<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</td>
<td>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</td>
<td>Type of comment</td>
<td>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</td>
<td>Proposed change by the MB</td>
<td>Proposed Editors Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And

1. 8.18  Table 1  Ed  Row 18.009 Typo: Pedifree Information  Pedigree Information  Accepted  
2. 8.18.15  Table 80  Te  At the SC37 meeting, there was considerable discussion about the same table used in their standard. It was suggested to remove codes 3, 4 & 5.  Harmonize with the Table to be used in the ISO standard (removing these codes).  Rejected per DNA WG  
3. 8.18.17  First Bullet  Ed  The first bullet says “Table 82” This makes no sense.  Revise to discuss the first information item.  Accepted  
4. 8.14.25  Ed  Typo: indiviuial  Change to :individual  Accepted  
5. General  Ed  Comments should not appear in the draft  Remove comments in side margin  Accepted  
6. 8.22.8  Third bullet  Te  There seems to be no provision for removing an optional field – only subfields and information items.  Add an example for removing a field: 5,-14.024,NA,NA  Accepted  
7. Annex C  Implementation Domains  Ed  The text does not reflect that multiple domains may now be present.  Add text to reflect the change to Field 1.013  Refer to XML WG for new wording.  
8. Annex C  Introduction, Indent # 1  Te  *All necessary elements in ansi-nist.xsd have been replaced by equivalent elements in a biometric domain, in Is this still true?  Refer to XML WG for new wording.  

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation  
2 Type of comment: ge = general  te = technical  ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.14.31</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Footnote reference unresolved</td>
<td>Refer to footnote 196</td>
<td>Accepted ✓ (also fixed 8.14.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NIEM subset namespaces</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>The fbi namespace is missing.</td>
<td>Add <a href="http://niem.gov/niem/fbi/2.0">http://niem.gov/niem/fbi/2.0</a></td>
<td>Accepted ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Annex E</td>
<td>Subject &amp; Scene Req’s SAP 40 +</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The bullets describe full profile and half profile but don’t give examples. This leaves it open to interpretation.</td>
<td>Include pictures showing these poses.</td>
<td>Accepted ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>There are no codes for 6th or 7th fingers on a hand.</td>
<td>Add codes to the table.</td>
<td>Accepted ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.20.2</td>
<td>2nd dash</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>libpng implementation is mentioned without any note of where / how to access it.</td>
<td>Provide link to this implementation.</td>
<td>Accept ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Annex A</td>
<td>2nd paragraph</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>First word of sentence is alone on one page and rest is on next page.</td>
<td>Correct formatting.</td>
<td>Accept ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Annex C</td>
<td>Character encoding</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>There is no mention of how this relates to field 1.015</td>
<td>Add: Only one character set encoding is valid for any particular transaction. This XML statement should specify the same character set as stated in field 1.015”</td>
<td>Refer to XML WG for new wording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Annex B</td>
<td>Switching between character sets</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>First paragraph mentions UTF-8, UFT-16BE and UTF-32 but last paragraph only mentions UTF-8. Alternate character sets should be able to be used in text fields as well.</td>
<td>Refer to all three character sets in last paragraph. Change second sentence to “Alternate character sets shall only be used in user-defined fields and text fields, such as Comment / COM in Record Types 9 and above.”</td>
<td>Accept ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Annex B</td>
<td>Type-1 Record</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>Example does not reflect the multiple domains possible in Field 1.013</td>
<td>Change example to “1.013:NoramUTexasDPSUSG”</td>
<td>Accept ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 1 | MB = Member of M1 - affiliation          |
| 2 | Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Annex B</td>
<td>Transmitted Data conventions</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>There is no description of organization name conventions for field like 1.008 (Section 7.16 mentions that the second information item is optional)</td>
<td>Add section: Agency Codes</td>
<td>Accept √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Annex B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Rest of document uses (u^s) not ({US}).</td>
<td>Change ({US}) to (u^s) and ({GS}) to (g^s) and ({FS}) to (f^s)</td>
<td>Accept √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.21.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>There is no example of an acceptable reference that is not a URL</td>
<td>Add example: “Case 2009:1468 AV Tape 5”</td>
<td>Accept; Repeat example in Record Type 20. √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.10.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The Distortion severity code / DSC is not clear in its definition.</td>
<td>Provide an example of Mild, Moderate and Severe</td>
<td>Accept in principle – Solicit canvases for example that can be printed (privacy release).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.10.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>Currently, the only time when a second hair color is allowed is in the case of BAL. This should cover multi-colored and streaked hair.</td>
<td>Add attributes: Streaked STR Multi-colored MUL Add example for multi-colored: If a person has multiple hair colors (such as blue in the middle and orange on the sides), select one color for the first entry and the other for the second. For streaked hair, use “STR” in the first entry, use the second entry to describe the principal color of the hair.</td>
<td>Accept with revised wording* If a person has multiple hair color (such as blue in the middle and orange on the sides), select one color for the first entry and the other for the second. For streaked hair, use “STR” in the first entry, use the second entry to describe the principal color of the hair.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.10.30 Last sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>There is no rationale for the statement: “The metric coordinates of 3D landmarks shall be obtained by multiplying the X, Y and Z coordinates by a fixed scale of</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>Discuss at the workshop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. **NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>2(^{nd}) paragraph</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The term ‘junk DNA’ in no longer in common use.</td>
<td>Delete the last part of the sentence (following DNA).</td>
<td>Accept √ Also changed 5.2.18 to remove the reference to junk DNA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.18.17</td>
<td>Table 81</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>There is no Code for U</td>
<td>Add code U to the table.</td>
<td>Reject (per DNA WG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.14.21</td>
<td>Table 81</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>During the lifetime of this version, it is expected that a second version of NFIQ will be produced. An information item should be added to indicate the NFIQ version, with the first version being the default (for backwards compatibility);</td>
<td>Change : “It consists of two information items” to “It consists of three information items”</td>
<td>Accept √ Add third bullet: - The third item is the NFIQ version / NFV which is a positive integer value. It is optional, with version 1 as the default assumed value if the item is not entered. Change the entry in the record layout table to show that this is optional and the value is m=1 M=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AABB</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Typo: Blod</td>
<td>Change to Blood</td>
<td>Accept √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Typos: Descernible; superresoluton; receieveing;thay; identifier;positive; recevver; measureable; sumultaneous; shemes; consideration; separae; calues; degress; coordinate;image; conforms;versions;orthr; friction;generalized; except; deletes; versin; recmoved; clarification; seqmented; measurable; reference; originating; cound; default; monmnic; oterh; mayl; Insttitiute; explicity</td>
<td>Correct to proper spelling</td>
<td>Accept √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is difficult to flip between sections when there are cross-references.</td>
<td>Include hyperlinks within the document when there are cross-references.</td>
<td>Accept √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>Para 4</td>
<td>Te-</td>
<td>This paragraph refers toType-14 finger views in a friction</td>
<td>Rewrite sentence as: “Full-length finger</td>
<td>Accept √</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 – affiliation  
2 Type of comment: ge = general  te = technical  ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment¹</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>min</td>
<td>ridge collection as “latent images” in the second sentence.</td>
<td>joint images use codes FV1 through FV4.”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>7.12 Figure 1</td>
<td>Te-maj</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothenar and Interdigital areas of the palm are not clearly indicated within the figure.</td>
<td>Remove the line that divides the interdigital area within the image and move the “Hypothenar” label down to be completely contained within the lines bounding the hypothenar region.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>7.12 Figure 1</td>
<td>Te-maj</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figure 1 and associated footnote 36 do not clearly define upper palm and lower palm image contents.</td>
<td>At minimum, footnote 36 should read “Note: Upper palm and lower palm images must include the interdigital area as overlap for verification. Therefore, the lower and upper palm locations have approximate boundaries in this illustration.” As explained in paragraph 3 of section 8.15.</td>
<td>Accept as written in proposed change. (must → shall).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Annex B Base-64 Encoding</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>References to Table C1 should be to Table 97</td>
<td>Change references to Table 97</td>
<td>Accept ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Foreword Last paragraph last sentence</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td>The statement does not indicate that the 2009 amendment is also superceded.</td>
<td>Add” and the amendment ANSI/NIST-ITL 1a-2009” to the end of the last sentence of the paragraph beginning “The Information Technology Laboratory”</td>
<td>Accept ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Introduction 2ⁿᵈ paragraph</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>The work “minor’ is not appropriate when describing an amendment.</td>
<td>Change “a minor supplement’ to ‘an amendment”</td>
<td>Accept ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Introduction 2ⁿᵈ paragraph</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>The standard has not always allowed different encodings, as the last sentence implies.</td>
<td>Change “The standard” to “This version of the standard” in the last sentence.</td>
<td>Accept ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Footnote 2</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Put in a statement about the use of the term marks for latents in the UK</td>
<td>Add this sentence to the footnote: ‘The term ‘marks’ is in some nations denotes what is called 'latent prints' in the terminology of this standard.”</td>
<td>Accept ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Introduction 1</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>The second sentence is potentially restrictive and misleading.</td>
<td>Delete the sentence.</td>
<td>Accept ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Add an annex for conformity assessment</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conformity assessment should be more thoroughly covered.</td>
<td>Insert text as Annex G and move Annex G to Annex H.</td>
<td>Reject. Conformity WG will prepare a separate document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to character sets are technically incorrect. The items shown in Table 2 are character encoding sets.</td>
<td>Change references from character set to character encoding set throughout the document</td>
<td>Accept Also added footnote in Section 5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment²</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

42. 8.22.9 Te This field was in an earlier draft but should have been removed from this version. Delete Accept

43. Cover Page Ed Cover page should be replaced with better artwork Accept

44. 5.2.4 Ed Part of last sentence missing. Accept

45. 5.2.11 Ed Phraseology not clear. Accept

Each of which can contain several character sets such as Latin, and Cyrillic.

describing the difference between character set and character encoding set. In Annex C changed the header “Character set” to “Unicode”

Delete

Accept

Also removed field 999 from table 88 and made fields 98.901 to be extended to 98.99 as reserved for future use.

Accept

Change to: Type-14 records may handle both 500 ppi images and those at greater resolutions that are now commonly exchanged.

Accept

Change to: Type-11 records are reserved for future use. They will contain voice data samples and data associated with the capture and characteristics of that data. Type-11 records are designed for biometric purposes (speaker recognition) and not for speech recognition or transcription of the vocal content of the voice sample. This record type has not been defined in this version of the standard.

Accept
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.2.12</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Phraseology not clear</td>
<td>Change to: Type-12 records are reserved for future use. They will contain dental record data, used for the identification of individuals and the verification of a person’s identity. This record type has not been defined in this version of the standard.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.3 Paragraph 2 First sentence.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The following sentence is not true, since the domain field is changed in this version: The structure of the Type-1 record (which describes the content of the transaction) does not change between versions.</td>
<td>Remove the sentence.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.14.2 last sentence of paragraph 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Last sentence incorrectly calls Type-7 a field.</td>
<td>Change to: An appropriate Record Type above 9 shall be used if scanning an other image at greater than 99.99 ppmm, since that is the maximum possible number for that Record Type.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.15.1 Paragraph 1, first sentence</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Awkward wording.</td>
<td>Suggested wording: The time and date fields are handled differently for each encoding.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Section 7.7, Version 2 ninth information item</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>The geodetic code is not 40 characters</td>
<td>Change to “It is an alphanumeric value up to 2 to 4 characters in length” and add a footnote to the list of codes, available at: <a href="https://portal.dgiwg.org/files/?artifact_id=3073">https://portal.dgiwg.org/files/?artifact_id=3073</a></td>
<td>Accept √ Also will change tables at beginning of each record type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl. No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. MB</td>
<td>tenth information items</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Add a reference to the text</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. MB</td>
<td>tables at the beginnings of the records</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The information items for Mercator northing and geographic reference text are missing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. MB</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Clauses are numbered strangely</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. MB</td>
<td>2.3 and 2.4</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>The Conformance WG has developed new terminology to be used in its companion document</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept to be in Draft 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. MB</td>
<td>8.18.1</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Section numbers 8.18.1, 8.18.2, 8.18.3, and 8.18.4 are reused multiple times on pages 306 – 319.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept to be in Draft 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. MB</td>
<td>8.18 Table 76</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>Field 18.018 – no min/max listed. Shouldn't multiple user defined profiles be permitted (that represent the same sample)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. MB</td>
<td>8.18 Table 76</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>Field 18.015, RES. Why is result (RES) mandatory, especially for transactions having new enrolments that have not been searched?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. MB</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>I don't see support for ladder/control sample electropherograms that can help trained DNA analysts interpret the specimen's electropherogram and allow them to make edits to alleles. Consider support for this in the specification.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. MB</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>Is encryption of the profile data supported?</td>
<td></td>
<td>General technical question; Encryption is not part of the standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. MB</td>
<td>8.18.2</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>Field 18.005 – NAL—indicates the multiple DNA analyses are possible but the specification doesn't appear to support multiple profiles. I don't understand the purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to DNA WG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general, te = technical, ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61. 18.18</td>
<td>Table 76</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>How does field 18.999 “ELECTROPHORGRAM IMAGE” differ from 18.019-Electropherogram data/EPD?</td>
<td>Review and fix if required and clarify in text.</td>
<td>Field 18.999 is a screenshot. However, the data is the actual output of a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62. 8.18</td>
<td>Table 76</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>Field 18.999 – Why a max of 1?</td>
<td>Set max to be unlimited.</td>
<td>The standard can only handle one Field 999 per record type. To accommodate multiple screenshots, this is now moved in the draft to an information item in 18.019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63. 8.18</td>
<td>Table 76</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Field 18.014, Character Type... column—typo on “239”. I believe this is a wrong footnote that isn’t properly referenced.</td>
<td>Fix.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64. 8.18</td>
<td>Table 76</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Field 18.019, EPD. I believe a row stating “Subfields: Repeating sets of information items” should be introduced in the section as 18.019 indicates “This optional field contains a subfield for each electropherogram” indicating that multiple electropherograms are permitted.</td>
<td>Fix as suggested.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65. 8.18</td>
<td>Table 76</td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>Fields 18.022-18.994 are identified as “RESERVED FOR FUTURE USE”. Have you considered reserving a range of fields specifically for implementers of this specification to define in their application profiles? This will prevent tag overlap when the ITL makes use of new field numbers. Perhaps this can be addressed by implementers working with field number &gt;= 18.1000.</td>
<td>Consider comment.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66. 4.0</td>
<td>Appendix F certified devices</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Definition is missing a word: ‘to’</td>
<td>Should state: “This refers to devices that have successfully completed…”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67. 5.2</td>
<td>Table 1 Record Types</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The ‘Record Contents’ column is hard to read with centered.</td>
<td>Left justified the ‘Record Contents’ column.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
### Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>5.4 Character Types</td>
<td>Terminator</td>
<td>Unsure why the phrase ‘and . , ! &quot; ‘ ‘ ’ –’ is placed in the definition of the Alphabetic. Assumed that these were part of the Special Character set.</td>
<td>Move these to the Special character set definition.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>6.0 Implementation domain</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Need a definition of ‘codified’ in the context of the first sentence.</td>
<td>Replace the wording with: “An implementation domain, coded in Field 1.013 Domain name…”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>7.2/par 8 IDC Example</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The IDCs listed in the first example under ‘Examples of the user of ICD follow:’ are not correct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>7.0 Common Fields on Record Types</td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>Would this section be easier to read if the fields were listed in alphabetic order or by field number order?</td>
<td>List the fields in a consistent order.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>7.0 Common Fields on Record Types</td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>Need to have field numbers listed with the field description as did with the first two fields.</td>
<td>Place the field number in all fields listed in this section. Such as, with the follow: “The SRN shall be used to link a Type-20 record (20.021)…” And another: “The first information item contains the Associated context number value / ACN (21.021) for a particular Record Type-21.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>7.0 Common Fields on Record Types</td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>Some sections have the ‘information items’ indented, and some do not. Need to be consistent.</td>
<td>Ensure that all ‘information items’ under each field description is indented.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>7.4 Associated context</td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>There is an extra word in the second sentence.</td>
<td>Need to reword: “This field is used when the representation transmitted…”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>7.5 Annotated</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>In the definition of the second information item, missing a</td>
<td>Need to reword: “The second information item</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general, te = technical, ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
## Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment (^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>closing parenthesis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Geodetic sample acquisition</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The last sentence of the second paragraph, need to spell out the 'esp.'</td>
<td>Need to finish: &quot;…or below the earth’s surface; specifically referring to data that is geographic…”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Geodetic sample acquisition</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>In the definition of the fifth information item, LGD, should the value be inclusive of both -180 and +180?</td>
<td>Need to reword: “The value shall be between -180 (inclusive) and +180 (inclusive).”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Geodetic sample acquisition</td>
<td>Te- minor</td>
<td>In the definition of the eighth information item, ELE, should there be a range?</td>
<td>If there is a range, then need to include it.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Table 4 Friction Ridge position</td>
<td>Te- Major</td>
<td>Would like to see a new code for Wrist Crease.</td>
<td>Add new code for Wrist Crease to table.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>New code 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Note to mobile id codes</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Believe the footnote is significant enough to be pulled up into the text prior to the table for the codes 40 – 50.</td>
<td>Pull footnote #35 up into the text.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Need ‘PPD’ acronym at the end of the title.</td>
<td>Correct title to state: ‘Print position descriptions / PPD’</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>1ST Paragraph</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Need to format the sentences consistently as you are referring to the same fields.</td>
<td>Change the first sentence of the first paragraph of 7.12 section to the same as the first sentence of the first paragraph of 7.11 section.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>2nd paragraph</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Need a semi-colon at the end of the last sentence of the second paragraph.</td>
<td>Add a semi-colon to the last sentence of the second paragraph.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Table 5 Joint Image</td>
<td>Te- minor</td>
<td>Would like to see some wording around this table to indicate that the first – sixth row is for the first information item and the seventh – ninth row is for the second</td>
<td>Add apparent wording.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
## Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</td>
<td>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Subject acquisition profile</td>
<td>Need to make the image size pixel representation in the same format.</td>
<td>In the third bullet use 768x1024 pixels instead of the complete sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Level 50 &amp; 51</td>
<td>The forth sentence seems to have some extra data. Maybe an explanation of why it is there.</td>
<td>Remove “for the 99th percentile male in the U.S. population” from: “Identification applications require approximately 1700 pixels wide by 2515 pixels high on the face.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>Subject Acquisition profile</td>
<td>If this table is specific for Mobile ID, then may need a reference to the profiles built for live-scan.</td>
<td>Need clarification of live-scan profiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Compressio n Codes for Iris</td>
<td>In the definition of JPEG2000, need to change support to supports.</td>
<td>Need to change wording to: “This supports both lossy and lossless compression.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Record Layout Tables</td>
<td>Having one column for Character Type &amp; Min/Max Character count seems overwhelming.</td>
<td>Separate this column into: 3 columns for Character Type, Min Character Count, and Max Character Count.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Record Layout Tables</td>
<td>The same footnote for each column heading should be part of the intro before going into each record type.</td>
<td>Pull up footnote up in the intro of the section 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>1.004 Type of Transaction</td>
<td>In the last sentence, Note sentence, need to be consistent in capitalizing.</td>
<td>Need to change the wording to: “(Note: The Type of Transaction shall be in accordance with definitions provided by the receiving agency.)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Te-Minor</td>
<td>1.005 Date</td>
<td>CJIS/FBI restated this in their standard that this date was for when the transaction was ‘submitted’ not ‘initiated’ as these two dates could be different and cause errors when validating date printed against date submitted.</td>
<td>Change wording to: “This mandatory field shall contain the local date that the transaction was submitted.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Te-Minor</td>
<td>1.011 &amp; 1.012 Resolutions fields</td>
<td>Thought that both of the fields would be “00.00” if no Type-4 or Type-7 was included in the transaction. In the previous version it stated that when the transaction does not contain Type-3 through Type-7, this field should be ‘00.00’. Now that the Type-3 and Type-6 have been</td>
<td>Change the first sentence for each field to: “This mandatory field shall be set to ‘00.00’ if there are no Type-4 and no Type-7 records in the transaction.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation  
2 Type of comment: ge = general  te = technical  ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>8.2.1</td>
<td>2.001 Header</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The body of the paragraph seems to have smaller font then the remaining sections.</td>
<td>Need to make the section body font the same.</td>
<td><strong>Accept</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>8.4 &amp; 8.4 Table 23 &amp; 4.004 FGP</td>
<td>Te-Minor</td>
<td><strong>Minor</strong></td>
<td>The constraints on the 4.004 FGP field need to be looked at closely. FGP = 19 is a supplemental that needs more definition fields to fully describe that image. FGP = 239 needs explanation: not in the code table provided in section 7.10.</td>
<td>Remove references to FGP=19 &amp; 239.</td>
<td><strong>Accept</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td><strong>Table 25</strong></td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>In the Character count of 8.004 SRT, the Traditional format should use the number 1 instead of spelling it out. Be consistent with previous representations.</td>
<td>Change the wording to: “Traditional format = 1 byte”</td>
<td><strong>Accept</strong> format changed due to suggestion # 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>8.8.4</td>
<td>8.004 SRT</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>In Table 25 the field constraints for SRT are relying on the value of SIG, but in the definition it appears they are not tied together.</td>
<td>Need to ensure that the definition of the individual fields, SIG &amp; SRT, are consistent with the constraints in Table 25.</td>
<td><strong>Accept</strong> Changed contrains to SRT = 0 or 1 or 2. Also, The entry for 8.008 should have read “Dependent upon value of SRT”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>8.8.8.1, 8.8.8.2, &amp; 8.8.8.3</td>
<td><strong>Image data field description</strong></td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The titles need to be indented to follow the format of the other titles for previous sections.</td>
<td>Indent the titles to follow the format of the other titles for previous sections.</td>
<td><strong>Accept</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td><strong>Table 26</strong></td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The row entries for 9.901 LAI field are consistent with other entries where there are repeating values. Normally the statement: “Subfield: repeating values” is on a row by itself with the information being repeated placed in the row below it.</td>
<td><strong>Put “Subfield: repeating values” in a separate row between the 9.901 LAI field definition and the description of what is being repeated</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reject. This is the difference between Subfield: repeating values and Subfields: Repeating sets of information items.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>8.9.5</td>
<td><strong>M1-378 Feature Set</strong></td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Sub-section titles seem to have different font systems, some bold while others not. Also need indented.</td>
<td>Indent the sub section titles along with ensure all titles are of the same font and the body for each section is the same font and spacing between body and title.</td>
<td><strong>Accept</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>8.9.6.24</td>
<td><strong>Table 42 EFS Codes</strong></td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>As FBI/CJIS is moved to the EBTS v9.1 and still maintains the same definition as EFTS v7.1 for this</td>
<td>Need to decide if changing the wording of the EFTS7.</td>
<td><strong>Refer to EFS WG</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minutiae and Ridge counts, should this version change?</td>
<td>Recommend that this be a 2-column table with the page/section to be newspaper columns.</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Reformat Table 46 to be 2-column table and then turn on newspaper columns for this page. See Annex D for example.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>8.9.6.40 Table 46 EFS Codes</td>
<td>Other feature sets</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The font style for the titles of the sub sections under this section cause it to be printed with very little space between items.</td>
<td>Need to ensure that title font style are consistent with readability for the sub sections under this section.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.9.7.7 Type-10 field definitions</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Need to give specific clause numbers for each field or at least the paragraph under that clause number.</td>
<td>Add the appropriate complete clause number or paragraph under the clause number cited.</td>
<td>Accept √ Will also do in other record types with these fields.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>8.10.14 Following sections</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Numbering of sections restarted after 8.10.14.</td>
<td>Need to restart the numbering of Field 10.016: Scanned Horizontal pixel scale with 8.10.15.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>8.10.7 (should be 8.10.31) Field 10.032 AFF</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The third information item has the acronym as HCV, would think this would be HCX. Also have extra space between this item and the fourth information item.</td>
<td>Change wording to: “The third information item is the X coordinate / HCX.”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>8.10.7 (should be 8.10.31) Following sections</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Numbering of sections restarted after this section.</td>
<td>Need to continue the numbering of sections.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>8.10.3 (should be 8.10.38) Field 10.039</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The last sentence is missing a word, ‘be’.</td>
<td>Change wording to: “This field shall not be used if there are no multiple images of...”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>General All references to ASC</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>In definitions of the ASC, Associated Context, need to reference the Type-21 field number for ACN.</td>
<td>Need to add 21.021 to all references to ACN. For example, in the definition of the Field 10.995.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>General All references to SOR</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>In definitions of the SOR, Source representation, need to reference the Type-10 field number for SRN.</td>
<td>Need to add 20.021 to all references to SRN. For example, in the definition of the Field 10.997.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>General References to Type-20 &amp; Type-21</td>
<td>Te-Minor</td>
<td>Need an explanation in Section 7.4 as to why using this field versus the IDC field for relating like objects.</td>
<td>Need an explanation in Section 7.4 as to why using this field versus the IDC field for relating like objects. Along with an explanation in Type-20 field 20.021 SRN as to how this relates to the use of</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) MB = Member of M1 - affiliation  
\(^2\) Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>8.13 1(^{st}) paragraph</td>
<td>Te-</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Should there be an explanation about why this record is being used? FBI/CJIS is using for investigative searching where the Type-4, Type-14, &amp; Type-15 are used for identification/enrolment into the criminal database. Type-13 is for searching and enrolment into the ULF database.</td>
<td>Do we need a similar definition as how the FBI/CJIS is using this record type.</td>
<td>Reject. Don’t want the standard to reflect only CJS uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>8.14 Table 69, 14.014 row</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The Mnemonic for field 14.014 needs to remain FGP. Also the constraints need to include 33 &amp; 36 for the rolled hypothenar as it is considered to be among the supplemental set.</td>
<td>Change the Mnemonic for 14.014 to FGP and add 33 &amp; 36 to the constraint column.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>8.14 Table 69, 14.018 row</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Need to have the same constraints for the FGP subfield as for the 14.014 FGP field.</td>
<td>Include FGP = 19, 33, &amp; 36 to the constraint column for FGP subfield under 14.018 AMP field.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>8.14.18 Field 14.018 definition</td>
<td>Te-</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Need more detail as what is meant by XX and UP codes.</td>
<td>Add explanation: XX is to be used when only have a partial print due to amputation, therefore contains some friction ridge detail. UP is to be used with the complete block where an image was to be place has no image, therefore contains no friction ridge detail. An image with a scar should not be marked with XX or UP.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>8.14 General</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The sub sections under this section are not numbered correctly.</td>
<td>The section for Field 14.022 NIST quality metric is numbered 8.14.1 and should be 8.14.22. All remaining subsections need the correct numbering.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>8.15 2(^{nd}) paragraph</td>
<td>Te-</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>FBI/CJIS is not supporting ‘major case print card’. We are supporting the ‘Supplemental Fingerprint Card’ and the ‘Palmprint Card’. All images on the Supplemental Fingerprint Card are considered Type-14 images while the images on the Palmprint Card are considered Type-15 images.</td>
<td>Remove the phrase “a major case print card” from the sentence.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>8.15 3(^{rd}) paragraph</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Need a reference to the palm figure in section 7.</td>
<td>Add a reference to Figure 1 Palms and finger segment positions.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>8.21 1(^{st})</td>
<td>Te-</td>
<td>The introduction to this section seems to lacking a lot of</td>
<td>Need more detail added to the introduction of this</td>
<td>Refer to Type-20/21 WG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) MB = Member of M1 - affiliation  
\(^2\) Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>Annex D</td>
<td>Tables</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Minor information. Why have a data field (21.999) when really not conveying were derived biometrics are coming from?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>If an image is captured at 1000 ppi and put in a Type-14 record, and then the image is downsampled to 500 and put in a Type-4 record, do they have the same IDC? Are they considered to have 2 different dimensions (500ppiX500ppi image VS 1000ppi X 1000 ppi image)?</td>
<td>Clarify this type of case in the text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>IDCs are listed in 1.003 – not established</td>
<td>Change ’established’ to ’listed’</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Why “in addition”? The only purpose for the IDC was/is to link records together!</td>
<td>Delete the words ‘in addition’</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>Can a raw image and a <code>.wsq</code> image have the same IDC? Since WSQ is lossy, there will be a minimum of distortion and the features may not exactly line up between the 2 images?</td>
<td>Clarify this situation in the text</td>
<td>This would be the same IDC. I will put it in as an example. Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>These fields (&amp; 1.003)are unique to specific record types. Why are they included in the</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>Accept (Moved to 5.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1}\) MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

\(^{2}\) Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>The statement “The maximum number of records in a transaction is 255” is not true. The max number of UNIQUE IDCs is 255. But you can have multiple records with the same IDC. There has never been a maximum number records in a transaction. If you are going to establish one then it should be brought into the open at the meeting.</td>
<td>Remove text</td>
<td>Actually, upon closer examination of Field 1.003 in the 2007 version, the max number of record is 1000 (including Type-1) and the max number of IDCs is 99 ! This is because of the restriction on number of ASCII characters in the information items of Field 1.003. I will make appropriate changes to reflect both limits in the draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Footnote</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Isn’t “a potential ambiguity” ambiguous???</td>
<td>Revise wording</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2nd example</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>Why is a Type-21 included in this example. You seem to be implying that it is necessary for this scenario, when it may only be wanted by a particular agency such as DOD.</td>
<td>Remove reference to Type 21</td>
<td>Changed “a latent print search transaction that includes…” to “a latent print search transaction may include, in some circumstances…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>The statement “The IDCs are in sequential order in the transaction.” has never been a requirement</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>Reject. This is specifically stated in 2007 in 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>8.9.6.41</td>
<td>after 6th item</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>SWGFAST would like to have an additional entry in 9.353</td>
<td>1) For Field 9.353 Examiner Analysis Assessment (EAA), add an additional (7th) optional information item (Text, max</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
### Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>8.9.6.48</td>
<td>after 8th item</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>SWGFAST would like to add Complex comparison</td>
<td>For Field 9.362 Examiner Comparison Determination (ECD), add an additional (9th) optional information item (Text, max length=7): Complex comparison&lt;br&gt;For Field 9.362 Examiner Comparison Determination (ECD), add an additional (9th) optional information item (Text, max length=7):&lt;br&gt;<strong>Complex comparison</strong>&lt;br&gt;This information item is set to “COMPLEX” if the examiner determines that the comparison was complex as defined by SWGFAST [cite], based on the available quality and quantity of features, low specificity of features, significant distortion, or disagreement among examiners. Otherwise this information item is omitted.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **MB** = Member of M1 - affiliation<br>2. **Type of comment**: **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. **NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AABB</td>
<td>Page 26, Acronym AABB. The word ‘Blood’ is misspelled.</td>
<td>Recommend changing “Blod” to read “Blood”.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AABB</td>
<td>Page 26, Acronym AABB. Consistency. Period missing from end of definition. Most definitions have a period at the end.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Appendix F certified devices</td>
<td>Page 26, definition Appendix F certified devices. Consistency. Period missing from end of definition. Most definitions have a period at the end.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ASCLD</td>
<td>Page 26, Acronym ASCLD. Consistency. Period missing from end of definition. Most definitions have a period at the end.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>distal segment</td>
<td>Page 27, definition distal segment. Consistency. Period missing from end of definition. Most definitions have a period at the end.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>exchange schema</td>
<td>Page 27, exchange schema. The use of “itl” is not consistent in the definition.</td>
<td>Recommend changing the second use from “Itl” to read “itl”.</td>
<td>Rewrote the definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>exemplar</td>
<td>Page 28, definition exemplar. Consistency. Period missing from end of definition. Most definitions have a period at the end.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frankfurt horizon</td>
<td>Page 28, definition Frankfurt horizon. The definition should either refer to eye socket without defining which socket and making “ears” singular.</td>
<td>Minor. Recommend changing the definition to read “This is the plane determined by the lowest point of the eye socket and the tragion of the ear.”</td>
<td>Reject. This is the official definition – requiring three points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>INCITS</td>
<td>Page 30, acronym INCITS. Consistency. Period missing from end of definition. Most definitions have a period at the end.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 30, acronym ISO. Consistency. Period missing from end of definition. Most definitions have a period at the end.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IUPAC</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 30, acronym IUPAC. Consistency. Period missing from end of definition. Most definitions have a period at the end.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>JFIF</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 30, acronym JFIF. Consistency. Period missing from end of definition. Most definitions have a period at the end.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 36, first unmarked paragraph, line 5. Incorrect word.</td>
<td>Recommend changing the word “form” to read “from”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 38, Table 1, record identifier 7. A bracket is missing.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a closing bracket after the word “only”.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>5.2.3</td>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Page 39. Previous version of this document has been referenced. Once this document has been approved, previous versions will be obsolete. Instead of referring, this document must contain the information.</td>
<td>Major. Recommend including the information from ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2007 for Type 3 records to this document.</td>
<td>Reject. This record type should not be included in the standard. Will include better wording in the description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.</td>
<td>5.2.5</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Page 40. Previous version of this document has been referenced. Once this document has been approved, previous versions will be obsolete. Instead of referring, this document must contain the information.</td>
<td>Major. Recommend including the information from ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2007 for Type 5 records to this document.</td>
<td>Reject. This record type should not be included in the standard. Will include better wording in the description.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td>5.2.6</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Page 40. Previous version of this document has been referenced. Once this document has been approved, previous versions will be obsolete. Instead of referring, this document must contain the information.</td>
<td>Major. Recommend including the information from ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2007 for Type 6 records to this document.</td>
<td>Reject. This record type should not be included in the standard. Will include better wording in the description.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td>5.2.18</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Page 41. Reference missing from clause 3.</td>
<td>Minor. Recommend including ISO/IEC 19794-14 as a reference in clause 3</td>
<td>Can't do a full reference yet, since it is still in draft stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Page 44, ANS bullet. It is unclear what is meant by “Alphanumeric with extended and special characters”</td>
<td>Major. Define what is meant by “extended” and which special characters are included.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Page 45, character set 005 – 127. Character sets should be consistent in index description. If three digits are required, use three digits for the entries “0 – 4”.</td>
<td>Major. Recommend changing the character set to “5 – 127” in order to be consistent with the character set index for 0 – 4.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 47, third unmarked paragraph, second bullet, line 4. Closing bracket missing from example.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a bracket at the end of the example.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 50, second bullet (PVN), line 1. Closing bracket missing.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a bracket after the acronym “PVN”.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 52, GRT paragraph. Period missing from line 4.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period to the end of the last sentence.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 58, second unmarked paragraph. Period missing from line 3.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period to the end of the last sentence.</td>
<td>Partial Accept. Used a colon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 59, third unmarked paragraph (FVC). Period missing from line 3</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period to the end of the last sentence.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 59, fourth unmarked paragraph (LOS). Period missing from line 3.</td>
<td>Recommend adding a period to the end of the last sentence.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation  
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
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<table>
<thead>
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<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td>7.13.1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Page 64. Reference number incomplete.</td>
<td>Recommend changing the reference to read “ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2000”.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.</td>
<td>7.13.1.6 Note</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Page 64. Image capture requirements for mobile devices are unrealistic. Level 30 specifications are referenced. Army Soldiers using mobile devices will not be able to adhere to the level 30 requirements. Visual capture under field conditions will not meet the 18% gray and three point lighting requirements. In fact, how would a visual image taken with a mobile device check to ensure that there was 18% gray and proper lighting?</td>
<td>Major. Recommend that mobile device mugshots have requirements that more closely relate to level 20.</td>
<td>Agree clarifying language needed. Background is not part of the SAP 32 requirements. New wording for SAP 32 (and similar for 42 &amp; 52): The requirements for level 32 are based on those of level 30, but not fully inclusive of all of those requirements. For instance, relative centering error and 18% grayscale with appropriate lighting may not be realistic for a mobile application. Use of this SAP number indicates that the image was captured with a mobile device. See Table 9 for the complete requirements for SAP 32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.</td>
<td>p.39 5.2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>ge</td>
<td>This draft version of the AN – ITL-2011 standard indicates that the Type 4 record is being maintained for backward compatibility with older systems and that new users are encouraged to utilize record Type 14 to convey fingerprint images. Since the RCMP is reliant on type-4 images, may we request a potential target date for when NIST may decide to sunset the Type 4 record? Should the Type 4 record no longer be supported, how much advance notice should industry be provided?</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Suggested change in language to not imply possible deprecation. Remove references to it being for legacy systems only in the version 2.0 as a reference in clause 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation  
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial -- For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compelling.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>notice will be provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td>document. Remove sentence in Type 4 description stating “Since many older systems still use this record type, it is maintained for backward compatibility.” Replace with: Many systems still use this record type and it will remain an integral part of the standard.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167.</td>
<td>2nd Draft</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Previous versions of ANSI/NIST-ITL make use of Sections, not Clauses, except when referring to INCITS/ISO standard clauses. Will the community accept the switch from Sections to Clauses?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global search-and-replace ‘Clause’ with ‘Section’ – or – Explain the switch from Sections to Clauses</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
### Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169.</td>
<td>Annex B, Type-7 record</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Strike footnote references from:</td>
<td>Strike footnote references from:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.10.18 Field 10.019: Lighting artifacts / LAF</td>
<td>8.10.18 Field 10.019: Lighting artifacts / LAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.10.31 Field 10.033: Feature contours / FEC</td>
<td>8.10.31 Field 10.033: Feature contours / FEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.10.32 Field 10.038: Comment / CMT</td>
<td>8.10.32 Field 10.038: Comment / CMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.10.42 Field 10.995: Associated context / ASC</td>
<td>8.10.42 Field 10.995: Associated context / ASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.10.43 Field 10.996: Hash/ HAS</td>
<td>8.10.43 Field 10.996: Hash/ HAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.10.44 Field 10.997: Source representation / SOR</td>
<td>8.10.44 Field 10.997: Source representation / SOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.10.45 Field 10.998: Geographic sample acquisition location / GEO</td>
<td>8.10.45 Field 10.998: Geographic sample acquisition location / GEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.14.27 Field 14.031: Subject acquisition profile / SAP</td>
<td>8.14.27 Field 14.031: Subject acquisition profile / SAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.15.21 Field 15.995: Associated context / ASC</td>
<td>8.15.21 Field 15.995: Associated context / ASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.15.23 Field 15.997: Source representation / SOR</td>
<td>8.15.23 Field 15.997: Source representation / SOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.15.24 Field 15.998: Geographic sample acquisition location / GEO</td>
<td>8.15.24 Field 15.998: Geographic sample acquisition location / GEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.16.21 Field 16.995: Associated context / ASC</td>
<td>8.16.21 Field 16.995: Associated context / ASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general, te = technical, ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
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<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.16.23 Field 16.997: Source representation / SOR</td>
<td>8.16.23 Field 16.997: Source representation / SOR</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Missing commas after “agencies” and “organizations”</td>
<td>Insert commas after “agencies” and “organizations”: “Law enforcement and related criminal justice agencies, as well as identity management organizations, procure …”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170.</td>
<td>1st sentence</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>“This includes scars, marks, tattoos …”</td>
<td>Define “This” –or– Replace “This” with “These identifying characteristics”</td>
<td>Replace with “These identifying characteristics”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>2nd par, last sentence</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Missing comma after “In 2009”</td>
<td>Insert comma:</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 – affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
### Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</td>
<td>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</td>
<td>Type of comment</td>
<td>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</td>
<td>Proposed change by the MB</td>
<td>Proposed Editors Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>2nd Draft 3</td>
<td>Normative References</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Missing Terms and definitions from Resolution Text Working Group output: class resolution The value of scanning resolution used to name (or identify) a class of scanners, where the native scanning resolution is within a specified variance around that value. Example: A scanner is referred to as &quot;500 ppi&quot; (class resolution) if the native scanning resolution is within 1% (5 ppi). variance The allowable range of deviation from the nominal resolution, symmetric around the nominal resolution. For PIV single fingerprint scanners in the class resolution of 500 ppi, the variance is 2%. For all scanners other than PIV, the variance is 1%.</td>
<td>Insert Terms and definitions: class resolution The value of scanning resolution used to name (or identify) a class of scanners, where the native scanning resolution is within a specified variance around that value. Example: A scanner is referred to as &quot;500 ppi&quot; (class resolution) if the native scanning resolution is within 1% (5 ppi). variance The allowable range of deviation from the nominal resolution, symmetric around the nominal resolution. For PIV single fingerprint scanners in the class resolution of 500 ppi, the variance is 2%. For all scanners other than PIV, the variance is 1%.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.</td>
<td>2nd Draft 4</td>
<td>Terms and definitions</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>After lots of discussion and debate, the term proposed by the Resolution Text Working Group was ‘nominal resolution’, not ‘nominal transmitting resolution’. I have a general concern that what may seem like a trivial editorial change in the name of a term may have larger ramifications for the meaning and use of this term with respect to other ‘resolution’ terms.</td>
<td>Verify with Margaret Lepley, Rick Lazarick, and Mike McCabe that they are happy with this change in term and that it has no effect on the meaning or use of this term with respect to other ‘resolution’ terms.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation  
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
### Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>2nd Draft 4</td>
<td>Terms and definitions</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Missing Terms and definitions from Type-20 Working Group: Context data provides circumstances and conditions relevant to Type-20 or other biometric type records Derived representation biometric type record derived from a Type-20 record or a Type-20 record derived from one (or more) Type-20 records that itself has a derived representation in a biometric type record Source representation source of biometric type record(s) or one (or more) Type-20 records</td>
<td>Insert Terms and definitions: Context data provides circumstances and conditions relevant to Type-20 or other biometric type records Derived representation biometric type record derived from a Type-20 record or a Type-20 record derived from one (or more) Type-20 records that itself has a derived representation in a biometric type record Source representation source of biometric type record(s) or one (or more) Type-20 records</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Missing closing parenthesis at end of Record Identifier 7</td>
<td>Insert closing parenthesis: User-defined image (for existing systems only)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179.</td>
<td>2nd Draft 5.2.13</td>
<td>Type-13 records</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Missing Resolution Text Working Group recommendation: In all cases, the scanning resolution for latent images shall be 39.37 pppm (1000 ppi). The variable-resolution latent image data contained in the Type-13 record shall be uncompressed or may be the output from a lossless compression algorithm. There is no limit to the number of latent records that may be present in a transaction.</td>
<td>Insert text: In all cases, the scanning resolution for latent images shall be 39.37 pppm (1000 ppi). The variable-resolution latent image data contained in the Type-13 record shall be uncompressed or may be the output from a lossless compression algorithm. There is no limit to the number of latent records that may be present in a transaction.</td>
<td>Partial accept. There is a limit to the number of latent records, since there is a limit to the total number of records in a transaction. Revised to “The number of latent records in a transaction is only constrained by the...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180. 2nd Draft 5.2.14</td>
<td>Missing Resolution Text Working Group recommendation: The scanning resolution is not specified for this record type. While the Type-14 record may be used for the exchange of 19.69 ppmm (500 ppi) images, it is strongly recommended that the scanning resolution for fingerprint images be 39.37 ppmm (1000 ppi). It should be noted that as the resolution is increased, more detailed ridge and structure information becomes available in the fingerprint image. However, in all cases the scanning resolution used to capture a fingerprint image shall be at least as great as the minimum scanning resolution of 19.69 ppmm (500 ppi). The variable-resolution fingerprint image data contained in the Type-14 record may be in a compressed form. In major case prints, there may be up to 78 images: each of the ten fingers may contain a rolled tip image and either one entire joint image or one full finger rolled image and left, center, and right full finger plain impressions.</td>
<td>Insert text: The scanning resolution is not specified for this record type. While the Type-14 record may be used for the exchange of 19.69 ppmm (500 ppi) images, it is strongly recommended that the scanning resolution for fingerprint images be 39.37 ppmm (1000 ppi). It should be noted that as the resolution is increased, more detailed ridge and structure information becomes available in the fingerprint image. However, in all cases the scanning resolution used to capture a fingerprint image shall be at least as great as the minimum scanning resolution of 19.69 ppmm (500 ppi). The variable-resolution fingerprint image data contained in the Type-14 record may be in a compressed form. In major case prints, there may be up to 78 images: each of the ten fingers may contain a rolled tip image and either one entire joint image or one full finger rolled image and left, center, and right full finger plain impressions.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181. 2nd Draft 5.2.15</td>
<td>Missing Resolution Text Working Group recommendation: The scanning resolution is not specified for this record type. While the Type-15 record may be used for the exchange of 19.69 ppmm (500 ppi) images, it is strongly recommended that the minimum scanning resolution for palmprint images be 39.37 ppmm (1000 ppi). It should be noted that as the resolution is increased, more detailed ridge and structure information becomes available in the image. However, in all cases the scanning resolution used to capture a palmprint image shall be at least as great as the minimum scanning resolution of 19.69 ppmm (500 ppi). The variable-resolution palmprint image data contained in the Type-15 record may be in a compressed form. In major case prints, there may be up to 78 images: each of the ten fingers may contain a rolled tip image and either one entire joint image or one full finger rolled image and left, center, and right full finger plain impressions.</td>
<td>Insert text: The scanning resolution is not specified for this record type. While the Type-15 record may be used for the exchange of 19.69 ppmm (500 ppi) images, it is strongly recommended that the minimum scanning resolution for palmprint images be 39.37 ppmm (1000 ppi). It should be noted that as the resolution is increased, more detailed ridge and structure information becomes available in the image. However, in all cases the scanning resolution used to capture a palmprint image shall be at least as great as the minimum scanning resolution of 19.69 ppmm (500 ppi). The variable-resolution palmprint image data contained in the Type-15 record may be in a compressed form. In major case prints, there may be up to 78 images: each of the ten fingers may contain a rolled tip image and either one entire joint image or one full finger rolled image and left, center, and right full finger plain impressions.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
### Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment2</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>182.</td>
<td>2nd Draft 5.2.19</td>
<td>Type-19 records</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Missing Resolution Text Working Group recommendation: While the Type-19 record may be used for the exchange of 19.69 ppm (500 ppi) images, it is strongly recommended that the scanning resolution for plantar images be 39.37 ppm (1000 ppi). It should be noted that as the resolution is increased, more detailed ridge and structure information becomes available in the image. However, in all cases the scanning resolution used to capture a plantar image shall be at least as great as the minimum scanning resolution of 19.69 ppm (500 ppi). The variable-resolution plantar image data contained in the Type-19 record may be in a compressed form.</td>
<td>Insert text: While the Type-19 record may be used for the exchange of 19.69 ppm (500 ppi) images, it is strongly recommended that the scanning resolution for plantar images be 39.37 ppm (1000 ppi). It should be noted that as the resolution is increased, more detailed ridge and structure information becomes available in the image. However, in all cases the scanning resolution used to capture a plantar image shall be at least as great as the minimum scanning resolution of 19.69 ppm (500 ppi). The variable-resolution plantar image data contained in the Type-19 record may be in a compressed form.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183.</td>
<td>5.2.20</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Unclear text: The Type-20 record contains source representations employed to create representation used in another record. Typically, one source Type-20 representation is used to generate one or more representations for use in other record types.</td>
<td>Replace 1st sentence with: The Type-20 record contains the source representation(s) from which other Record Types were derived. Typically, one Type-20 source representation is used to generate one or more representations for use in other record types.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.</td>
<td>5.2.20</td>
<td>Para 1, last sentence</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Unclear text and use of the word ‘instance’ instead of ‘record’: In some cases, several Type-20 instances may each</td>
<td>Replace last sentence with: In some cases, multiple Type-20 records may be</td>
<td>Partial accept. Placed ‘20’ between ‘Type’ and Record’ at the end of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE: Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
### Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>(2) Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>(3) Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>(4) Type of Comment (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>(5) Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>(6) Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>(7) Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185. 5.2.20 Bullet list, 2nd bullet ed</td>
<td>Missing word ‘separate’: From a high-resolution color image in a Type-20 record, two latent fingerprint images are segmented, rescaled and grayscaled for storage in Type-13 records</td>
<td>Processed to derive a single Type Record.</td>
<td>Insert word ‘separate’: From a high-resolution color image in a Type-20 record, two latent fingerprint images are segmented, rescaled and grayscaled for storage in separate Type-13 records</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>186. 5.3 Header 1st para ed</td>
<td>Header (backwards) and text (backward) are inconsistent. Use “backward compatibility” or “backwards compatibility” consistently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept Also changed ‘backwards’ to ‘backward’ in Annex C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187. 5.3 2nd para ed</td>
<td>Missing period before closing parenthesis</td>
<td>Insert period: (In Traditional encoding, they are ‘binary’ data with a fixed structure.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>188. 5.3 Last para ed</td>
<td>“This is described in Annex C.”</td>
<td>Define “This” –or– Replace “NIEM-conformant XML encoding has inherent backwards compatibility issues due to the need to develop new schemas. This is described in Annex C.” With “NIEM-conformant XML encoding, described in Annex C, has inherent backwards compatibility issues due to the need to develop new schemas.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial Accept. For consistency, stated “See Annex C … for details” Since this type of statement is used elsewhere in the standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>189. 5.4 Bullet list ed</td>
<td>Missing word numeric in “Alphabetic and 1 2 3 …”</td>
<td>Replace: AN: Alphabetic and 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0. With: AN: Alphabetic and Numeric 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept Also after 0 put ‘and . (the period)” to clarify the period is intentionally included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190. 5.5 1st para ed</td>
<td>Missing comma after “Clause 5.1”</td>
<td>Insert comma: “As stated in Clause 5.1, each transaction …”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phrase has been removed due to other editing in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>191.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2(^{nd}) para</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Extra comma after “UTF-8”</td>
<td>Remove comma: “As noted in Annex C, UTF-8 is the preferred …”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.</td>
<td>2(^{nd}) Draft 6 8.1 8.1.13</td>
<td>Last para Table 21</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>In Section 6, Implementation domain refers to “three more optional pairs of information items”, but does not explain what the other information item is in the pair. In Section 8.1, Table 21 shows three information items DNM, DVN, and ONM. In Section 8.1.13, Field 1.013 Domain name/DOM states “it shall consist of one or two information items”, but describes three information items DNM, DVN, and ONI.</td>
<td>In Section 6, clarify the meaning and use of domain name and version. Resolve inconsistencies with respect to number, names, and meaning of information items between Section 6, Section 8.1 (Table 21), and Section 8.1.13.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
implementation domain to which the transaction conforms. Additional implementation domains may be used when a transmission is conformant with more than one domain specification, such as NORAM, and Texas DPS (Department of Public Safety). The information items for the first domain that is specified are described below. See Table 22 for the information item names for the additional domain references. The format of each set is the same as for the first domain that is specified. (See Section 6 for more information about the implementation domain).

193. 7  Ge Recommend including field names (ID) with field numbers, so the reader understands to what is being referred without having to look it up elsewhere in the standard. Include field names (ID) with field numbers, so the reader understands to what is being referred without having to look it up elsewhere in the standard. This is the general practice throughout the document. In looking at this section, the field ID names were included, so I am not sure what to change.

194. 7.2 Para 2 ed Incorrect cross reference: IDC references are established in Type-1 Field 1.014. Correct cross reference: IDC references are established in Type-1 Field. Accept

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>195.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Para 3</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Edit for clarity and correctness. IDCs link together records that pertain to different representations of the same biometric, e.g., Type-9 minutiae are a different representation of the fingerprint contained in a Type-13 latent image.</td>
<td>Replace: Two or more records shall share a single IDC solely to identify and link together records that pertain to the same captured representation of a biometric trait. With: Two or more records shall share a single IDC solely to identify and link together records that pertain to different representations of the same biometric trait.</td>
<td>Accept 01/25/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Bullet list, 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; bullet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing comma after i.e.</td>
<td>Insert comma: “(i.e., a feature at …)”</td>
<td>Accept 01/25/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; bullet list, 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; bullet</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>CJIS does not currently accept Type-8 records.</td>
<td>Remove reference to Type-8 signature records (IDCs 14-16)</td>
<td>Accept 01/25/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; para</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>SRN used as an acronym before it is defined.</td>
<td>Expand first use of SRN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 <sup>MB</sup> = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 <sup>Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.</sup>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>199.</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Bullet list, 2nd bullet</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Capitalization error: “IT specifies …”</td>
<td>Correct capitalization: “It specifies …”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Bullet list, 2nd bullet</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Inconsistent capitalization</td>
<td>Replace: Segment Position / SEG With: Segment position / SEG</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Bullet list, 2nd bullet</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>What is the purpose of referring to Reference type value/RTV?</td>
<td>Explain reference to RTV or strike.</td>
<td>Accept Stricken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.</td>
<td>7.3.1</td>
<td>Last para</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>“The SOR does not appear in certain record types.”</td>
<td>Explain which records and why (not).</td>
<td>Accept Added sentence: Record Type-18 (DNA) does not contain a field xx.997. Record Type-98 does not contain this field since that is not a biometric data record type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.</td>
<td>7.3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>It is not clear how a Reference type value denotes a segment of a source, or how segments are defined in, for example, a group photo. If a Type-10 Record has an SOR of SRN=1 and RTV=3, what does that mean?</td>
<td>Please clarify the meaning and use of RTV.</td>
<td>Accept This section has been rewritten to respond to other comments. It now reads: The second information item in Field xx.997 is optional. It is the reference segment position / RSP. It contains the index to a particular set of segmentation coordinates of the source representation (There may be more than one segment, such as from an audio/visual recording, with different frames yielding input for separate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment²</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>biometric data record instances in the same transaction). This same segmentation index appears in Record Type-20 as the <strong>reference type value</strong> / RTV in <strong>Field 20.016: Segments</strong> / SEG. There may be up to 99 segments listed in <strong>Field 20.016</strong>, but only the segment used to produce the biometric data record is contained in <strong>Field xx.997</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

204. 7.3.2 | Last sentence | ed | Incomplete sentence: "It appears as an information item in Field 20.016 for in a record with the appropriate SRN." | Complete sentence |

205. 7.4 | heading | ed | Missing acronym: Associated context | Insert acronym: Associated context/ASC | Accept |

206. 7.4 | 1st para | ed | ACN is used as an acronym before it is defined. | Expand first use of ACN. | This section has been rewritten to respond to other comments. The acronym no longer appears here. |

207. 7.4 | 1st para | ed | Incomplete sentence: **This field and is used** when the representation transmitted in this record is linked to associated context data. | Complete sentence | This section has been rewritten to respond to other comments. |

208. 7.4.1 | Bullet list, 2nd bullet | ed | "It specifies the reference to the segmentation coordinates (Field 21.016 Segment Position / SEG) of the associated context data that is represented in this record" | **Reword:** "This information item contains the Associated segment position/ASP." | This section was changed as was 7.3.2. See comment 203 |

---

1 **MB** = Member of M1 - affiliation

2 **Type of comment**: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. **NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209.</td>
<td>7.4.1</td>
<td>Last para ed</td>
<td>The ASC does not appear in certain record types.</td>
<td>Explain which records and why (not).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept. Changed to: New to this version of the standard, optional field xx.995 is contained in biometric data sample Record Types 10 and above that may have instances of Record Type-21 linked to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210.</td>
<td>7.4.2</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Please explain how ASP is different from RTV. The wording seems to be the same.</td>
<td>Please explain how ASP is different from RTV.</td>
<td>New wording in response to other comments: The second information item in Field xx.995 is optional. It is the associated segment position / ASP. It contains the index to a particular set of segmentation coordinates of the source representation (There may be more than one segment, such as from an audio / visual recording, with different frames yielding input for separate biometric data record instances in the same transaction). This same segmentation index appears in Record Type-21 as the reference type value / RTV in Field 21.016: Segments / SEG. There may be up to 99 segments listed in Field 21.016, but only the relevant segment is contained in Field xx.995.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

\(^2\) Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Explain why Field xx.902 does not apply to Type-18. Dispose of this comment with Error! Reference source not found. Error! Reference source not found. Error! Reference source not found.</td>
<td>Explain why Field xx.902 does not apply to Type-18. Dispose of this comment with Error! Reference source not found. Error! Reference source not found. Error! Reference source not found.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Bullet list, 1(^{st}) bullet</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>To what is this GMT date and time referring? When the annotation was written? When the process occurred?</td>
<td>Clarify meaning and use of GMT date and time information item.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Bullet list, 2(^{nd}) bullet</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Missing closing parenthesis</td>
<td>Insert closing parenthesis: (Processing algorithm name/version / PNV)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Bullet list, Last bullet</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Use of 'image' instead of 'sample': “… procedure applied to the image …”</td>
<td>Replace 'image' with 'sample': “… procedure applied to the sample …”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Previous fields have information items formatted as bullets.</td>
<td>Reformat information items as bullets for consistency with other fields.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>LTD and LGD are used as acronyms before they are defined.</td>
<td>Expand first uses of LTD and LGD.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Missing comma after “60-80” and incorrect subject-verb agreement: Note that for codes 1-40 and 60-80 the table specify MAXIMUM width and height</td>
<td>Insert comma and change ‘specify’ to ‘specifies’: &quot;Note that for codes 1-40 and 60-80, the table specifies MAXIMUM width and height&quot;</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>Footnote 34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Misspellings: Friction Ridge Genralized</td>
<td>Correct spellings: Friction Ridge Generalized</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Previous field have information items formatted as bullets.</td>
<td>Reformat information items as bullets for consistency with other fields.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Previous field have information items formatted as bullets.</td>
<td>Reformat information items as bullets for consistency with other fields.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>Para 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Missing periods</td>
<td>Insert periods at the end of para 2, 3, 4.</td>
<td>There are no paragraphs 2 3 and 4 in any version of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>222.</td>
<td>7.13.1.10</td>
<td>Heading 1st para</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Heading states ‘Level 52’, but text states ‘Level 42’.</td>
<td>Replace “Level 42” with “Level 52”.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223.</td>
<td>2nd Draft 7.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>ge</td>
<td>Text inconsistent mixes use of pppm (ppi) and ppi (ppmm), e.g. 7.14.2, 2nd para. There are fewer instances of ppi (ppmm); recommend consolidating on usage from the Resolution Text Working Group output and using only pppm (ppi).</td>
<td>Replace instances of ppi (ppmm) with pppm (ppi).</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.</td>
<td>7.15.5</td>
<td>1st para</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Recommend using semi colons instead of commas for separators for better readability: In Clause 7.15, YYYY designates the four-digit year, MM designates the month (01 through 12), DD represents the day of the month (01 through 31), hh represents the hour (01 through 24), mm represents the minute (1 through 59), and ss represents the seconds (1 through 59).</td>
<td>Replace commas with semi colons: In Clause 7.15, YYYY designates the four-digit year; MM designates the month (01 through 12); DD represents the day of the month (01 through 31); hh represents the hour (01 through 24); mm represents the minute (1 through 59); and ss represents the seconds (1 through 59).</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>Last para</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Incorrect preposition: “…are comprised on one information item.”</td>
<td>Replace ‘on’ with ‘of’: “… are comprised of one information item.”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227.</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td>What field number is this? Nothing is said about where this information is stored.</td>
<td>Clarify meaning and use of Device monitoring mode/DMM.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is unclear whether any of these three information items are replacing NFIQ or AQM. What field numbers are they? In what records will they appear? Why are these here? To what field do these information items belong?</td>
<td>Clarify meaning and use of Sample quality.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation  
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MB</strong></td>
<td><strong>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type of comment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed change by the MB</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Editors Disposition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229.</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>2nd para</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>1st sentence ends with &quot;by at least 8-bit pixels.&quot; 2nd sentence states, &quot;by eight or more bits.&quot; Isn’t this redundant?</td>
<td>Remove ambiguity.</td>
<td>Reject. This sentence describes monochrome images. The sentence following describes color images.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230.</td>
<td>7.20.4</td>
<td>Bullet list</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Inconsistent capitalization: 1st bullet – file suffix type/FST 2nd bullet – special encoding and decoding specifications/SCS</td>
<td>Use consistent capitalization: 1st bullet – File suffix type/FST 2nd bullet – Special encoding and decoding specifications/SCS</td>
<td>Reject. Throughout the document information items should not be capitalized. Fields begin with a capital letter. That is the difference as to why these are not capitalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231.</td>
<td>7.20.4</td>
<td>te</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is FST optional or mandatory? What are the field names (IDs) for 20.015 and 21.015?</td>
<td>Clarify meaning and use of FST, 20.015 and 21.015.</td>
<td>Partial Accept. Reference added to indicate that FST is mandatory. Editor believes that explanation is clear about the use of these fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.</td>
<td>7.21.2</td>
<td>2nd para</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Missing period at the end of the 2nd para.</td>
<td>Insert period at the end of the 2nd para.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234.</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td></td>
<td>What field number is this? Nothing is said about where this information is stored.</td>
<td>Clarify meaning, use and acronym of Comment.</td>
<td>Partial Accept. Added list of fields. Editor does not believe more explanation of Comment is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235.</td>
<td>2nd Draft 8.1.3</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject-verb agreement: Each of the remaining subfields of Field 1.003</td>
<td>Replace ‘correspond’ with ‘corresponds’: Each of the remaining subfields of Field 1.003 Transaction content / CNT corresponds</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>8.1.12</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Missing Resolution Text Working Group recommendation: For Type-4 images transmitted at a native scan resolution beyond 510 ppi, this field shall be set to 00.00.</td>
<td>Insert recommendation as last paragraph of 8.1.12: For Type-4 images transmitted at a native scan resolution beyond 510 ppi, this field shall be set to 00.00.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>8.18 Table 76</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>For consistency with the other record types, the Type-18 record should contain Field 18.902 Annotated information/ANN and Field 18.997 Source representation/SOR. If a Type-18 Record may contain an electropherogram image and data, it also should allow for the possibility that this image was derived from a source representation in a Type-20 record (18.997), any operations to prepare it (18.902) for inclusion in the Type-18 record.</td>
<td>Insert Field 18.902 Annotated information and Field 18.997 Source representation/SOR – or – Insert text explaining why Type-18 is inconsistent with the other Type Records.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>8.9.6 Table 26</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Insert new Field 9.303 Feature set profile/FSP:</td>
<td>Insert new Field 9.303 Feature set profile/FSP:</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
## Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This optional numeric field is used to indicate an EFS Profile, which defines the specific set of EFS fields incorporated in this ANSI/NIST file. Profiles can be incorporated by reference into the definition of transactions: this decoupling of feature sets from transactions enables different transactions to share a common feature set, aiding in interoperability. If a given ANSI/NIST file is compliant with two or more profiles, the code for each profile is entered in a separate subfield. The valid values of Field 9.303 Feature Set Profile (FSP) are maintained by NIST and are available at <a href="http://www.nist.gov/itl/iad/ig/ansi_standard.cfm">http://www.nist.gov/itl/iad/ig/ansi_standard.cfm</a>. Table insertion text follows this comment table. Ensure document consistency, i.e. Annex B, Annex C, and Annex F, with insertion of new Field 9.303 Feature set profile/FSP.</td>
<td>This optional numeric field is used to indicate an EFS Profile, which defines the specific set of EFS fields incorporated in this ANSI/NIST file. Profiles can be incorporated by reference into the definition of transactions: this decoupling of feature sets from transactions enables different transactions to share a common feature set, aiding in interoperability. If a given ANSI/NIST file is compliant with two or more profiles, the code for each profile is entered in a separate subfield. The valid values of Field 9.303 Feature Set Profile (FSP) are maintained by NIST and are available at <a href="http://www.nist.gov/itl/iad/ig/ansi_standard.cfm">http://www.nist.gov/itl/iad/ig/ansi_standard.cfm</a>. Table insertion text follows this comment table. Ensure document consistency, i.e. Annex B, Annex C, and Annex F, with insertion of new Field 9.303 Feature set profile/FSP.</td>
<td>Changes 'file' to 'transaction' and deleted 'maintained by NIST'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>1st sentence ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unclear text and missing period at the end of the 1st sentence: The Type-20 record contains source representations employed to create representation used in another record</td>
<td>Replace 1st sentence with: The Type-20 record contains the source representation(s) from which other Record Types were derived.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>Table 83 te</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allow Field 20.014 Acquisition source to have multiple occurrences, e.g., Min=1 and Max =9.</td>
<td>Change Max Occurrence Count for Field 20.014 Acquisition source from 1 to 9.</td>
<td>Accept. But need to put in a subfield to do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>2nd Draft 8.21</td>
<td>Table 86 te</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing Field 21.995</td>
<td>Insert Field 21.995 Reserved for future use/RSV</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>2nd Draft Annex B</td>
<td>Encoding for specific record types Type-1 record te</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why is Texas DPS the default for Domain Version Number? No offense to Texas DPS or Mike Lesko, but strike Texas DPS from the default for Field 1.013.</td>
<td>Strike Texas DPS from the default for Field 1.013.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
## Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>243. Annex B</td>
<td>Encoding for specific record types Type-1 record</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Insert cross reference for Field 1.013 Domain name/DOM.</td>
<td>Insert cross reference for Field 1.013 Domain name/DOM.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>244. Annex B</td>
<td>Encoding for specific record types Type-9 record</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Missing Traditional Encoding Working Group recommendation: For Field 9.006, if the exact finger, palm or plantar position cannot be determined, multiple positions may be entered, separated by the &quot;RS&quot; character. When it is not possible to identify uniquely the fingerprint class, reference fingerprint classes may be used and shall be separated by the &quot;RS&quot; character. In Field 9.008, the &quot;RS&quot; separator shall separate multiple occurrences of core positions. In Field 9.009, the &quot;RS&quot; separator shall separate multiple occurrences of delta positions. All information items in Field 9.012 shall be separated from the subsequent items by the &quot;US&quot; character. (Note that x, y and theta is considered to be a single item, not three items). If the quality measure is not available but the type and/or ridge count data is present, then a &quot;US&quot; separation character shall be included. If the minutia type information is not available for this minutia but ridge count data is present, then a &quot;US&quot; information separator must be included. The fifth information item is optional ridge count data. It shall be formatted as a series of information items, each consisting of a minutia number and a ridge count. This information shall be conveyed by listing the identity (index number) of the distant minutia followed by a comma, and the ridge count to that minutia. The &quot;US&quot; character shall be used to separate these information items. These information items shall be repeated as many times as required for each minutia (subfield). A Record separator character &quot;RS&quot; shall be used at the end of the Record.</td>
<td>Add footnote explaining divergence from ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2007 encoding -- or -- Insert text: For Field 9.006, if the exact finger, palm or plantar position cannot be determined, multiple positions may be entered, separated by the &quot;RS&quot; character. When it is not possible to identify uniquely the fingerprint class, reference fingerprint classes may be used and shall be separated by the &quot;RS&quot; character. In Field 9.008, the &quot;RS&quot; separator shall separate multiple occurrences of core positions. In Field 9.009, the &quot;RS&quot; separator shall separate multiple occurrences of delta positions. All information items in Field 9.012 shall be separated from the subsequent items by the &quot;US&quot; character. (Note that x, y and theta is considered to be a single item, not three items). If the quality measure is not available but the type and/or ridge count data is present, then a &quot;US&quot; separation character shall be included. If the minutia type information is not available for this minutia but ridge count data is present, then a &quot;US&quot; information separator must be included. The fifth information item is optional ridge count data. It shall be formatted as a series of information items, each consisting of a minutia number and a ridge count. This information shall be conveyed by listing the identity (index number) of the distant minutia followed by a comma, and the ridge count to that minutia. The &quot;US&quot; character shall be used to separate these information items. These information items shall be repeated as many times as required for each minutia (subfield). A Record separator character &quot;RS&quot; shall be used at the end of the Record.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
### Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 245. | 2nd Draft Annex B Types-14 through 99 record te | Insert text for Field 14.025: Alternate finger segment position(s) / ASEG: This field shall consist of one to four subfields. Each subfield shall consist of a finger number between 1 and 10, the total number of vertices of the polygon encompassing the finger, and the set of consecutive vertices. Each vertex shall be represented as horizontal and vertical pixel offsets relative to the origin positioned in the upper left corner of the image. The horizontal offsets (X) are the pixel counts to the right, and the vertical offsets (Y) are the pixel counts down from the origin. A minimum of three points is required to describe a finger location. A "US" character shall be used to separate the finger number, the number of vertices, each X coordinate, and each Y coordinate. Subfields representing each finger are delimited by the "RS" separator character. | Insert text for Field 14.025: Alternate finger segment position(s) / ASEG: This field shall consist of one to four subfields. Each subfield shall consist of a finger number between 1 and 10, the total number of vertices of the polygon encompassing the finger, and the set of consecutive vertices. Each vertex shall be represented as horizontal and vertical pixel offsets relative to the origin positioned in the upper left corner of the image. The horizontal offsets (X) are the pixel counts to the right, and the vertical offsets (Y) are the pixel counts down from the origin. A minimum of three points is required to describe a finger location. A "US" character shall be used to separate the finger number, the number of vertices, each X coordinate, and each Y coordinate. Subfields representing each finger are delimited by the "RS" separator character. | Accept | Added references for the new codes for 6th fingers |
| 246. | 2nd Draft Annex B Types-14 through 99 record te | Insert text for Field 19.018: Friction ridge - plantar segment position(s) / FSP: This field shall consist of one to four subfields. Each subfield shall consist of a planar number between 1 and 10, the total number of vertices of the polygon encompassing the planar, and the set of consecutive vertices. Each vertex shall be represented as horizontal and vertical pixel offsets relative to the origin positioned in traditional format differently than Field 14.025: Alternate finger segment position(s) / ASEG – or – Insert text for Field 19.018: Friction ridge - plantar segment position(s) / FSP: This field shall consist of one to four subfields. | Explain why Field 19.018: Friction ridge - plantar segment position(s) / FSP 9.018 is encoded in traditional format differently than Field 14.025: Alternate finger segment position(s) / ASEG – or – Insert text for Field 19.018: Friction ridge - plantar segment position(s) / FSP: This field shall consist of one to four subfields. | Accept | Used supplied text |

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
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<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</td>
<td>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</td>
<td>Type of comment</td>
<td>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</td>
<td>Proposed change by the MB</td>
<td>Proposed Editors Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247.</td>
<td>2nd Draft Annex B</td>
<td>ge</td>
<td>Elsewhere in the Draft there are placeholders for Type-11 and Type-12. Type-11 Voice data This record type is reserved for future use. Type-12 Dental record data This record type is reserved for future use.</td>
<td>Insert placeholders: Type-11 Voice data This record type is reserved for future use. Type-12 Dental record data This record type is reserved for future use.</td>
<td>Denoted in the table for Logical record types and added sections.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.</td>
<td>2nd Draft Annex C</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Missing page break</td>
<td>Insert page break just before Annex C</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249.</td>
<td>2nd Draft Annex B, C, E</td>
<td>Headings</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Instead of relying on indentation to guide the reader, consider adding section numbers to improve readability.</td>
<td>Add section numbers to Annexes</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.</td>
<td>2nd Draft Annex E</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>The Introduction states: “These clauses can be categorized into four types of requirements: digital, photographic, subject and scene, and data handling.” This does not include the 5th heading on page 426 of FORMAT REQUIREMENTS (SAP LEVELS 40 AND ABOVE) to a subheading under DATA HANDLING REQUIREMENTS – or – Replace: These clauses can be categorized into four types</td>
<td>Demote FORMAT REQUIREMENTS (SAP LEVELS 40 AND ABOVE) to a subheading under DATA HANDLING REQUIREMENTS – or – Replace: These clauses can be categorized into four types</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment2</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2nd Draft Annex E</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The requirement for non-frontal poses is too important to be relegated to a footnote. For non-frontal pose (SAP levels 40 and above), the subject shall satisfy these conditions when the head is rotated about an axis though the head and torso from the current pose back to center (zero angles) pose.</td>
<td>Delete footnote and insert text just before the heading for the &quot;Head and Shoulders&quot; photo composition: For non-frontal pose (SAP levels 40 and above), the subject shall satisfy these conditions when the head is rotated about an axis though the head and torso from the current pose back to center (zero angles) pose.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251.</td>
<td>2nd Draft Annex E</td>
<td>&quot;Head and Shoulders&quot; photo composition</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Missing Face Image Capture Best Practices Working Group recommendation: For other poses, the composition shall be rotated about an imaginary axis extending from the top of the head though the base of the neck.</td>
<td>Insert text at the end of the 1st paragraph just before the bullet list: For other poses, the composition shall be rotated about an imaginary axis extending from the top of the head though the base of the neck.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252.</td>
<td>2nd Draft Annex E</td>
<td>SUBJECT &amp; SCENE REQUIREMENTS Hair</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Between 1st and 2nd Draft SAP Level restriction was dropped: SAP Levels 40 and above: If hair covers the ears, then when possible, two photographs shall be captured – one with hair in its normal state, and one with hair pulled back behind the ears.</td>
<td>Reinsert SAP Level restriction – or – Add footnote explaining the need for the additional constraint on SAP Levels below 40</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254.</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>Table 69 Type-14 record layout</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Pg 248, field 14.021, the first item is described as FGP finger position number. Should be renamed to either “friction ridge generalized position / FGP” or “Friction Ridge Code / FRC” to be consistent with the rest of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>255.</td>
<td>8.14.20</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Pg 256, field 14.021, the first item is described as “Finger position number / FGP”. Should be renamed to either “friction ridge generalized position / FGP” or “Friction Ridge Code / FRC” to be consistent with the rest of the document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>Table 69, Type-14 record layout</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Pg 246, field 14.013 has mnemonic FPP and is named FRICITION RIDGE POSSIBLE POSITION; however, elsewhere in document it is FGP and named Friction ridge generalized position. (8.14.13 Field 14.013: Friction ridge generalized position / FGP) Both mnemonic and name should be renamed in table 69 appropriately and Value Constraints column should reference Table 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257.</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>Table 69, Type-14 record layout</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Pg 247, field 14.018, the first item is FGP finger number; however the FGP mnemonic means Friction Ridge Generalized Position elsewhere in the document. Should be renamed “friction ridge generalized position” or mnemonic/name changed to FRC Friction Ridge Code. Also, Value Constraints column should reference Table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.</td>
<td>8.14.18</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Pg 256, Field 14.018, the first item is described as “Finger number / FGP. Should be renamed to either “friction ridge generalized position / FGP” or “Friction Ridge Code / FRC” to be consistent with the rest of the document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259.</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>Table 69, Type-14 record</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Pg 248, field 14.021, the first item is described as FGP finger position number. Should be renamed to either “friction ridge generalized position / FGP” or “Friction ridge generalized position / FGP”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

2 Type of comment: ge = general, te = technical, ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
## Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.</td>
<td>8.14.20</td>
<td>layout</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Ridge Code / FRC&quot; to be consistent with the rest of the document. Also, Value Constraints column should reference Table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261.</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>Table 69 Type-14 record layout</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Pg 248, field 14.022, the first item is described as FGP finger number. Should be renamed to either “friction ridge generalized position / FGP” or “Friction Ridge Code / FRC” to be consistent with the rest of the document. Also, Value Constraints column should reference Table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>Table 69 Type-14 record layout</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Pg 249, field 14.023, the first item is described as FGP finger number. Should be renamed to either “friction ridge generalized position / FGP” or “Friction Ridge Code / FRC” to be consistent with the rest of the document. Also, Value Constraints column should reference Table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265.</td>
<td>8.14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Pg 258, Field 14.024, the first item is described as Finger number / FGP. Should be renamed to be Friction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266. 8.14</td>
<td>Table 69 Type-14 record layout</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Ridge Code/FRC to be consistent with name/mnemonic referenced in Table 69 Type-14 record layout.</td>
<td>Reject based on renaming it per comment 265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>267. 8.14.3</td>
<td>pg 258, Field 14.025, Value Constraints column should reference Table 4 and “1 &lt; FGP &lt; 10” should be “1 &lt; FRC &lt; 10”.</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Pg 258, Field 14.025, the first item is described as Finger number / FGP. Should be renamed to “friction ridge generalized position / FGP” to be consistent with name/mnemonic referenced in Table 69 Type-14 record layout.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Change to friction ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>268. 8.14</td>
<td>Table 69 Type-14 record layout</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Pg 250, Field 14.025, Value Constraints column should reference Table 4</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>269.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall observation: is it necessary to have 4 different mnemonics/names to describe 1 value set (Table 4): FGP/Friction Ridge Generalized Position FPP/Friction Ridge Probable Position PDF/Probable Decimal Finger Position FRC/Friction Ridge Code</td>
<td>Field 9.302 is called FPP but has an information item FGP in it. Field 13.013 will be changed to FGP. PDF is retained for the information item in 13.014 since Field 13.013 is now called FGP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>270.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In thinking ahead to when this might be implemented in XML via NIEM, you might want to consider adding class word “code” to end of name. NIEM standards require appropriate class words at end of names. Friction Ridge Code meets this standard but others don’t.</td>
<td>The XMP working group will have a cross-reference, so this should not be a problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
## Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>271.</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>Table 71 Type-15 record layout</td>
<td>Pg 262, Field 15.013, respell &quot;GENERALISE&quot; to &quot;GENERALIZED&quot;. <strong>Value Constraints</strong> column should reference Table 4 and &quot;20 &lt; value &lt; 38&quot; should be &quot;20 &lt; FGP &lt; 38&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 272. | 8.19 Record Type-19: Plantar image record | Pg 320, as per this paragraph: "Plantars are defined in this standard to be friction ridge prints from the foot. The areas are the five individual toes, ball/inter-digital area, arch and heel for each foot. A record card for printing the plantar images is called the Plantar Print Record (PPR), with four cards per record: one flat and one rolled impression for each foot. It is recommended to capture foot friction ridge data at 1000 ppi.

This statement implies the need to differentiate flat vs. rolled prints; HOWEVER, the new Impression Type values 30 – 35 specified in Table 3 (pg 59) for Plantar do not differentiate flat vs. rolled plantar prints. Are new codes needed for this differentiation? | | Need to discuss at the workshop |
| 273. | | Table 16 Table 18 | Table 16: Iris occlusion opacity and Table 18: Face occlusion opacity have same codes and similar definitions. Can these be merged? | | | |
| 274. | | Table 17 Table 19 | Likewise Table 17 and Table 19 are very similar. Normalization should be considered. | Accept Did same for occlusion type |
| 275. | | | Consider standardizing field mnemonics/names for the information items that exist under the fields: Field 10.045: Occlusion / OCC
  - FOO face occlusion opacity
  - OCT occlusion type
Field 17.037: Occlusion / OCC
  - IOC iris occlusion code
  - OCT iris occlusion type | Accept |
| 276. | Conformanc e Clauses | | The working Group on Conformance has proposed a new set of definitions and criteria. | Insert new text from the Conformance Working Group | Accept Also need to change the definitions |

\(^{1}\) **MB** = Member of M1 - affiliation

\(^{2}\) **Type of comment:** \(ge\) = general \(te\) = technical \(ed\) = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. **NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
## Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>277.</td>
<td>XML annex</td>
<td>The working Group on XML has updated the annex as associated terms, definitions and references</td>
<td>Update text to reflect modifications of the WG</td>
<td>STILL TO DO – IN PROCESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278.</td>
<td>Te</td>
<td>In the latest discussion with the XML WG, it was determined that a code for “unknown friction ridge” is necessary.</td>
<td>It was proposed that the code value “0” for “unknown finger” should remain as it is, and code value “18” should be added to represent “unknown friction ridge.”</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Also needed to change references throughout the text to allow code 18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279.</td>
<td>Type-98 Section</td>
<td>Information Assurance WG has updates to the text</td>
<td>Use supplied updates to modify the text</td>
<td>Partial Accept</td>
<td>I had to change some of the references from subfields to information items, but tried to keep the essence of what was delivered intact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Accept</td>
<td>2) Changed to Sections 7 and 8 of this document</td>
<td>3) Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) pagination: goes from xxvii to 28 (1 scope) – should be page 1  
2) Section 2.2 and 2.3: multiple references to clause 7 and 8. What is being referred to? This looks like a holdover from the ISO standards  
3) Page 45 1st bullet: “A field is used to ....” Suggest making into a bulleted item  
4) Page 46 : I reiterate my objection to reserving record types 11 & 12 for future development. Also sections 5.3.11 and .12  
5) For the type-4 record: to describe as "for existing systems only" is putting you in the policy-making arena. This is not a mandate as far as I know. Also

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

---

1) MB = Member of M1 - affiliation  
2) Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MB</strong></td>
<td><strong>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type of comment</strong>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed change by the MB</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Editors Disposition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3.4</strong></td>
<td>6) Page 46: footnote 15: are you sure you mean “Multiple domains”. From 8.1.13: “The domain name may only appear once within a transaction.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7) 5.3.2: par 2: line 3: DOM is an optional field. If not used then domain defaults to Noram. “...of the domain name[s] as listed...” change to “...of the domain name or Noram.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8) 5.3.4 : End of 1st par: “...or other capture. Devices operating...” I think you may want to remove the period (.) and extra line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9) 5.3.7: Type-7 records. to describe as &quot;for existing systems only&quot; is putting you in the policy-making arena. This is not a mandate as far as I know. Also see Table 1 on page 46.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10) 5.3.10. What do you mean by &quot;other body part images&quot;??? How about an X-ray of your big toe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11) Page 52; section 5.5: You may be begging for big trouble by allowing extended Latin and non-Latin characters under the &quot;ANS&quot; character type. (does NS also include extended Latin and non-Latin). I realize you can use different character sets as described in field 1.015, but this may give the impression that these characters can be used anywhere without qualification including fields for the Type 1 record.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> **MB** = Member of M1 - affiliation  
<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. **NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment?</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12) Sec 5.6; par 1  which says all Type-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>encoding is specified IN this record, there must be a specified character encoding agreed upon in order to read this Record Type, particularly with Traditional encoding. All of the fields in the Type-1 record shall be recorded using the 7-bit ASCII code. There are no character types ANS for any fields in this record type. (See Section 5.5 for a description of the character types). This provides for backward compatibility with previous versions of the standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fields shall be 7-bit ASCII. But par 2 seems to be allowing the n with a tilde to n to be used. Isn't this a violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>12) Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13) Sec 7.3; Page 56 par 1; line 4; “Also in the Field xx.999…” Field xx.999 is for the image! I assume you mean xx.997</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is a violation. Text changed to: An example is Field 10.038: Comment / Com. In Spanish speaking areas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14) Page 56 before 7.3.1: “Field 14.026: Simultaneous…..that do not capture the finger images in a manner preserving full relative position of the fingers in placed in a single image” This needs explaining. A simultaneous capture will keep the relative position. That is finger 2 will be to the left of finger 3 which will be to the left of finger 4 etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>14) Page 56 before 7.3.1: “Field 14.026: Simultaneous…..that do not capture the finger images in a manner preserving full relative position of the fingers in placed in a single image” This needs explaining. A simultaneous capture will keep the relative position. That is finger 2 will be to the left of finger 3 which will be to the left of finger 4 etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15) Page 57 ; last paragraph Error: Reference source not found</td>
<td></td>
<td>15) Page 57 ; last paragraph Error: Reference source not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16) Page 62 ; line 3 Error: Reference source not found</td>
<td></td>
<td>16) Page 62 ; line 3 Error: Reference source not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17) Section 7.7.3 page 65: Between the 5th and 6th bullets, you are missing the seventh information item (I assume longitude second value)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17) Section 7.7.3 page 65: Between the 5th and 6th bullets, you are missing the seventh information item (I assume longitude second value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18) Page 83; last paragraph 6th line down: “…above 190” 190 what? Click on 190 and you are sent to page 190. I think you want to remove the 190.</td>
<td></td>
<td>18) Page 83; last paragraph 6th line down: “…above 190” 190 what? Click on 190 and you are sent to page 190. I think you want to remove the 190.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19) Page 83; par 2; line 4; “ 20.08 ppm (510ppi)” That is a 2% tolerance good for PIV. This entire paragraph is quoting 2% tolerance for PIV – but no mention made of 1% tolerance for</td>
<td></td>
<td>19) Page 83; par 2; line 4; “ 20.08 ppm (510ppi)” That is a 2% tolerance good for PIV. This entire paragraph is quoting 2% tolerance for PIV – but no mention made of 1% tolerance for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MB = Member of M1 - affiliation</td>
<td>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</td>
<td>Type of comment(^2)</td>
<td>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</td>
<td>Proposed change by the MB</td>
<td>Proposed Editors Disposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</td>
<td>Proposed change by the MB</td>
<td>Proposed Editors Disposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>other FBI processing. Also Click on 190 (3 lines from bottom of paragraph) and you are sent to page 190.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20) Section 7.7.7; Par 1; As written, your second sentence is telling me that the quality field may contain identifying segmentation data. I think what you are trying to tell me is that there can also be another field that is devoted to judging the quality of the segmentation algorithm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21) Page 86; What is the difference between 7.7.8.4 and 7.7.8.7? Also difference between sections 7.7.8.5 and 7.7.8.8?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22) Page 87; Section 7.7.9; Par 1; line 7: &quot;Other color schemes are...&quot; don't you mean &quot;Other color spaces...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23) Page 88 Section 7.7.9.1; line 1: JP:EG 10918 was never recommended for 500 ppi fingerprint compression – only WSQ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

\(^2\) Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment (^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17) Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18) Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19) Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>revised text: The transmitting resolution shall be within the range 19.30 ppmm (490 ppi) to 20.08 ppmm (510 ppi) for a Type-4 record. This range reflects the 2% deviance from 500 ppi allowed for PIV certified devices. (See Table 12). For example, a sensor that scans natively at 508 ppi would list both NSR and NTR as 20 ppmm (= 508 ppi). These images should not be sampled down to exactly 500 ppi. Type-7 records may have a scanning resolution up to 99.99 ppmm. This field is set to “00.00” if no Type-4 or Type-7 records are present in the transaction. Given that the transmitting resolution shall not be greater than the scanning resolution, Appendix F certified devices (See Table 12) are restricted to a 1% deviance from 500 ppmm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 \(\text{MB} = \text{Member of M1 - affiliation}\)

2 \(\text{Type of comment: } \ge = \text{general} \text{ te} = \text{technical} \text{ ed} = \text{editorial} \) – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. \(\text{NOTE}\) Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.

20) Accept ✓

Corrected.

Deleted reference and change to ‘may contain other information items.”

21) These refer to separate fields. Added wording to the fields. For HPS / VPS described that this reflects the original image. SHPS and SVPS is utilized if the scanned parameters differ from HPS and VPS.

22) Accept ✓

Corrected

23) Reject. Page 32 of the 2007 standard (Compression algorithm for Type-4) specifically states that both are allowed. Maintained for backward compatibility.

ppi.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>7.3.1, 7.4.1</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>The information items ACN (Associated Context Number) and SRN (Source Reference Number) appear in many of the record tables. The tables show allowable values of 1-255. Paragraphs 7.3.1 and 7.4.1 say allowable values are 0-255. Recommend 0-255.</td>
<td>Change all the tables that use XX.995 to use 0 &lt; ACN &lt; 255, and change all the tables that use XX.997 to say 0 &lt; SRN &lt; 255.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The mnemonics listed in this section are GMT, PNV, PWN and DSC, but in the tables for each record type they are GMT, NAV, OWN and PRO</td>
<td>Make the mnemonics consistent.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Section 7.7 talks about the 12th and 13th information items GCN and GRT, but those info items are missing from all the tables for each record type.</td>
<td>Add those information items to the individual tables.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>te-major</td>
<td>Under SLC, it says &quot;A value of &quot;2&quot; shall indicate pixels per millimeter.&quot; In the 2007/2008 version a value of 2 indicated pixels per centimeter. Was this an intentional change?</td>
<td>Ensure that this was an intentional change.</td>
<td>It was an error corrected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The bullet point that starts with &quot;The second (or third in the case of Field 20.016, Field 21.016 or Field 17.037) information item...&quot; This list in parentheses should include Field 10.045, since it has a different second information item.</td>
<td>Add Field 10.045 to the list</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The bullet point that starts &quot;For Fields 10.045 and 17.037, the second information item...&quot; There should be a separate bullet for each one, because Field 10.045 uses Table 19 while 17.037 uses Table 17.</td>
<td>Separate into 2 bullet points that refer to different table numbers.</td>
<td>This has been modified in the new version</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Table 23</td>
<td>Footnote #61 is incorrect. There was something called OrganizationName in 2008, but it was mapped to what you are calling DNM, the Domain Name from 2007. So,</td>
<td>Do not add a separate domain organization name, just leave it at domain name (DNM) and version (DVN)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Table 23</td>
<td>te-</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td>do we really need a 3rd information item? If it was put in for compatibility with XML, it is not necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Table 23</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>If there any reason not to just make this a repeating subfield? The way it is defined now (with many information items and a separate concept of “triads” described in the text) seems excessively complicated and inconsistent with other field definitions.</td>
<td>Have a field with repeating subfields with 2 information items: domain name (DNM) and version (DVN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Table 23</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Table 23 says domain is mandatory but the text in section 8.1.13 says it's optional.</td>
<td>Make the mnemonics consistent, for clarity.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Table 23</td>
<td>te-</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Make it optional in both places?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Table 21</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 1.003, please use a different mnemonic for REC in the first subfield vs. REC in the second and subsequent subfields. Call the first one FRC for First Record Category Code? Using the same mnemonic necessitates a special note in the XML mapping document about which REC is being used where.</td>
<td>Change the first REC to FRC</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./Subclause No./Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/Figure/Table/Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change by the MB)</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>293.</td>
<td>8.1.13</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The first paragraph says it will contain 1 or 2 information items. But it contains 3, or 12 depending on how you look at it.</td>
<td>Make it say 1 to 12 information items (unless we make it a repeating field).</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Text is changed to: This field, if used, contains sets of information items that each describe a domain. For each domain, the only mandatory information item is the domain name. The other two information items for each domain are optional. Only one domain need be specified in this field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294.</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Table 27</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 9.127 the field itself and one of its information items have the same mnemonic (CEI)</td>
<td>Use a different mnemonic to distinguish them.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295.</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Table 27</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Field 9.138: It would be preferable not to have &quot;first&quot; repeating subfields that represent something different from other subsequent subfields. It complicates the explanation in the text, requires strange &quot;filler&quot; information items, and also complicates the XML mapping document. The only other case of this is 1.003, which should be kept as is for backward compatibility.</td>
<td>Make this two separate fields. The first is the ridge count extraction method, and the second is a field with repeating subfields that for the ridge counts.</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296.</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Table 28</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 9.300 has 5 information items in the table, but 6 in the text description of the field (PCV is missing)</td>
<td>Either add PCV to the table or delete it from the text description.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297.</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Table 28</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Under field 9.350 (Method of Feature Detection), the information items FIE, FME, and EMT are mandatory.</td>
<td>Make EMT optional in the table.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. **NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298.</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Table 28</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The text at 8.9.6.38 says that only the first two information items are mandatory.</td>
<td>Change the table as described.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299.</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Table 55</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 10.014 should be top vertical and bottom vertical (not horizontal).</td>
<td>Change the name and the mnemonic for these information items (in the table; it’s already correct in the text).</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Table 55</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 10.015 should be reserved.</td>
<td>Add a line reserving 10.015.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301.</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Table 55</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Is 10.023 intended to repeat up to 8 times? If so, this is new in this version and not marked as such. The description doesn't seem to indicate that it is repeating.</td>
<td>Verify that this was an intentional change, and if so, modify the text in section 8.10.21 to indicate that multiple values may be provided. Also consider a footnote indicating that the cardinality changed in 2011.</td>
<td>Accept - The reference to the repeating subfield was an error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Table 55</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>10.026 has only one information item but it is listed in a separate row. This is inconsistent with other &quot;repeating values&quot; fields, e.g. 10.019, where there is no separate row for the information item, and it does not have a mnemonic.</td>
<td>Remove the information item row from the table. Also, do not give it a mnemonic in the text description in section 8.10.24.</td>
<td>Accept - The reference to the repeating subfield was an error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303.</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Table 55</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>10.041 - It says that HGT is between 1 and VLL, but VLL is in pixels and this field is in centimeters. Likewise for WID.</td>
<td>Remove the value constraint from the table, since it does not make sense.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Table 55</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>10.045 - The table does not have an information item for the polygon.</td>
<td>Add an information item for the polygon.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305.</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>Table 68</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The table says that the 13.014/FIC item can contain only EJI and FV1-4, but the text implies that it can also contain PRX, DST and MED.</td>
<td>Make this consistent.</td>
<td>Accept - Changed to: Add item Text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306.</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>Table 69</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>Both Table 66 and text at 8.14.20 declare that field.</td>
<td>Change this field back to optional in the table and</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

\(^2\) Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
### Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment*</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>307.</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>Table 69</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 14.025, the value constraints for the HPO information item mistakenly says &quot;HOP&quot; instead of &quot;HPO&quot;</td>
<td>Change &quot;HOP&quot; to &quot;HPO&quot;.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308.</td>
<td>8.14, 8.15.4, 8.16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>The section headers for these say &quot;Field XX.004: Source agency / ORI / SRC&quot;. They should say &quot;Field XX.004: Originating agency / ORG&quot; The SRC mnemonic is not used in these types, and ORI is the mnemonic of a subfield.</td>
<td>Change the section headers.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309.</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>Table 73</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 17.020 references table 14 when it should be table 20.</td>
<td>Change the reference to table 20.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310.</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>Table 73</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 17.025 references table 72 when it should be table 74</td>
<td>Change the reference to table 74.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311.</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>Table 73</td>
<td>te-minor</td>
<td>The table says that user defined fields for type 17 are 17.800 - 17.900. This is a change from 2007/2008, where it was 17.200-17.900. Also, the max boundary of the reserved field range was lowered. Were these deliberate changes?</td>
<td>Ensure that this was an intentional change.</td>
<td>It was a typographical error. Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312.</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>Table 73</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 17.037, to be consistent with the way other repeating fields are described, the cardinality on this field should be 0..1 and an additional line should be inserted that says &quot;Subfields: repeating sets of information items&quot; with the cardinality 0..Unlimited.</td>
<td>Change the table as described.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313.</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>Table 76</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 18.017 refers to table 80 or 81, should that be table 81 or 82?</td>
<td>Change the table reference.</td>
<td>Changed to proper reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314.</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>Table 76</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 18.011 is optional in the table but mandatory in the descriptive text.</td>
<td>Make the cardinalities consistent.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315.</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>Table 76</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 18.017 has order AGTC, but text says AGCT.</td>
<td>Make the order of the information items consistent.</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. 

NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment(^2)</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>316.</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>Table 76</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Field 18.999 is mandatory in the table but optional in the descriptive text.</td>
<td>Make the cardinalities consistent.</td>
<td>It has been removed. There are now optional information items in the electropherogram fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317.</td>
<td>8.18.3</td>
<td>Footnotes 250 and 251</td>
<td>te-minor</td>
<td>For field 18.003, information items CFG and SOC, it would be preferable not to introduce comma-delimited values as a way of separating repeating information items. This is inconsistent with other fields, introduces a separate paradigm outside our field/subfield/information item model, and is not properly reflected in Table 76, which says that it is an integer value and does not repeat.</td>
<td>Elevate these information items to separate fields with repeating subfields/values.</td>
<td>Not sure how to accomplish this. The use of commas is the same as within EFS fields. Changed table to state that the values are in the ranges and integers separated by commas. Also made text clearer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318.</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>Table 83</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>In the table, 19.018 says it can repeat 4 times, but the description of the field in section 8.19.16 says it can repeat 5 times.</td>
<td>Make this consistent.</td>
<td>Accept (\checkmark) in the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319.</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>Table 84</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>There are mandatory elements that only apply to images (color space, horizontal pixel scale, etc.)</td>
<td>Make fields that are only required for 2D images optional in the table.</td>
<td>Changed to M if 2D image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320.</td>
<td>8.20.14</td>
<td>Table 86</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Code 15, &quot;receiver&quot; is misspelled &quot;receivier&quot;</td>
<td>Fix typo.</td>
<td>Accept (\checkmark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321.</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>Table 88</td>
<td>ed</td>
<td>Under field 98.900, the repeating information item &quot;original value&quot; does not have a mnemonic.</td>
<td>Give &quot;original value&quot; a mnemonic.</td>
<td>Accept (\checkmark) in the table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table insertion for comment 239

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation
2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.
### Comments on ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 First Draft for 2nd Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 8.10.24)</th>
<th>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</th>
<th>Type of comment²</th>
<th>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed change by the MB</th>
<th>Proposed Editors Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Ident Cond Code Field # Field name —Information Items Char type # inf Items Field size per occurrence (Min/Max) Number of occurrences (Min/Max)

[...]

| FSP | O | 9.303 | Feature Set Profile | N | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

---

1 MB = Member of M1 - affiliation

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment. NOTE Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 are compulsory.