Public Comment Deadline: 11/29/2021

ASB Standard 137, Standard for Examination and Documentation of Footwear and Tire Impression Evidence

#	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comments	Final Resolution
1	3.6		Removed "verification" under terms and definitions.	Accept.
2	4.4.1 and 4.4.3		There is no allowance for comparison to a known footwear or tire where the actual shoe or tire is not submitted. The standard requires the creation of at least two test impressions if any agreement is found between the unknown and known. Furthermore, there are times on certain cases where the court will prohibit the taking of test impressions. Also, every commercially prepared proficiency test I am aware of does not provide an actual shoe or tire, but just photographs and pre-prepared test impressions. The way the standard is written, you wouldn't be able to take a proficiency test that complies with the standards because ISO 17043 is gong to require all the samples provided to the test takers are as homogeneous as possible, so the proficiency test companies can't ship out the actual shoes or tires, and provide the same ones to each test taker. Often these commercially prepared tests only include one test impression. I also don't understand why we would need multiple test impressions if you have one high quality test impression. Meaning, if you do it right the first time, why would you need to do it a second time? I understand the variation that can occur between a vertical impression and a walking impression with a shoe, but do we also intend to take two fully rolled standards of every tire for comparison? I think we just need to add an "if available" for test impressions, and change the requirement of creating two test impressions to one.	Accept.
3	3.6		No option to vote yes with edits, so voting no. I see that the entire verification section was removed and listed beyond scope of this document (no problem), but the terms and forward of the redline still contain it. Seems that we should delete "verification" from the terms section (let it be defined in a future document that actually discusses it), and cut any reference to it from the forward. Thanks (hopefully I'm looking at the most recent redline revision and the terms/forward were not already edited/fixed and my comments are useless. If so, sorry).	Accept.