NIST has not submitted comments or rebuttals. The Editor's response is the only set of statements from NIST

| Comment Number | Comment | Editor's Response |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | We are not sure why this needs to be separated into two records. We believe it is important to consider the impact on legacy systems. | |
| 2 | While all images have properties in common, the additional properties need to describe Scar/Mark/Tattoo (SMT) images are distinctly different from the properties needed to describe a facial image. It makes good sense to separate these into two different record types. | |
| 3 | The amount of documentation required to keep Type-10 synchroized with Type-11 appears huge. Consider freezing the Type-10 record at the 1-1007 version level, and adding the 1-2010 enhancing features ONLY to the Type-11 record. Any implementation of these enhancements would necessarily be a "new implementation" and new implementations should use Type-11. | This will be up to the canvassees as to the best approach, should this general proposal get accepted |
| 4 | New implementations should require users to use Types 11 & 12 | This will be up to the canvassees as to the best approach, should this general proposal get accepted |