* We agreed to update our response language for the responses that included File QA in their comment to, " We have chosen not to implement the 95% confidence level option for file QA or offer a secondary option for field QA at this time. The public comment consensus leads the Task Group to believe that the 10% file QA and 1% field QA is currently effective. There are proposed changes to Chapter 9 to incorporate RESNET receiving more QA results. As more statistics are built, the best methods for file and field QA will be re-evaluated in the future." (The underlined portions are the field additions to our already agreed to file comment, they will not be underlined in the comment response.)
* We updated those comments that required a field comment response, rejecting all but the comment from the BER which we agreed to in principle since it stated that we should not make changes without data driving us toward that change.
* We discussed our response to Thiel Butner, comment 16, which was the editorial items comment that we had agreed at the last meeting to incorporate with the Chapter 9 update that is going out for public comment. For her response we agreed in principle, used the above comment, and added that we appreciated the editorial changes and would be incorporating them in the Chapter 9 update rather than in this amendment.
* We completed our review of the Google Doc for any additional data items that we would like to see gathered for our upcoming future data analysis and determined that everything we are hoping to be able to analyze will be gathered with the requirement to incorporate QA Checklist items into the registry or are already available and being gathered in the registry.