|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |
| Noblis 0 | All | |  | Ge | Version v1c of the Supplement has not changed significantly from previous versions despite comments to Brad Wing and Mark Przybocki in mid-July that it appears to be a final report of the Voice Committee more than it appears to be an addendum to ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011.  With the possible exception of the terms and definitions, the first 524 lines of the document belong in the Voice Committee’s final report and an application profile that defines TOTs.  Following the precedents of ANSI/NIST-ITL 1a-1997 and ANSI/NIST-ITL 1a-2009, the Supplement should look much more like instructions to the reader on how the text supplements the base ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011 standard. | Separate into appropriate documents:   * Final report – lines 52-82 * Supplement – lines 83-313, 525-564, 660-1834 * Application profile – lines 314-524, 565-659   Format the Supplement following ANSI/NIST-ITL as a style guide, i.e., use section headings, figure captions, etc. | Accept |
| Nob1/DHS1 | Contents | | Page 2 | ed | Contents do not contain the Summary preceding the Introduction. | Add Summary to Contents | See Nob0 above |
| DHS2 | Contents | | 49 | Ed | Promote grammatically consistent use of capitalization for title case in the Table of Contents. | The “r” in “Voice record” should be capitalized to “Voice **R**ecord.” | Accept |
| DHS3 | Summary | | 65 | Ed | There is no period at the end of the sentence that ends with “2011.” Grammar conventions require a period, and it should appear inside the quotation marks, not outside. | Delete the comma that currently appears after footnote one. Add a period inside the quotation marks. | Accept |
| Nob2/DHS4 | Summary | | Page 3, Line 67 | ge | In the sentence, “This supplement to that standard is based upon a report of those”, the use of the word “those” in ambiguous. | Define the word “those.” | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 1 | Summary | | Line 58 | Ge | The term Forensic in association with this voice record interchange standard implies the scope is limited to criminal litigation purposes. The voice data interchange record will more likely be implemented in a broad range of scenarios and should not be limited to forensics. | Remove the adjective Forensic before voice throughout | Accept at editor’s discretion |
| DoD BSWG 2 | Summary | | Line 77-79 | Ge | The record should be designed with consideration for the broader community; beyond law enforcement and homeland security. | Add “formatted transactions for law enforcement, homeland security, and defense....” | Accept |
| DHS5 | Summary | | Throughout, example: 76-77 | Ed | The number of spaces between sentences varies throughout the document from one to four. | Adopt a consistent number of spaces between sentences and implement throughout. | Noted |
| DHS6 | Summary | | 80 | Ed | Extra space. | Delete extra space after “control.” | Accept |
| Nob3/DHS7 | Introduction | | Page 4, Line 96 | ed | In the sentence, “…speech (linguistic content) .”, there is an extra space between “linguistic content” and “.” | Remove extra space | Accept |
| Nob4/DHS8 | Introduction | | Page 4, Line 96 | ed | In the sentence, “An automated interlocutor is considered to be a “speaker” in for…”, there is an extraneous word after “speaker”: “in” | Remove word “in” | Accept |
| Nob5/DHS9 | Introduction | | Page 4, Line 97 | ed | In the sentence, “…purposes of this record type, since the intent is to directly…”, there is an extra space between “type,” and “since” | Remove extra space | Accept |
| DHS10 | Introduction | | 111, 136 | Ed | Period should be inside the quotation marks. | Move the period at the end of the sentence inside the quotation marks. | Partial accept. At 111, but not 136 |
| DHS11 | Introduction | | 114-146 | TE-Major | Voice samples can be segmented much like fingerprints can be in a highly used area. Although there are greater technical difficulties, this should not be a limitation place on the voice samples. If proper documentation is given on how the voices were separated, it will provide the necessary validation needed for analysis. |  | Noted. |
| Nob6/DHS12 | Introduction | | Page 4, Line 123-124 | ed | In the sentences, “…annotation work-flow tools. In all cases, …”, there are two extra spaces between “tools” and “In” | Remove extra spaces | Accept |
| Nob7/DHS13 | Introduction | | Page 5, Line 148 | ed | There is no space between “Type-11” and “record.” | Add space between “Type-11” and “record” | Accept |
| DHS14 | ANVWG | | 182-312 | TE-Minor | Additional terms such as Score, Rating, analytical reporting, should be added, especially with all of the subjective interpretations of the voice sample presented later in the document. |  | Noted. |
| NOB8/DHS15 | Definitions | | 195 | te | It is assumed this only refers to hearable frequencies, but perhaps this should be clarified with regard to both amplitude and frequency. That is, while the amplitude would control at what distance a human would hear audio, frequencies would not. | Change Note to “’Audible’ means ‘within the ranges of frequency and amplitude hearable by most humans’.” | Reject Eliminate note and word audible |
| DHS16 | Definitions | | 222 | GE | Quality as it is defined in the document: An estimate of the usefulness of a biometric sample for the purpose of recognition, leaves it up to great interpretation, especially if we utilize the company providing the collection technology to define what quality is, this needs to be better defined. Giving something a higher quality score gives the voice biometric a great amount of power, but it is also a double edge sword, if a sample gets a high score like a 90 and then is found to be completely false (such as a woman’s voice being mistaken for a man’s voice, happened a lot with early facial recognition), it could also destroy the creditability of voice analysis. |  | Noted. |
| DoD BSWG 4 | Definitions | | Line 213 | Te | The definition of metadata needs to be expanded into a more meaningful explanation. Metadata includes data about the data in the more traditional use of the term. | Provide an expanded definition of metadata. | Noted |
| Nob9/DHS17 | Definitions of Specialized Terms | | Page 6, Line 223 | te | The definition of quality reads: “An estimate of the usefulness…” The way quality is quantified is not clear. | Reword sentence to: “An *ordinal* estimate of the usefulness…” | Accept |
| Nob10/DHS18 | Definitions of Specialized Terms | | Page 6, Line 235 | ge | There shouldn’t be application profile-specific references | Remove application-profile specific references from this document. | See Nob 0 |
| Nob11/DHS19 | Definitions | | Page 8, Line 310 | Te | The definition of Voice Subject includes a note saying “This may not be the subject of the transaction.“ This seems to contradict the ANSI/NIST-ITL principle of one subject per transaction.  Disagree with Editor’s response. Quote from ANSI/NIST-ITL – “The transaction shall contain records pertaining to a single subject. Biometric data used to identify another individual shall be contained in a separate transaction.” Saying that the transaction can contain data of persons other than the subject is tantamount to saying a transaction can have multiple subjects, a violation of ANSI/NIST. Editor does not indicate what data he thinks is applicable. If a voice in the background of a Type-20 record, that is one thing. Having Type-11 records from multiple speakers is another, and clearly not allowed. | Delete Note 1. | Partial accept Remove definition. |
| Nob12/DHS20 | Definitions of Specialized Terms | | Page 8, Line 311 | ge | Any abbreviations would need to be in the list above. Things already defined in the standard are not to be included, since this is supplemental to it. |  | Noted. No abbreviation cited. |
| Nob13/DHS21 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 8, Line 325 | ed | For the sentence, “The information designation character/IDC value (s) in Filed 1.003 are selected to be unique…”, the word “are” only accounts for multiple IDC values | Substitute “are” with “is(are)” | Accept |
| Nob14/DHS22 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 9, Line 329 | ed | Responses are linked to requests; not vice versa. | Reword sentence to: “In this manner, *responses* are linked to *requests*”. | Accept |
| Nob15/DHS23 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 9, Line 336 | ed | For the sentence, ““in a Type-11 record or records is derived.”, the word “are” only accounts for multiple biometric samples | Substitute “are” with “is(are)” | Accept |
| Nob16/DHS24 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 9, Line 357 | te | Scenario 1 response says “TOT field 1.004 specified appropriately for the specific application profile indicating that a voice model has been created.” It leaves out an indication that a record has been enrolled for the subject.  The simple fix here then is to remove all TOT-specific discussion from this document. | Add “and enrolled for the subject” to the end of the sentence so that it reads “…indicating that a voice model has been created *and enrolled for the subject*”. | See Nob0 |
| Nob17/DHS25 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 9, Line 360 | te | Scenario two fails to discuss the content of the response.  The simple fix here then is to remove all TOT-specific discussion from this document. | Add “The response would then indicate that the voice record for the unknown subject has been enrolled in an unidentified biometric file (database).” | See Nob0 |
| Nob18/DHS26 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 9, Line 366 | te | The response would then indicate that the voice record for the unknown subject has been enrolled in an unidentified biometric file (database)  The simple fix here then is to remove all TOT-specific discussion from this document. |  | See Nob0 |
| DHS27 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 368 | TE-Major | When defining a speaker in two different recordings there is no process defined on how the records will be associated. In the event of a database search, I should be able to pull up one record and see an associated record linked, even if it is just a reference number (automation, like hyperlinking would not be needed). This would also be done with recordings of unknown subjects where the analyst has not ascertained the identity of the subject but believes multiple recordings are of the same person. |  | Noted. |
| Nob19/DHS28 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 9, Line 368 | ge | Is this limited to one speaker per recording? If not, the result would be MxN comparisons. |  | See Nob0 |
| Nob20/DHS29 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 10, Line 376 | ed | The segmented transaction may be taken from the second or subsequent recording.  The simple fix here then is to remove all TOT-specific discussion from this document. | Reword sentence to: “…segmented transaction from the second *or subsequent* recording”. | See Nob0 |
| Nob21/DHS31 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 10, Line 379 | te | The sentence describes submission of multiple Type-11 records when an organization cannot segment an audio record. | What if there are more than two? Why wouldn’t the original recording be a Type-20? | See Nob0 |
| DHS30 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 379 | Ed | Proper use of the em dash. | Remove the spaces before and after the em dash. Should read: “records—one” | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 6 | Transactions | | Figure V1, line 386 | Ed | Figures normally have a short title, not a paragraph, and are identified using a standard naming convention. . Is this supplement going to be identified by “V”? | Shorten the title of the figure and rename the figure using a standard naming convention, | See Nob0 |
| Nob22/DHS32 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Figure VI | te | The figure shows a Type-20 record being saved to the database and archive, but does not reflect a Type-20 as being contained in the original transaction.  Quote from ANSI/NIST-ITL – “The transaction shall contain records pertaining to a single subject. Biometric data used to identify another individual shall be contained in a separate transaction.” A questioned recording is from a subject that may or may not be the same as the known recording, and therefore MUST be in a separate transaction. The identity of the subject may not be known, but it is a subject nonetheless. | Add a Type-20 record to the transaction contents on the left. Also, the known and questioned recordings need to be reflected as being in separate transactions. | Partial accept. Known and questioned recording can be in the same transaction.  See Nob11 |
| Nob23/DHS33 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 10, Line 392-393 | te | Transaction # 4 describes “Comparison of the voice in an audio recording to the voice models from a list of known speakers.”  The simple fix here then is to remove all TOT-specific discussion from this document. | Is this meant to imply a repository of known subjects? Does “List” refer to an entire repository, repository subset of known subjects, or a list of ID #s of individuals known to be in a repository? | See Nob0 |
| Nob24/DHS34 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 10, Line 396-398 | te | Candidate lists are part of the Type-2 record. Any biometric records accompanying the candidate lists would be contained in the same transaction, just like images returned for candidates from a latent search. | Delete sentence “Each potential candidate would be handled by sending a separate transaction from the laboratory/receiving agency to the submitting organization”. | See Nob0. |
| Nob25/DHS35 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 10 – 12, Lines 400 - 478 | te | Transaction descriptions of numbers 5 – 17 are more workstation functions than transactions that would be data transfers.  The simple fix here then is to remove all TOT-specific discussion from this document. | Delete 5 – 17 from this section and create separate section for workstation functions, either by the capturing organization or the receiving organization if transferred in an electronic submission. | See Nob0 |
| DHS36 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 399, 405, 411, 417 | TE-Major | Need an assessment of the quality of the analog recording prior to being digitized. This can be added to the metadata or in the comments section, but it needs to be addressed. There should also be a two-man rule added when transferring a piece of potential evidence from one medium to another. |  | Noted. |
| Nob26/DHS37 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 11, Line 424 | ge | The distinction is unclear. Does this involve speaker separation only, or also clustering of speech segments from the same individual? The former is assumed. | Change TOT 9 to “Determination of the time indices when a given speaker begins and ends a segment of speech in a voice recording (also known as speaker change detection).” | Accept |
| Nob27/DHS38 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 11, Line 427 | ed | “TOT” is not bolded | Bold “TOT” | Accept |
| Nob28/DHS39 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 11, Line 439 | ge |  | Suggest adding to list of key terms, key terms from cases 7-11:  voice signal: Information in analog or digital form that consists of acoustic content produced by a human’s vocal folds speech signal: Information in analog or digital form that consists of acoustic linguistic content produced by a human, or produced by another means imitating speech produced by humans distinct speaker: A vocalizing human (or synthesized voice) that has been identified as different from other speakers in question indexing: Listing the timing of a speaker or speakers’ vocalizations within an audio signal  segmentation: Snipping to produce an audio signal including only the content produced by a single speaker. | See Nob0 |
| DHS40 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 451 | GE | Redaction of an audio recording to remove sensitive speech segments needs to be further defined as to when and why this action was taken. For example, this could potentially raise an issue concerning someone’s 5th Amendment Due Process rights over the protection of classified information (including devolving method and means).  The simple fix here then is to remove all TOT-specific discussion from this document. |  | See Nob0 |
| DHS41 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 456 | GE | Snipping parts of recordings out can potentially lead to that the analyzing group was purposely taking information out of the recording. The caveat is added that segments of non-speech, speech not attributable to the subject of interest, or speech not of interest to the transaction are the reasoning, but it is not the decision of the investigative body of what is important. Whenever possible the recording should stay intact. |  | Noted. |
| Nob29/DHS42 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 12, 464 | ge | Note a requirement to document the nature of any enhancements and how they were performed? | After the first sentence of TOT 15, insert “Should include documentation of the nature of these enhancements and how they were performed”. | See Nob0 |
| DHS43 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 478 | GE | Under what protection(s) would the permanent storage be upheld and maintained over potentially long periods of times (decades)? Voice over any other biometric has the largest raw data with long recording easily being gigabytes in size, which could cause a storage problem that will grow exponentially. If different agencies decide to store their own voice samples, this could potential cause samples to be contaminated or not used since standards between agencies are not universal. This topic may not need to be defined in this document but it does need to be address by NIST in future documentation. |  | Noted. |
| DHS44 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 483, 655, 663 | Ed | Extra space is present. | Delete the extra spaces. | Accept |
| DHS45 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 483-484 | TE-Minor/Major | By requiring ‘No response is required from the receiving laboratory / agency’ makes for no receipt or chain of evidence when handling the voice samples. Not thinking from just a criminal prosecution aspect, but with no receipt between analyzing laboratories how would the individual know where the sample has been and if it has been tampered with? There should always be an audit trail, makes for good science and analysis. |  | Noted. |
| DHS46 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 485, 1792 | Ed | Extra spaces are present. | Delete the spaces before and after the slash. | Accept. Global change. |
| DHS47 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 491 | Ge | Unclear which voice signal is meant by “**This** voice signal.” | Clarify whether you are referring to voice signal record Type-1 or Type-11. | Accept. |
| DHS48 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 491 | Ge | Unclear what transactions are meant by “**these** transactions.” | Replace “these” with the transactions you mean to refer to. | Accept |
| Nob30/DHS49 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 13, Line 493 | ed | The word “of” in a previous version of the document has been changed to “on”, and it seems in error. | Change the word “on” to “of” so that the sentence reads: “…transmissions of fully or partially processed voice recordings.” | Accept |
| Nob31/DHS50 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 13, Line 494 | ed | Sentence reads: “Further, the type of transactions ultimately to be performed on the voice recording.” Types of transactions are not performed ON voice recordings. They are a means to exchange data. | Reword sentence to “Further, the type of transactions that will ultimately contain the voice recording might not be fully known at the time the Type-11 record is created.” | .  Accept |
| Nob32/DHS51 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 13, Line 497 | ed |  | Remove the word “very” | Accept |
| DHS52 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 500 | GE | When talking about metadata, NIST should be defining what the metadata will be in the recording, not asking for the agency to define what it deems important. NIST is setting the standard not a recommendation. |  | Noted. |
| DHS53 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 500-509 | Ed | Colons are properly followed by one space, not two. | Delete the second space after each colon in the bulleted list. | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 7 | Transactions | | Bullet 4, line 507 | Te | There is no discussion concerning transmission frequency of the voice file (radio intercept), time of day, location, and other aspects that could be described as metadata that is useful to an intelligence analyst in determining associations. | Expand the discussion of the audio technology bullet to include metadata that could be useful for intelligence exploitation or add another bullet. | Noted. No wording suggested. |
| Nob33/DHS54 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 13, Line 507-508 | ed | The audio technology metadata also consists of transmitted data | Reword sentence to: “…how the voice signal *was* collected, *processed, transmitted, and stored* and what technical parameters…” | Accept, but if transmission is by FedEx, this field may not apply. |
| Nob34/DHS55 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 13, Line 510 | ed | The ambient environment should also be documented | Add a new bullet: “Ambient conditions of the recording environment (e.g., background noise)”. Note: if suggestion is accepted, change “four” to “five” in Line 497. | See Nob0. |
| Nob35/DHS56 | Transactions Supported by a Type-11 Record | | Page 13, Line 515 | te | The transaction is specified in an agency’s profile of the ANSI/NIST-ITL standard; ANSI/NIST-ITL does not specify transactions per se. | Replace “ANSI/NIST-ITL” with “overall” | See Nob0 |
| DHS57 | Trans. Supported by a Type-11 Record | | 518 | Ge | The goal statement in this line seems important as setting forth the purpose of the Supplement. It would be helpful to know this goal earlier in the document. | Move the goal statement to the beginning of the document, or at least to the beginning of this section so the reader knows why the subsequent information is relevant. | See Nob0 |
| DHS58 | Scope of the Type-11 Record | | 542, 556, 559, 560 | Ed | Comma is misplaced outside the quotation marks instead of inside. | Move the comma inside the quotation marks. | Partial accept. Replace quotation marks with italics |
| Nob36/DHS59 | Scope of the Type-11 Record | | Page 14, Line 547 | ed | The word “accordance” was spelled correctly in a previous version of the document, but has been changed to an incorrect spelling. | Correct the spelling of “accordance.” | Accept |
| FBI-JS1 | “Scope of the Type-11 Record” | | First paragraph | ed | Spelling error | Change ‘acordance’ to ‘accordance’ | Accept |
| Nob37/DHS60 | Scope of the Type-11 Record | | Page 14, Line 553 | ge | Unless the source documents are normative (incorporated in their entirety), they need to be in the informative list, which is Annex I |  | Accept |
| Nob38/DHS61 | Scope of the Type-11 Record | | Page 14, Line 555 | ge | The standard can’t refer to itself as normative (i.e. Section 3) - this is an infinite loop. Also, EBTS is not normative for the standard. |  | Reject |
| DHS62 | Admin Metadata Req. | | 564 | GE | Administrative Metadata Requirements comes under the same reasoning as defined in DHS10 |  | See DHS10: Move the period at the end of the sentence inside the quotation marks. |
| DHS63 | Admin Metadata Req. | | 564 | GE | Should add a requirement if the voice recording is sensitive, classified or with what agencies (LE, IC or foreign entities) the sample can be shared with. |  | See Nob0 |
| DoD BSWG 8 | Administrative Metadata Requirements | | Line 565 | Te | Suggest using the term **Contextual Data** for this type of data. | Propose section title rename from “**Administrative Metadata Requirements**” to “**Contextual Data Requirements**” | See Nob0 |
| Nob39/DHS64 | Administrative Metadata Requirements | | Page 14, Line 575 | te | Requirement 6 is Embed Case ID. This is undefined. Should it be simply Case ID? | Provide description of Embed Case ID. | See Nob0 |
| DHS65 | Admin Metadata Req. | | 578 | Ed | Proper hyphenation required | Change “user defined” to “user-defined.” | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 9 | Speaker and Content Metadata Requirements | | Line 585 | Te | Suggest using the term **Contextual Data** for this type of data. Contextual data is normally described as Biographic or Situational.  **Biographic Data** is data that describes physical and non-physical attributes of a biometric subject from whom biometric sample data has been collected. For example, full name, age, height, weight, address, employers, telephone number, email address, birthplace, nationality, education level, group affiliations, also data such as employer, security clearances financial and credit history.  **Situational Information** is the who, what, when, where, how, why, etc. associated with a collection encounter event and permanently recorded as an integral component of contextual data. | Propose section title rename from “Speaker and Content Metadata Requirements” to “Speaker and Content Contextual Data Requirements” or “Biographic and Situational Contextual Data Requirements” | See Nob0 |
| DoD BSWG 10 | Speaker and Content Metadata Requirements | | Lines 587-589 | Ed | Update paragraph accordingly for revised terms and removal of metadata term | Update paragraph accordingly for revised terms and removal of metadata term | See Nob0 |
| Nob40/DHS66 | Administrative Metadata Requirements | | Page 15, Line 587 | ed | The use of the word requirements implies mandatory information, some of which, such as educational level, may not be readily available. | Delete “requirements for metadata” | See Nob0 |
| Nob41/DHS67 | Speaker and Content Metadata Requirements | | Page 15, Line 591 | ge | First item is Identifier, and is undefined. Is this a unique agency-specific identification number? | Change 1. to “Agency-specific Identifier” | See Nob0 |
| DoD BSWG 11 | Speaker and Content Metadata Requirements | | Line 592 | Te | Since the “**Long Term Attributes**” pertain to the subject and not the encounter (they are NOT time variant), **Biographic Contextual** wouldbe a better group name for these attributes. | Propose rename of “**Long Term Attributes**” to “**Biographic Contextual Attributes”.** | See Nob0 |
| DHS68 | Speaker & Content Metadata Req. | | 594 | GE | Everyone speaks with an accent, just no one admits to it, you are adding a VERY subjective identifier to the biometric then could potential eliminate it from a database search, with no malice coming from the analyst. For example, I say the individual spoke with an Egyptian accent and the analyst was looking for an Arabian or Iraqi accent. Also it takes expert language analysts to determine specific accents, especially when defining it down to specific sub-regions of a geographic area. |  | Noted. |
| Nob42/DHS69 | Speaker and Content Metadata Requirements | | Page 15, Line 594 | ge | ‘Accent’ is a subjective and linguistically inaccurate classification. | Exclude item b., or change it to ‘dialect | See Nob0 |
| DoD BSWG 13 | Speaker and Content Metadata Requirements | | Line 594 | Te | A person could change accents over time – especially if they are an actor. So, therefore, **Accent** should be considered **Situational Contextual.** | Consider moving **Accent** attribute to the list of **Short-Term** aka **Situational Contextual Attributes**. | See Nob0 |
| DoD BSWG 12 | Speaker and Content Metadata Requirements | | Line 600 | Te | Since these “**Short Term Attributes**” pertain to the subject at the time of the encounter (time variant), **Situational Contextual** would be a better group name for these attributes. | Propose rename of “**Short Term Attributes**” to “**Situational Contextual Attributes”.** | See Nob0 |
| Nob43/DEHS70 | Speaker and Content Metadata  Requirements | | Page 15, Line 603 | ed | Short Term Attributes includes C. “Language proficiency Health status”  Should these be two separate items? | Separate these two items if appropriate. If not, then clarify. | Accept (Comma added) |
| Nob44/DHS71 | Speaker and Content Metadata  Requirements | | Page 15, Line 607 | te | Short Term Attributes includes G. Citizenship. Should this also be included as a possible Long Term Attribute? | Add to Long Term if appropriate. | See Nob0 |
| DoD BSWG 14 | Audio Technology Metadata Requirements | | Line 611 |  | This section contains a de-normalized group of fields. Some fields are specific to the instance in time when a sample is collected and some are specific to the device.  The list of attributes in this section should be considered data instead of metadata and should be separated out into two separate groups. The data that pertains to the instance of time when sample was collected should be called **Audio Technology** S**ituational Contextual.** The data that pertains to the device should be called **Audio Technology Reference**. | Rename section title from “**Audio Technology Metadata Requirements**“ to **“Audio Technology Data Requirements”** orto **“Audio Technology Contextual Situational Requirements”.**  **Suggested replacement text is as follows:**  The relevant contextual data for the audio technology is:  **Audio Technology Contextual Situational**   1. Overall/Preliminary signal quality 2. Duration of signal measured in seconds 3. Duration of signal measured in samples 4. Encoding/container format 5. Sampling rate 6. Bit depth (may be encoding dependent) 7. Recording method (conversion of temporary to permanent storage) 8. Time/date of recording 9. Where recorded   **Audio Technology Reference**   1. Type of recorder 2. Make/model/serial number of recorder 3. Transducer characteristics 4. Transducer type: array, earbud, wire, microphone, handset, speaker phone,… 5. Channel information | See Nob0 |
| DHS72 | Audio Tech. Metadata Req. | | 621 | Ed | The footnote is a different font. | Change the font of footnote 2, which currently appears below line 621, to Times New Roman. | See Nob0. Final typesetting of the entire document will be done by NIST |
| DHS73 | Audit Logs | | 633 | GE | Type-98 Best Practice Implementation Guidance it not the correct course of action. If a national standard is to be defined it should not be an optional piece of information. Allowing for special data protection procedures should be the norm. |  | Noted. |
| Nob45/DHS74 | Audit Logs | | Page 16, Lines 642-643 | te | First sentence says “An example might be that a local police lab sends a transaction with multiple Type-11 records, containing voice signals of both known and unknown persons, “  A single transaction should not contain samples of both known and unknown subjects, as they serve two different purposes, one for enrolment, and one for searching.  The transaction shall contain records pertaining to a single subject. Biometric data used to identify another individual shall be contained in a separate transaction. A questioned recording is from a subject that may or may not be the same as the known recording, and therefore MUST be in a separate transaction. The identity of the subject may not be known, but it is a subject nonetheless. | Revise to say that the police lab would send two transactions, one with known and one with unknown. | See Nob0 |
| Nob46/DHS78 | Audit Logs | | Page 16, Line 647 | ed |  | Replace “national” with “FBI” | Partial accept. Replace national FAVIAU with “central laboratory” |
| DHS77 | Gen. Org. of Type-11 Record | | 648 | Ed | Comma needed instead of period. | Should read “Unit, which” and not “Unit. which.” | See Nob46 |
| FBI-JS2 | “Audit Logs” | | Second Paragraph | Ed | Punctuation error | Change ‘.’ to ‘,’: “...Image Analysis Unit. which may create diaries...” | Accept |
| Nob47/DHS79 | General Organization of Type-11 Record | | Page 17, Line 665 | ed |  | Replace “Types” with "record types” | Accept |
| DHS80 | Gen. Org. of Type-11 Record | | 668 | Ge | The list would be easier to read if spaced out and if the major roman numeral headings were bold, italicized, or underlined. | Add a return before each major roman numeral line to distinguish each roman numeral and its sub-items from the next roman numeral in the list. | Accept |
| Nob48/DHS81 | General Organization of the Type-11 record | | Page 17, Line 673 | ed | Global Field 03 says “Audio object descriptor (internal or external digital file, external physical media containing digital/analog/unknown recording)”  As an unknown recording can be either digital or analog, it is curious why it is called out here as being different. | Change to read “digital/analog known/unknown recording” | Accept |
| Nob50/DHS75 | General Organization of the Type-11 record | | Page 17-18 | te | Do not see any field numbers provided for User-defined fields. | Indicate which of the fields reserved for future use are to be user-defined. | Accept. |
| Nob51/DHS82 | General Organization of the Type-11 record | | Page 17, Line 677 | ed | Would the Recorder be the source of the voice recording? | Reword if appropriate | Accept Change to “recording device” |
| Nob52/DHS83 | General Organization of the Type-11 record | | Page 17, Line 688 | ed |  | Reword sentence to: ”…where *in recording* and why redaction occurred” | Accept |
| Nob53/DHS84 | General Organization of the Type-11 record | | Page 18, Line 709 | ed | A dash and “1-“ is missing: “ANSI/NIST ITL 2011” | Reword to: “ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2011” | Accept |
| Nob54/DHS85 | General Organization of the Type-11 record | | Page 18, Line 715 | ge | Are some of the fields reserved for future use above intended to be user-defined? Not indicated as such. |  | Accept |
| FBI-JS3 | “General Organization of the Type-11 Record” | | Outline topic II, item 04 | Ge | Consistency problem | Voice Laboratory Setting has been renamed to Voice Recording Information | Accept |
| DHS86 | Record Type-11: Voice Record | | 734 | Ge | “Voice signal” was already defined above. Is it necessary to redefine again here? | Omit the definition of “voice signal” here unless necessary to repeat from above. | Partial accept. Voice signal added to definitions and removed at 734 |
| Nob55/DHS87 | Record Type-11: Voice Record | | Page 18, Line 737 | ed | Extra period after “transaction” | Delete extra period. | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 15 | Record Type 11 | | Line 753 | Te | There should be discussion of linking records together to determine associations exploitable by intelligence analysts. | Add additional context for the capability to link records for the purpose of association exploitation. | Noted. No text offered. |
| Nob56/DHS89 | Record Type-11: Voice Record | | Page 19, Line 755 | te | How could they be the same record when items such as the snips or the meta-data would be different? The audio file may be the same, but the Type-11 record must be different. | Move 748 to 759 to a separate document | Accept |
| DHS88 | Record Type-11: Voice Record | | 753-759 | Ed | Margins are inconsistent for lines 753-759. | Adjust margins. | Accept |
| Nob57/DHS90 | Record Type-11: Voice Record | | Page 19, Line 758 | ge | Is there a more generic term that can be used in place of “voice models”? As discussed earlier, while voice models are predominately used as the features in speaker recognition, this is not a requirement. | Perhaps “features” is more appropriate as it generalizes better. | See Nob0 |
| Nob58 | Record Type-11: Voice Record | | Table V-I |  | Are Table references supposed to be hyperlinks? If so, they are not working. The Table references also need to be standardized in format. Some are green, some are black, some are black and bold, etc. | Standardize the format of the Table references and verify that the hyperlinks are working correctly. | Partial accept Leave colored for now. Brad will investigate hyperlinks |
| FBI-JS4 | “Record Type-11: Voice Record” | | Second paragrapgh | Ed | Punctuation error | Remove second ‘.’ at the end of the second sentence (after ‘transaction’). | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 16 | Table V-1 | | Line 762 | Ed | Tables are normally identified using a standard naming convention. V-1 does not appear to follow this type of convention. Is this supplement going to be identified by “V”? | Change the table identifier to a name using a standard convention for this table and all tables that follow. | Accept Number tabes sequentially in the document Table 1,2,3…. number figures sequentially |
| DHS91 | Record Type-11: Voice Record | | 767 | Ge | Is “mnemonic” the correct term or do you mean “acronym” or “abbreviation” instead? | Replace “mnemonic” with “abbreviation.” | Reject |
| DoD BSWG 17 | Table V-1 | | field11.032 | te | The character type “NS” is used for entries in field 11.032. There is no description of the meaning in “NS” in the key. | Add the character description for “NS” in the character key. | Accept Add “S=special character” |
| Nob59/DHS92/DHS93 | Table V-I | | Field 11.003 | ge | Are Table references supposed to be hyperlinks? If so, they are not working. The Table references need to be standardized in format. Some are green, some are black, some are black and bold, etc. | Fix hyperlinks and create one format for Table references. Standardize the format of the Table references and verify that the hyperlinks are working correctly. | Partial Accept. Brad will resolve hyperlinks. |
| Nob60/DHS94 | Table V-1 | | Field 11.003 | te | The value constraints for this field say from 0 – 4, but Table V-2 shows a value of 5 for no audio object. | Change values to 0 - 5. | Accept |
| FBI-JS5 | Table V-1 | | 11.003, value constraints | Ge | Consistency problem | Change the allowed values to be 0 to 5 to agree with the table V-2. | Accept |
| Nob61/DHS95 | Table V-1 | | Field 11.004 (SRT) | ge | SRT=Signature Representation Type in the Type-8 (8.004). | Suggest alternative mnemonic such as Recording Organization Type (ROT) | Accept See DoDBSWG022 |
| DoD BSWG | Element 11.004\_4: code of the sending country | | Line 828, Table V-1 |  | This information item references *ISO-3166-1. (Similar to 18.003 in the DNA logical record).*  The code set available in NIEM is out of date.  Additionally, it has been determined by US Stakeholders, that US Government Agencies could not adopt ISO 3166 as published, due to unique US Gov requirements. These requirements are to be addressed by a US profile of ISO 3166; the GENC Standard currently under development is this standard.  What is the plan for ITL to coordinate updates with NIEM? adopt GENC profile? | Implement GENC, US Profile of ISO 3166-1.  Although it is understood that ITL is an internationally leveraged standard, it should also allow for choice of either ISO 3166 or user profile. | NOTED Referred to ANSI/NIST committee |
| Nob61A | Table V-1 | | Field 11.004 (SRT) | ge | Do the current categories cover most likely recording agencies? ‘Government’ may not adequately cover law enforcement recordings and 911 calls. | . Add LE to list of sources in item 1 (SRT) of 11.004, to be reflected throughout the document | Partial accept. Change to VRSO. Link to DoDBSWG22 Information is mandatory with up arrow |
| Nob62/DHS96 | Table V-I | | 11.006 (MAK) | ed | Be consistent - Is “none” capitalized or not? | Look throughout the entire table and be consistent in the capitalization of the word “none” | Accept. Replace with “none”. |
| Nob63/DHS97 | Table V-I | | 11.006 (COM) | Ed | Should the content description for COM be “Comments” for all content descriptions that follow? (See also comment information items in 11.012, 11.021, 11.022, 11.023. 11.025, 11.026, 11.031, 11.033, 11.037, 11.904) |  | Partial accept. Change “comment” to “comments” |
| Nob64/DHS98 | Table V-I | | 11.009 (TIM) | Te | Should all start/stop time entries that follow specify units as microseconds (see also information items in 11.022, 11.024, 11.026)? |  | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob65/DHS99 | Table V-I | | 11.009 (TSM) | Te | The maximum value in the value constraints column appears to be 14 characters. | Change the maximum character length to 14 | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob66/DHS100 | Table V-I | | 11.010 (STK) | Te | Why is 200 the maximum character length when the maximum value permitted is 99? | Change the maximum character length to a of 2 | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary. |
| Nob67/DHS101 | Table V-I | | 11.012 (SRT) | Te | It appears that a comma (see 100,000 in the value constraints column) should be allowed as a special character | Allow commas as special characters | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob68/DHS102 | Table V-I | | 11.026 (SID) | ed | Is a comma allowable (see 600,000)? If so, the character type should be NS | If appropriate, change the character type to NS. | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob69/DHS103 | Table V-I | | 11.031 (SID) | ed | Is commas allowable (see 600,000)? If so, Type should be NS. | If appropriate, change the character type to NS. | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob70/DHS104 | Table V-I | | 11.031 (SID) | ed | The maximum value in the value constraints column appears to be 14 characters. | Change the maximum character length to 6 | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob71/DHS105 | Table V-I | | 11.032 (SID) | ed | The value constraints column does not specify if the integers are positive or negative and what the maximum allowed value is. | Reword to “0 or a list of *positive* integers *≤ 600,000* separated by commas” | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob72/DHS106 | Table V-I | | 11.032 (ELE) | ed | Decimal is allowable, but no other special characters are. (see the column of value constraints) | In Constraint block of ELE, add “decimal point is the allowed special character.” | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob73/DHS107 | Table V-I | | 11.033 (SID) | ed | The value constraints column does not specify if the integers are positive or negative and what the maximum allowed value is. (Also applies to SID information items for fields 11.034, 11.035, 11.036, 11.037, 11.038) | Reword to “0 or a list of *positive* integers *≤ 600,000* separated by commas” | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| FBI-JS6 | Table V-1 | | 11.033/COM minimum occurrence | Ge | Consistency problem | Change the minimum occurrence to ‘0’ in accordance with the data dictionary. | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| FBI-JS7 | Table V-1 | | 11.036/SID, minimum occurrence | Ge | Consistency problem | Change the minimum occurrence to ‘1’ in accordance with the data dictionary. | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| FBI-JS8 | Table V-1 | | 11.037/SID, minimum occurrence | Ge | Consistency problem | Change the minimum occurrence to ‘1’ in accordance with the data dictionary. | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob74/DHS108 | Table V-I | | 11.038 (SID) | te | Change the character type to “NS”? |  | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob75/DHS109 | Table V-I | | 11.038 (ENV) | te | Should the allowable character types include special characters like commas and periods? |  | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob76/DHS110 | Table V-I | | 11.038 (ACS) | ge | The referenced table should be Table 88 | Replace Table 83 with Table 88 throughout record Type-11 | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| FBI-JS9 | Table V-1 | | 11.038/SID, minimum occurrence | Ge | Consistency problem | Change the minimum occurrence to ‘1’ in accordance with the data dictionary. | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| DoD BSWG 19 | Table V-1 | | Field 11.903 | te | There is no description of the meaning for the value constraints “M or P”. | Define what is meant by “M or P”. | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| DoD BSWG 18 | Table V-1 | | Field 11.903 | te | The character type “S” is used for entries in field 11.903. There is no description of the meaning in “S” in the key | Add the character description for “NS” in the character key. | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob77/DHS111 | Table V-I | | 11.904 (MMS) | ed | Suggest that this field be distinguished from 11.006 | Suggest excluding this field, as it is identical to 11.006 | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| FBI-JS10 | Table V-1 | | 11.904, min/max occurrence | Ge | Consistency problem | Change the minimum occurrence to ‘0’ and the maximum to ‘1’ in accordance with the data dictionary. | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob78/DHS112 | Table V-I | | 11.995 (CAN) | ed | Should the mnemonic be ACN? |  | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob79/DHS113 | Table V-I | | 11.999 (DATA) | te | Should the maximum character length allowed be “\*” (to accommodate a digital voice recording)? |  | Editor to harmonize table with new text as necessary |
| Nob80/DHS114 | Field 11.002 | | Page 34, Line 778 | ge | Instructions concerning record type-2 belong in the application profile, like EBTS. |  | Noted |
| DoD BSWG 20 | **Field 11.003: Audio Object Descriptor** | | Line 780 |  | This is a de-normalized field containing multiple pieces of data (1: internal vs external; 2: analog vs. digital; 3: physical medium vs. file).    Also, these field values appear to be redundant with values for field id 11.006\_5: | Redefine field and codes to include only codes that are not redundant with **Acquisition Source.** i.e. Internal vs External.  For example, change field to represent a voice-sample-medium-type-code which indicates the type of voice sample medium as:  0 Internal digital file  1 External physical medium | Noted. No text offered. |
| DoD BSWG 21 | Field 11.004: VRI | | insert |  | Consider moving the 11.006\_5 **Acquisition Source** field here because it pertains to sample as a whole and is not specific to the **Audio** **Recording Device.** This instance of **Acquisition Source** would represent the “overall” **Acquisition Source** for the entire voice sample, regardless of number of segments or channels it traversed. |  | Consider at January meeting |
| DoD BSWG 22 | Field 11.004: Voice Recording Information | | Line 801 |  | The **Voice Recording Information** set name implies that it contains information about the voice recording when it is really contains information about the source organization. | Suggest renaming field name to: **Voice Recording Source Organization** | Accept Rename as VRSO |
| DoD BSWG 23 | Field 11.004: Voice Recording Information | | Line 808 |  | The name for the first information item, **source recorder type,** implies that it describes a type of recorder; however it is really describing the source organization:  U = Unknown  P = Private individual  I = Industry / Commercial  G = Government  O = Other | Suggest renaming field name to: **Voice Recording Source Organization Type Code or Source Organization Type Code** (for short) | Accept Source Organization Type Code |
| DoD BSWG 24 | Field 11.004: Voice Recording InformationInfo Item 2 | | Line 818 |  | As per the ISO/IEC 11179 Part 5: Naming and identification principles, the use of prepositions (at, by, from, in, of, to) is discouraged when naming data attributes. Field 11.004\_2, **name of original source,** contains a preposition. | Suggest renaming the second information item of field 11.004, **name of original source** to: **Voice Recording Source Organization Name** or **Source Organization Name** (for short). | Accept Change to SON |
| DoD BSWG 25 | Field 11.004: Voice Recording Information Info Item 4 | | Line 828 |  | As per the ISO/IEC 11179 Part 5: Naming and identification principles, the use of prepositions (at, by, from, in, of, to) and articles (the, a, an) is discouraged when naming data attributes. Field 11.004\_4 contains both. | Suggest renaming the fourth information item of field 11.0004, **code of the sending country** to: **Voice Recording Source Organization Country Code** or **Source Organization Country Code** (for short). | Deferred action with regard to all aspects of country code |
| Nob81/DHS115 | Field 11.004 | | Page 35, Line 807 | ed | As noted on table, SRT=Signature Representation Type for Type-8, field 8.004. | Need a new mnemonic, e.g., Recording Organization Type (ROT) | See NOB61 |
| Nob82/DHS116 | Field 11.004 | | Page 35, Line 807 | ed | Information item descriptions should be consistent in format | Start a new paragraph and add a new bullet in front of “The first information item…” | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 26 | Field 11.005: Role of Voice Recording | | Line 835 |  | Field name contains preposition. Use of prepositions is discouraged when naming data attributes.  Also, the **Role of Voice Recording** field contains values that do not represent roles, they describe the kind of and number of speakers. | Suggest renaming field to: **Speaker Descriptor Code**. | Accept Instruct editor to decompose the table into three fields and reconsider. Change name to Subject Attriributes G;lossary of terms used |
| DoD BSWG 27 | Field 11.006: Recorder | | Line 846 |  | Enhance set name to be a little more descriptive. | Suggest renaming field to: **Audio** **Recording Device** | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 28 | Field 11.006: Recorder Info item 1 | | Line 856 |  | As per the ISO/IEC 11179 Part 5: Naming and identification principles, each data name should have a “representation term” as it’s last component.  The first information item**, recorder type** is missing a “representation term”. | Since this field is defined as a text field of up to 4000 char, suggest renaming field to: **recording equipment description text.** However, it is strongly recommended to come up with a standard list of enumerated values, i.e. home answering machine, speaker phone etc. and name accordingly: **recording equipment type code.**  Field does not need to be constrained to this list but at least the most common types are standardized and then therefore easier to query on subsequent inquiries.  Also a careful evaluation and differentiation between this and the field 11.038 info items 3 transducer type and 4 transducer should be considered so fields do not contain overlapping values. | Accept. Renaming recording device description JPC action item to define recording device, recording equipment, transducer |
| DoD BSWG 29 | Field 11.006: Recorder Info item 5 | | Line 869 |  | The fifth information item, **acquisition source,** pertains to specific voice recording and not the recording device. | Recommend to separate this data item outside this structure since it pertains to the specific voice recording sample and not the recording device. It is also included under **Field 11.038: Segment Channel.** Is it necessary to have this field twice?  Assuming there is a need for the “overall” **acquisition source** for the “end state” voice sample, it should be captured in place of Field 11.003: Audio Object Descriptor or immediately after 11.003. | Noted. No text provided |
| DoD BSWG 30 | Field 11.006: Recorder Info item 5 | | Line 872 |  | The supplement text for the fifth information item, **acquisition source,** states: **“**when multiple sources are used for various voice segments in the voice recording, the code “MS” shall be used and individual sources will be given in the following comment item. “  It is not advised to use comments for recording multiple **acquisition source** values as a de-normalized list. Instead, the “overall” **acquisition source** for the “end state” voice sample could be capturedin the beginning of the **type** 11 in place of or immediately after **Field 11.003.**  Then, the individual sources for the various voice segments can be recorded in a normalized field within the diary(s) or segment(s) to which they pertain. | **Acquisition source** should be a normalized field captured in two different places:  In place of or immediately after field 11.003 to represent overall source  within the diary(s) or segment(s) to which they pertain. | Brad to reword 865 to 875 to clarify, |
| DHS122 | | Field 11.006 | 883 | TE-Minor/Major | Acquisition Sources should be defined on the general quality and storage procedures that are needed for each piece of information. Also limitations on which technologies can be used for each type of recording. Example would be System A is good at analyzing analog recordings, whereas System B is good at digital recordings. |  | Partial accept Copy Field 20.014 into this record and eliminate AQS as an item. Note change to segmentations |
| DoD BSWG 31 | | Field 11.006: RecorderInfo item 6 | Line 883 |  | Info item 6, c**omments,** has text that states: **“**If **AQS** indicates multiple sources, this field should be used to summarize the known sources from which the voice recording was created. | It is not advised to use comments to record de-normalized data values. Sources should be summarized in a normalized field and/or within the diary(s) that they pertain to. | Noted. |
| Nob83/DHS117 | Table V-3 | | Page 36, Line 842 | ge | Is there a need for a comment field to describe “other”? (see second to last row in table) |  | Table to be revised with three items |
| Nob84/DHS118 | Field 11.006 | | Page 37, Line 865/866 | ed |  | Replace “all of the” with “the entire” | Accept |
| Nob85/DHS119 | Field 11.006 | | Page 37, Line 867/868 | ed | Table 83 relates to DNA | Change Table 83 to Table 88 | Accept |
| Nob86/DHS120 | Field 11.006 | | Page 37, Line 869/870 | ed |  | Change Table 83 to Table 88 | Accept |
| Nob87/DHS121 | Field 11.006 | | Page 37, Line 872/873 | ed |  | Change Table 83 to Table 88 | Accept |
| Nob88/DHS123 | Filed 11.006 | | Page 38, Line 881/883 | ed |  | Change Table 83 to Table 88 | Accept |
| FBI-JS11 | Section 6 | | 11.006/COM | Te | The Voice WG identified the possibility that multiple audio sources may need to be tied to their respective snips. | Consider adding “...and their corresponding SIDs.” To the end of the sixth information item. | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 32 | Field 11.007: Record Creation Date | | Line 889 |  | Would this date ever be different from the date when the transaction was created (1.005)? If no, then is this field needed? |  | REJECT. Creation of Type-11, transaction and voice data generally occur on different dates. |
| FBI-JS12 | Section 9 | | 11.009/TSM | Te | The Voice WG identified that the term “sample” is not defined in the document. | Add a definition for “sample” to the Definitions of Specialized Terms, and make sure it is used consistently throughout the document. | “Digital sample” added to list of specialized terms. Definition solicited |
| FBI-JS13 | Section 10 | | 11.010/TRK | Te | The Voice WG identified that the term “track” is not defined in the document. | Add a definition for “track” to the Definitions of Specialized Terms, and make sure it is used consistently throughout the document. | “track” added. Definition solicited. |
| DoD BSWG 33 | Field 11.010: Physical Media Object Info Item 1 | | Line 931 |  | The first information item, **media type** should have a standardized list of enumerated values. (i.e., analog cassette tape, reel-to-reel tape, CD, DVD, phonograph record) | Recommend that this field be renamed **Media Type Description** or **Media Type Code** accordingly and that a standard list of media types be assigned. It does not need to be constrained to this list but at least the most common types are standardized and then therefore easier to query on subsequent inquiries. | Accept as --- add E.G. in place of i.e. |
| DoD BSWG 34 | Field 11.010: Physical Media ObjectInfo Items 2-6 | | Line 942-961 |  | Rename fields as per the ISO/IEC 11179 Part 5: Naming and identification principles to include appropriate representation term. | Rename fields as follows:  recording speed units to recording speed measurement unit description text  equalization to equalization text  tracks to track count  speaker track to speaker track number | Accept: Rename eq, track count, speaker track number. |
| Nob89/DHS124 | Field 11.010 | | Page 40, Line 935 | ed |  | Bold the “r” in “recording speed” | Accept |
| Nob90/DHS125 | Field 11.010 | | Page 40, Line 940 | ed |  | Bold the “r” in “recording speed units” | Accept |
| Nob91/DHS126 | Field 11.010 | | Page 40, Line 944 | ed |  | Bold the “e” in “equalization” | Accept |
| Nob92/DHS127 | Field 11.010 | | Page 40, Line 946 | ge | How is this information to be expressed? |  | Noted. No text provided. |
| Nob93/DHS128 | Field 11.010 | | Page 40, Line 948 | ed |  | Bold the “t” in “tracks” | Accept |
| Nob94/DHS129 | Field 11.010 | | Page 40, Line 952 | ed |  | Bold the “s” in “speaker track” | Accept |
| Nob95/DHS130 | Field 11.010 | | Page 40, Line 955 | ge | Change to “comments” for consistency? (See also Lines 1017, 1060, 1095, 1123, 1171, 1127, 1271, 1329, 1389, 1490, 1658, 1728) |  | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 35 | Field 11.012: Codec | | Line 965 |  | Does **Field 11.012: Codec** contain information aboutthe CODEC or about the container? | Name accordingly. | REJECT. Field 11.011 is container. Field 11.012 is Codec. |
| Nob96/DHS132 | Field 11.011 | | Page 41, Line 984 | te | The term “canonical containers” in not clear | Reword or further explain the term “canonical containers” | Vince and JPC to rkevisit \* formats. Remove all contrainers without \* Rewrite sentence abut transcoding |
| DHS113 | Field 11.011 | | 991 | GE | As done in other tables add additional numbering to the attribute codes to allow for additional file types that have yet to be produced. The other choice would be to create an Other attribute code that allows for free text to be added, no more than 10 characters would be needed. |  | JPC and Vince rto consider |
| DoD BSWG 36 | Field 11.012: Codec Info Items 1-6 | | Line 1020 |  | Rename fields as per the ISO/IEC 11179 Part 5: Naming and identification principles to include appropriate representation term. | Rename fields as follows:  Codec type to CODEC type code  sampling rate to sampling rate number  bit depth to bit depth count  endian to endian code  fixed point to fixed point indicator  number of channels to channel count | Accept |
| Nob97/DHS134 | Field 11.012 | | Page 41, Line 1035 | ed | Up until now, the term “information item” has been used instead of “item”. Going forward, both terms appear to be used. | Use either “information item” or “item” consistently throughout the document. | Accept |
| FBI-JS14 | Section 12 | | 11.012/SRT | Te | The Vince Stanford identified that the sampling rate in the document should be presented in Hz only. | Remove references to kHz and MHz in the description for the second information item. Also, it should be an integer value, not a decimal. | Accept |
| FBI-JS15 | Section 12 | | 11.012/SRT | Te | The Vince Stanford identified that the sampling rate value of ‘0’ is reserved to mean ‘unknown’ or ‘variable’, and is not an actual sampling rate value. | Clarify the allowed sampling rate values are from 1 to 100,000,000 Hz, and indicate that ‘0’ is only to be used for unknown or variable sampling rates. | Accept |
|  | Field 11.013 | | 1072 | GE | Since IBIA is not officially recognized, if IBIA gives an endorsement to the quality or the matching of a potential voice sample can be called into question if further scrutiny of the sample is needed. |  | Noted |
|  | Field 11.013 | | 1074 | TE-Major | 0 (low quality) and 100 (high quality) with no definition on how this number is obtained. This is not something that can be left up to the company creating the technology; there has to be a clear set of guidance on what a good sample is, just like there when a Fingerprint Analyst is assessing a recovered fingerprint for viability. |  | Noted |
| Nob98/DHS137 | Field 11.013 | | Page 43, Line 1077 | ed | Table V-1 under Value Constraints says “integer”. There are inconsistencies in that sometimes the text says integer and table does not, and also vice versa. | Add “as an integer” so that the sentence reads: “shall indicate the general quality as an integer value between…” Adopt a consistent approach throughout the document, so that the text and the table say the same thing. | Accept. Add “shall indicate the general quality as an integer value between…” |
| DoD BSWG 37 | Field 11.021: Redaction  Info Item 2 | | Line 1120 |  | Re Information item 2, **redaction authority,** could one agency direct/authorize a redaction while another agency directs/authorizes a different redaction? | If so, consider grouping this field inside the 11.022 Redaction Diary so that authorizing agency can be associated accordingly. Also consider renaming to **Redaction Authority Organization Name.** | Partial Accept: Rename redaction authority |
| DoD BSWG 38 | Field 11.022: Redaction Diary  Info Item 2 | | Line 1134 |  | The second item, t**racks,** is a de-normalized, comma separated field. | Can this be normalized by breaking out into separate field that repeats? | Noted. Editor doesn’t understand the term “normalized”. See DoD30 |
| Nob99/DHS138 | Field 11.023 | | Page 46, Line 1180-1181 | te | For snips conveyed in one Type-11 record, how can snips that originated from multiple voice recordings be related back to their original source recording? | Put each source recording in a separate Type-20 record, as indicated in 11.024 | Partial accept Editor to reword first sentence. Remove reference to multiple sources in one type-11 record |
| Nob100/DHS139 | Field 11.023 | | Page 46, Line 1188-1189 | te | If 11.023 is present, shouldn’t value of SGI default to “1”? |  | Editor to revise with above 11.023 can indicate no snipping at the time of record creation. |
| DoD BSWG 39 | Field 11.023: Snipping Segmentation  Info Item 2 | | Line 1193 |  | Re the second information item **snipping authority,** could one agency direct/authorize a snip while another agency directs/authorizes a different snip? | If so, consider grouping this field inside the 11.024 Snipping Diary so that authorizing agency can be associated accordingly. Also consider renaming field to **Snip Authority Organization Name.** | Revise with above |
| Nob101/DHS140 | Field 11.024 | | Page 46, Line 1204 | ed | The part of the sentence, “allows this type to document the snips obtained…” is awkwardly worded | Change to “allows the documentation of snips obtained…” | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 40 | Field 11.024: Snipping Diary  Info Item 2 | | Line 1223 |  | The second item, t**racks,** is a de-normalized, comma separated field. | Can this be normalized by breaking out into separate field that repeats? | Noted. |
| DoD BSWG 41 | Field 11.025: Diarization  Info Item 2 | | Line 1255 |  | Re the second information item **diarization authority,** could one agency direct/authorize a diarization, while another agency directs/authorizes a different diarization? | If so, consider grouping this field inside the 11.026 Segment Diary so that authorizing agency can be associated accordingly. Also consider renaming to **Diarization Authority Organization Name**. | Reject: because. The current concept is that multiple diaries require multiple Type-11 records |
| Nob102/DHS141 | Field 11.026 | | Page 48, Line 1280-1281 | ge | A Best Practices document would benefit from specifying criteria for the inclusion of uncertain segments—a numerical threshold for automated segmenters or a confidence level for manual segmentation. |  | Noted |
| DoD BSWG 42 | Field 11.026: Segment  Diary  Info Item 2 | | Line 1307 |  | The second item, t**racks,** is a de-normalized, comma separated field. | Can this be normalized by breaking out into separate field that repeats? | Noted. |
| Nob103/DHS142 | Field 11.031 | | Page 50, Line 1364 | ed | For the sentence, “The fourth item (tagged date/TDT) is optional and gives the date tagged on the original…”, what is meant by “tagged”? | Clarify the meaning of “tagged”. | Noted. |
| DoD BSWG 43 | Field 11.031: Time of Segment Recording  Info Item 3 | | Line 1362 |  | The third item **(date of original recording)** contains “of” preposition. | Rename to **Original recording date.** | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 44 | Field 11.031: Time of Segment Recording  Info Item 5 | | Line 1371 |  | The fifth item **(start time of segment recording)** contains “of” preposition. | Rename to **segment recording start time** | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 45 | Field 11.031: Time of Segment Recording  Info Item 7 | | Line 1380 |  | The seventh item (**end time of recording**)contains “of” preposition. | Rename to **segment recording end time** | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 46 | Field 11.031: Time of Segment Recording  Info Item 9 | | Line 1389 |  | The ninth item, **Source of the time,** should be renamed. | Rename to **time source description text** | Accept |
| DHS143 | Field 11.032 | | 1444 | GE | NIEM needs to be spelled out before being short-titled | Replace with “National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) | Accept |
| DHS144 | Field 11.033 | | 1481 | GE | A fifth information item ... algorithm, which may be registered with the IBIA, but registration is not required. NIST is creating a standard, IBIA is not required but NIST can make it a requirement, allowing them to be the ‘gold standard’ that everything is compared against. |  | Noted |
| DHS145 | Field 11.034 | | 1500 | TE-Minor | A Vocal Collision Indicator is needed, but it is possible to separate overlapping voices on a recording. If properly documented and attached to the records this process could be invaluable, especially when you look at people talking in crowds or over the phone, people are constantly talking over one another, we are limiting the use of this biometric. |  | Noted. |
| Nob104/DHS146 | Field 11.034 | | Page 52, Line 1498 | ge | How would a collision indicator normally be used (address in a Best Practices document)? |  | Noted. |
| DoD BSWG 47 | Field 11.034: Vocal Collision Indicator | | Line 1504 |  | **Field 11.034: Vocal Collision Indicator** is not an indicator (y/n value) but rather a set of information Items. | Rename to **Vocal Collision.** | Change to Vocal Collision identifiers |
| Nob105/DHS147 | Field 11.036 | | Page 54, Line 1564 | ge | Should there be separate fields for each of these four items? (For instance, might an application benefit from directly accessing the phonetic transcript in automated processing of voice records?) |  | Noted. |
| Nob106/DHS148 | Field 11.036 | | Page 54, Line 1564 | te | The SID subfield suggests that a single transcription can pertain to multiple segments? |  | Yes |
| DoD BSWG 48 | Field 11.036: Segment Content  Info Item 3 | | Line 1565 |  | The third information item, **transcript,** is missing a “representation term”. | rename to **transcript text** | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 49 | Field 11.036: Segment Content  Info Item 4 | | Line 1569 |  | The fourth information item, **transcript authority** could be more descriptive. | rename to transcript authority comment text | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 50 | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 3 | | Line 1595 |  | The third information item**, impairment,** should be renamed to be more descriptive and to include appropriate representation term. | rename to **impairment level number** | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 51 | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 4 | | Line 1601 |  | The fourth item, **language being spoken,** should be renamed | rename to **dominant spoken language code** | Accept |
| Nob107/dhs149 | Field 11.037 | | Page 55, Line 1602 | te | The fluency of the spoken language is listed on a scale of 0-9. Are only integers allowed? It is assumed this is the case since the minimum and maximum amount of characters allowed in the fifth information item is 1. | Specify that only integers are allowed. Also, update Table V-I. | Accept |
| Nob108/DHS150 | Table V-6 | | Page 55, Attribute code 7 | ge | What does “map task and related methods” refer to? | Explain the meaning of map task, for those not familiar with the style of speech, and specify what is meant by “related methods”. | Accept Task induced speech stype |
| DoD BSWG 52 | | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 5 | Line 1604 |  | A fifth information item **language proficiency,** should be renamed to be reflect scale and to include appropriate representation term. | rename to **language proficiency scale number** | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 53 | | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 6 | Line 1607 |  | The sixth information item **(style of speech/** should be renamed.    ISO calls this the ConversationalType:  Unknown  Spontaneous/Free  Reading  Prompt  Conversational  Other | rename to **speech style code**  synchronize with ISO Draft 19794-13 | Partial accept. Add “spontaineous/free” |
| DoD BSWG 54 | | Table V-6  Style of Speech | Line 1613 |  | Remove preposition in name of **Table V-6**  **Style of Speech** | Rename table to **Speech Style;** also rename columns accordingly | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 55 | | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 7 | Line 1618 |  | The seventh information item, **intelligibility,** should be renamed to include scale and representative term. | Rename to **intelligibility scale code** | Accept |
| Nob109/DHS152 | | Field 11.037 | Page 56, Line 1620 | te | For the statement, “with 0 indicating no familiarity and 5 indicating high familiarity/intimacy”, it is unclear whether the input value ranges from 0 to 5. | Specify that the value ranges from 0-5 as is stated in Table V-1 and that the value can only be an integer (since the maximum character length is 1) | Accept, but add wording. |
| DHS151 | | Field 11.037 | 1621, 1625, 1630 | GE | Intimacy, health status and emotional state are too subjective especially to be limited to a coding system, if this kind of assessment is to be done it should be in a comments section, where it could add possible context to the analysis. For example a person talking to someone on a cell phone, in an angry tone, could be a code that something is wrong, just like using code words in what appears to be a normal conversation (example talking about an upcoming wedding means upcoming attack). Adding the narrative requirement provides this context. |  | Noted. 11.037 contains a comment item. |
| DoD BSWG 56 | | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 8 | Line 1621 |  | The eighth information item, **intimacy,** should be renamed to be more descriptive and to include appropriate representative term. | Rename to **familiarity degree code** | Accept |
| DHS153 | | Field 11.037 | 1622-1623 | ge | “with 0 indicating no familiarity and 5 indicating high familiarity/intimacy.” – wrong font size | Change font size to 12 pt | Accept. |
| DoD BSWG 57 | | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 9 | Line 1625 |  | The ninth information item, **health status,** should be renamed so name accurately depicts field contents. | Rename to **health comment** | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 58 | | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 10 | Line 1630 |  | The tenth information item, **emotional state,** should be renamed to include appropriate representative term. | Rename to **emotional state code** | Accept |
| Nob110/DHS154 | | Field 11.037 | Page 57, Line 1630-1631 | ge | The document states that “Only one value for this item is allowed across all of the segments”. The emotional state can easily vary throughout the course of a conversation. Is there a practical need for greater granularity? |  | Partial accept. Add “variable” to Table 6 |
| DHS155 | | Field 11.037 | 1636 | GE-Major | Multiple claims have been made that some of the characteristic fields are too subjective adding fields such as emotional state and vocal style would add even more confusion to any analysis done to the voice. For example I could say the subject was 4-Angry (Table V7) and 3-Sung (Table V8) to the individual on the phone. My counterpart performed the same analysis and stated the subject was 6-Agitated/Combative (Table V7) and 5-Rapped (Table V8) to the individual on the phone. Technically neither one of us would be wrong. Although it would add additional space requirements, requiring a narrative analysis of the voice recording would be more worthwhile. |  | Noted. |
| DHS156 | | Field 11.037 | 1654 | GE- Major | Awareness of the recording process is a very important piece of information. This piece should be in a field much earlier in the report instead of buried in the information fields. This is especially important to LE and IC agencies. |  | Noted |
| DHS157 | | Field 11.037 | 1658 | GE | If a script is utilized during the voice collection sample, the database should prompt that the script used should be added to the comments section (15th Field – Comments). This may require the 4,000 character limit to be increased or a way of attaching the script to the record. Since scripts are utilized to ensure a good biometric sample is created, the script’s validity may come into question and it would be good to have a copy of it. |  | Noted. The 14th information item is currently reserved for the script. |
| DoD BSWG 59 | | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 11 | Line 1641 |  | The eleventh information item, **vocal effort**, should be renamed to include scale appropriate representative term. | Rename to **vocal effort scale number** | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 60 | | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 12 | Line 1645 |  | The twelfth information item, **vocal style,** should be renamed to include appropriate representative term. | Rename to **vocal style code** | Accept |
| DoD BSWG 61 | | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 13 | Line 1654 |  | The thirteenth information item, **awareness of the recording process,** should be renamed to more accurately depict field contents. | Rename to **recording awareness indicator** | Accept |
| Nob111/DHS158 | | Field 11.037 | Page 57, Line 1656 | ed | The document states “The fourteenth (script/SCR) is optional…” | Reword sentence to: “The fourteenth *information item* (script/SCR) is optional…” | Accept. |
| DoD BSWG 62 | | Field 11.037: Segment Speaker Characteristics  Info Item 14 | Line 1658 |  | The fourteenth information item, **script,** should be renamed to include appropriate representative term. | Rename to **Script text** | Accept |
| Nob112/DHS159 | | Field 11.037 | Page 57, Line 1659 | ed | The document states “The fifteenth (script/SCR) is optional…” | Reword sentence to: “The fifteenth *information item* (script/SCR) is optional…” | Accept |
| Nob113/DHS160 | | Field 11.037 | Page 57, Line 1660 | ed | Speaker “characteristics” rather than “quality”? | Reword to “…information about the *characteristics* assessment process…” | Accept |
| FBI-JS16 | Section 28 | | 11.037/EM  Second Sentence | Ge | Consistency problem | The change the stated value for “other” to ‘9’ in the second sentence in order to agree with table V-7. | Accept |
| Nob114/DHS162 | Field 11.038 | | Page 57, Line 1685 | ed | Incorrect reference to Table V-8 | Replace “Table V-8” with “Table V-9” | Accept |
| Nob115/116/DHS163 | Field 11.038 | | Page 57, Line 1685 | ed | Incorrect reference to Table 83 | Replace “Table 83” with “Table 88” | Accept |
| Nob117/DHS164 | Table V-9 | | Page 58, Attribute code 2 | ge | What does “Multiple style microphones” refer to? | Explain the meaning of “multiple style microphones” | Editor to add words about microphone differences within a single room |
| DHS161 | Field 11.038 | | 1686, 1705 | GE- Major | Defining the transducer type should NOT be an optional integer, this goes directly to the quality of the recording and may need to be known by the LE or IC agency. The distance also should be indicated (although this may not be known or could be improperly gauged), this goes directly to the quality of the collection and may also have the LE or IC requirement. |  | Noted. Microphone characteristics and distance are not always known. |
| DoD BSWG 63 | Field 11.038: Segment Channel  Info Items 3 and 4 | | Lines 1686 - 1696 |  | Info items 3 (**transducer type**) and 4 (**transducer**) have names that are too similar and will be easily confused.  The description for info item 4 confuses it further by indicating itspecifies the **transducer type** as unknown=0, carbon=1, electret=2, or other=3.    ISO calls the field that differentiates between values carbon, electret, and unknown: **MicrophoneType**  ISO includes the following values for **Transducer Type:**  Telephone (default)  Microphone  Unknown  Handheld  Mobile phone | Rename info item 3 **transducer type** to **audio capture device type code.**  Rename info item 4 **transducer** to **transducer-principle-type-code** or **signal-conversion-methodology-code** or **transducer-material-type-code or microphone-type-code.**  Synchronization with ISO Draft 19794-13 should be considered.  Should these info items be moved to be under 11.006 since they pertain to the device and not the recording or segment channel? Will they ever be different for the same segment? | Accept. Add “dynamic” type as 4 |
| Nob118/DHS165 | Field 11.038 | | Page 58, Line 1695-1696 | ge | Is “mixed transducer types” the same as multiple style microphones? |  | Accept. Change “mixed’ to “multiple” |
| Nob119/DHS166 | Field 11.038 | | Page 58, Line 1698 | te | ASCII or uni-code? ASCII would cover these constraints assuming the alphabet used is English. Other fields give encoding specific requirements for numeric values. It would seem such requirements should be specific for text strings as well. | Specify whether the text encoding is ASCII or uni-code. | Accept all text fields should be UNICODE |
| Nob120/DHS167 | Field 11.038 | | Page 58, Line 1700 | ge | Would a more structured means of description be useful? Would a code table of common environments be useful? | Consider using a table or other method to organize the examples of text | Noted. |
| DoD BSWG 64 | Field 11.038: Segment Channel  Info Item 5 | | Line 1700 |  | The fifth item (**capture environment)** should be renamed to include appropriate representative term. | Rename to **capture environment description text** | Accept |
| DoD BSWG65 | Field 11.038: Segment Channel  Info Item 6 | | Line 1705 |  | The sixth item (**distance to transducer)** should be renamed to include appropriate representative term.  ISO draft 19794-13 recommends that the following distinct string values be used instead of integers:  *Near-field*  *Mid-field*  *Far-field*  *Other*  *Unknown*  With a default value of *Near-field*  This approach is preferred by ISO to using a numeric specification of actual distance because it is generally not possible to access that level of detail. NIST should consider adjusting value set accordingly.  NOTE: the example distances provided,  handheld = 5cm;  throat mic = 0cm,  mobile telephone = 15cm;  VOIP with a computer = 80cm  suggest that this data attribute could be reference data that can be derived based on the microphone type or capture device type (see example table provided in next column) | Rename to **transducer distance dimension or transducer distance text.**  Reconsider necessity of field if reference data can be used to derive. For example: | Partial accept. Change to “text” |
| DoD BSWG66 | Field 11.038: Segment Channel  Info Item 7 | | Line 1712 |  | The seventh item (**acquisition source/ACS**) | Is this redundant with field **Field 11.006\_5?** | Partial accept Add item for noise cancelling . |
| Nob121/DHS168 | Field 11.038 | | Page 58, Line 1712 | Ed | Incorrect reference to Table 83 | Replace “Table 83” with “Table 88” | Accept |
| DoD BSWG67 | Field 11.038: Segment Channel  Info Item 8 | | Line 1719 |  | The eighth item (**alteration/ALT**) should be renamed to include appropriate representative term. | Rename to **alteration description text** | Accept |
| Nob122/DHS169 | Field 11.902 | | Page 59, Line 1759 | ed | A description of the subfields shown in Table V-1 is missing. | Describe the subfields shown in Table V-1 directly below Line 1758 | Reject . |
| Nob123 | Field 11.903 | | Page 59, Line 1762 | ge | Do 11.903 and 11.904 refer to the same “device”? | For the recorder, this information can be addressed in 11.006. Would these two fields be focused on the transducer (microphone), which is introduced in 11.038? | Accept Eliminate 903 and 904. What about software sype used I nthe recording |
| DHS170 | Field 11.903 | | 1766, 1771 | GE | Question: Where can I locate Clause 7.7.1.1 & 7.7.1.2? |  | Pages 43 and 44 of ANSI/NIST 2011 |
| FBI-JS17 | Section 41 | | 11.995 | Te | Unnecessary data restriction | Change description to allow for field 11.995 to apply to all audio object type records, not just ones with included binary files. | Accept |
| FBI-JS18 | Section 42 | | 11.996 | Te | Unnecessary data restriction | Change description to allow for field 11.996 to apply to all audio object type records, not just ones with included binary files. | Accept |