

This is what NIST thinks of the standard the lab relies upon as stated in Gormley's affidavit: It is "under revision" for lack of scientific rigor. <http://www.nist.gov/forensics/nist-statement-on-astm-e2329-14.cfm>

"At the same time, concerns have been raised that some of the language in the standard is not scientifically rigorous. Both NIST and the FSSB have independently asked that ASTM review the language. For example, the standard currently states that "an appropriate analytical scheme effectively results in no uncertainty in reported identifications." NIST recognizes that the scientific community is still working to develop language that completely captures the confidence that should be associated with a qualitative measurement. Nevertheless, based on accepted scientific protocols, no measurement, qualitative or quantitative, should be characterized as without the risk of error or uncertainty."

NIST recognizes that the scientific community is still working to develop language that completely captures the confidence that should be associated with a qualitative measurement.

qualitative measurement – The Quality of the something

quantitative measurement – Of, the relating to or expressible in terms of quantity

Nevertheless, based on accepted scientific protocols, no measurement, qualitative or quantitative, should be characterized as without the risk of error or uncertainty."