<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Proposed Resolution</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1.1.1 | This section includes language indicating: “[The type of documentation photographs, written annotations, etc.] is used to meet the standard only."
| | A technical note is important, as it would assume that an unmentioned context has been added between the words written and annotations. As a more substantive note, this language threatens to create confusion and altered best practices in terms of fully documenting the features (i.e., lines of text) as required by the standard. There is an issue of research from other AS&E guidelines indicating that, on one hand, the interpretation of evidence can be subjective, but also that feature selection is a subjective and variable endeavor that is not without errors. After parties in the legal systems' defense and otherwise therefore desire to know what features' past environment or to whom these determinations and to have those disciplines determined to be in that standard.
| | Some courts are beginning to make decisions not to use those disciplines. For example, in Section 4.1.1.1, 4.1.2, 2012, 2012, 2012 (40th ed., 2000 & 2000), North Carolina, etc. Method, 4.1.2.1d (3rd ed., 2017). In losing the language, however, some courts will be required to reconsider the standard's contents (without explicit references regarding features relied upon as an). It may be a conflict with other parties of the standard as currently written, as it would suggest they should amend in subsequent comments.
| | 4.1.2.1d | The section includes language indicating: “[The type of documentation photographs, written annotations, etc.] is used to meet the standard only."
| | A technical note is important, as it would assume that an unmentioned context has been added between the words written and annotations. As a more substantive note, this language threatens to create confusion and altered best practices in terms of fully documenting the features (i.e., lines of text) as required by the standard. There is an issue of research from other AS&E guidelines indicating that, on one hand, the interpretation of evidence can be subjective, but also that feature selection is a subjective and variable endeavor that is not without errors. After parties in the legal systems' defense and otherwise therefore desire to know what features' past environment or to whom these determinations and to have those disciplines determined to be in that standard.
| | Some courts are beginning to make decisions not to use those disciplines. For example, in Section 4.1.1.1, 4.1.2, 2012, 2012, 2012 (40th ed., 2000 & 2000), North Carolina, etc. Method, 4.1.2.1d (3rd ed., 2017). In losing the language, however, some courts will be required to reconsider the standard's contents (without explicit references regarding features relied upon as an). It may be a conflict with other parties of the standard as currently written, as it would suggest they should amend in subsequent comments.

---

**Note:** All proposed modifications must accompany each comment or it cannot be considered.
This section states that the text of the document is subject to change. The section indicates that the language used throughout the document is not fixed and may be altered by reviewers. It also notes that the document is intended to be a work in progress and that the language may be refined or altered in the future.

Section 4.4.4 should be removed. If it is retained, it should not provide a way to avoid or mitigate the consequences of any changes made to the document. The section should instead encourage the use of cross-references to other sections of the document to maintain consistency.

Accept with modification: Section 4.4.4 was updated for clarity.