations for PT providers instead of putting this in a  
section on PT plan. | Accept: change made as suggested. Suggestion was included as 4.9.1 and the original  
sections became sub sections to 4.9.1. |
| 17   | 4.9.2   | T    | "tests should only be prepared by an experienced FSSP"  
experience does not indicate that something is adequate.  
Additionally, a test should have a variety of complexity levels and include a variety of  
situations.  
remove " tests should only be prepared by an experienced FSSP"  
state that an internal test shall include a variety of situations and complexity levels. | Partial Accept: accepted only the second suggestion - reference was included to refer  
to section 4.5.1. Should remains as it is a recommendation. |
| 18   | 4.10.1  | T    | a FSSP should not be needed to evaluate results. Conclusions should be stated so that  
anyone can grade a test  
remove "The FSSP’s agency should identify a qualified FSSP to evaluate the proficiency  
test results. “  
Reject: Prevents conclusions and justifications from being properly assessed by an  
untrained person. | |
| 19   | 4.10.3  | T    | a grading scale and the significance of incorrect conclusions needs to be  
predicted, not determined by an evaluator.  
Add that a grading scale shall be predetermined prior to administering a test (e.g., 90%  
with no erroneous conclusions is passing, or 100% correct conclusions is passing).  
Add the significance of incorrect conclusions shall be predetermined and stated prior  
to administering a PT (e.g. an erroneous identification or exclusion results in failing a  
test, over 10% of non-answered questions results in ‘not passing’ (which is not to be  
confused with failing a test)). | Partial accept: added section 4.10.3 that fulfills the second suggestions. The first  
suggestion was not accepted because there is no scientific justification for defining a %  
for test pass or fail. |
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| 20   | 4.11.1.1 | T    | Class 1 was given as an example in an earlier entry but is now being used as part of the standard. If these terms are part of the standard then define them in section 3.  
Either define these terms in section 3 or remove them as part of the standard. They could be referred to as another example. | Accept: Explanation of Class I, II and III was moved from 4.10.4 to definitions. |
| 21   | 4.11.2  | T    | "4.11.2 If more than one FSSP fails to technically perform one specific aspect of a proficiency test correctly, the whole discipline may choose to undergo specific remedial training in this area. "  
The entire discipline is held accountable for a few people? Maybe the agency needs to perform a root cause analysis before determining a CA. | Change 4.11.2 to say that if a PT results in the same error by more than one person then a Root Cause Analysis needs to be performed to establish the cause, and then appropriate corrective action shall be implemented.  
Remove 'the whole discipline', a problem should only effect 'those within this section of an agency'.  
Accept: Change made to 4.11.2 as suggested. |
| 22   | 4.12    | T    | "Criteria for successful proficiency should include the following:  
Conclusions that fall within the acceptable range of conclusions defined by the preparing FSSP(s)."  
i'm assuming FSSP(s) is really talking about Proficiency Test providers? | clarify by stating something like, "Criteria for proficiency shall include: acceptable conclusions"  
Accept: (added shall and proficiency test provider as suggested) |
| 23   | 4.12    | T    | "Criteria for successful proficiency should include the following:  
A measure of internal consistency (i.e., the FSSP's documented findings/notes shall support the derived conclusion). "  
It this intended to state that the plan shall include an overall report for all those who participated in the proficiency test to ensure consistency within an agency? If so, consistency is not as important as proficiency. | remove the need for consistency or clarify the meaning.  
Accept: clarification made |
| 24   | 4.10.1  | E    | suggest to drop FSSP (forensic service /provider) it is too general. Keep it simple and specific like Footwear/Tire Examiner. "It is confusing as it is.  
| 25   | 4.10.1  | E    | under 4.1 at the end of following add : (colon) and describe in bullet points the requirements.  
Add colon, structure the requirements in bullets  
| 26   | 4.10.1  | E    | under 4.1.2 use of "control samples" should be added.  
It is perfectly fine to use these words (control samples), currently is too broad  
Add a definition for proficiency testing to section 3.  
Add a definition for proficiency testing to section 3.  
| 27   | 4.10.1  | E    | Although there is a detailed explanation for proficiency testing in the foreword of the standard, a condensed definition for proficiency testing needs be added to section 3 of the body of the standard.  
Reject: this definition will be provided in the upcoming to be published: Terminology Used for Forensic Footwear and Tire Evidence.  
| 28   | 4.10.1  | E    | The terms competency test and proficiency test are sometimes interchangeably used even though the purposes of these tests have great distinction from one another. The definition for competency testing needs to be clear in stating that competency testing occurs during the training program and had nothing to do with ongoing proficiency testing.  
Suggested change to the sentence. The demonstration that a FSSP has acquired and demonstrated specialized knowledge, skills, and abilities upon the completion of a training program in the standard practices necessary to conduct examinations in a discipline and/or category of testing prior to performing independent casework.  
| 29   | 4.3     | E    | The use of the word should in the sentence "The proficiency test should reflect the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to fulfill the requirements of the FSSP's job in relation to footwear/tire evidence."  
suggests that it's optional for the test to reflect the knowledge, skill, and abilities needed for an FSSP to perform their job. Substituting shall for should does not imply that the subsequently listed skills are required to in every proficiency test, especially if the FSSP agency writes a detailed plan explaining what encompasses the testing program.  
The sentence should be changed to "The proficiency test shall reflect the knowledge, skill, and abilities necessary to fulfill the requirements of the FSSP's job in relation to footwear/tire evidence."  
| Accept |
| 30   | 4.8.2   | E    | Provide clarity on what is meant by "established procedures." Ambiguous terms like this suggest that a procedure that is not routinely used by the FSSP agency could be used for a proficiency test.  
A better descriptive phrase such as "laboratory validated" procedures can be substituted for "established procedures."  
| Partial Accept: Updated sentence. This document requires the Footwear and Tire examiners follow their agency's established procedures. |
| 31   | 4.10.1  | T    | Will "qualified FSSP" be defined in a forthcoming standard? If not, more clarity is needed on what it means to be a qualified FSSP.  
Provide a definition or an explanation of what a qualified footwear/tire FSSP is.  
| Accept - clarification added to 4.10.1 |
| 32   | 4.10.4  | E    | If an evaluator is required to identify a level of inconsistency between results, it should not be option for the FSSP to have a criterion on which the inconsistencies are measured, it should be a requirement.  
Suggested change to the sentence. The agency shall have criteria in place for the categorization of the levels of inconsistency based on the inconsistency's effect on the quality of the work product.  
<p>| Accept |</p>
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<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.10.4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>Are the terms class I, II, and III examples of categorizations that a FSSP can opt to use or are they mandatory categorizations that can describe the varying levels of inconsistency? Section 4.10.3 suggests that the terms class I, II, and III are just examples while section 11 implies that they are terms that should be used. Specify if the terms class I, II, and III are mandatory classifications.</td>
<td>Reject: Corrective action should be proportional to the level of inconsistency, but not classified as Class I, II and III. This is an example.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>The suggested criteria for a successful proficiency are minimal requirements. These should be mandatory.</td>
<td>Suggested change to the sentence. Criteria for a successful proficiency shall include the following, but are not limited to:</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Comment through CB vote</td>
<td>Looks good! I would suggest comparing the reference format with the test impression document to ensure we are formatting them the same and we stay consistent (I haven’t compared them).</td>
<td>Accept. CB will review references across documents for consistency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>