Avri Doria

I am abstaining from the vote on the acceptance of the report from FTI Consulting due to the fact that while I accept the path forward as defined in the motion, I cannot accept the report itself.

From my study of the documentation provided by FTI Consulting, I am concerned about the rigor of the study and some of its conclusions. In scope 2, the analysis of the application of criteria, while they described a rigorous methodology, the documentation describes their inability to fully apply that methodology. The report indicates that they were not able to obtain all of the required documentation from the CPE provider necessary for the full application of the process they had defined. Any scientific method, when the method cannot be rigorously applied, the results be viewed as, at best, tentative and should be treated with caution. Though FTI Consulting reports that there is no evidence of differential application of criteria, they cannot claim with certainty that there was no differential application in the absence of full and rigorous application of their chosen methodology.

It also appears in the report that only a portion of the evaluators were interviewed. In fact, the report states that FTI consulting only interviewed two of the evaluators from a larger set of evaluators. This appears to me to be another flaw in the application of their methodology.

Any definitive determination that there was no conclusive differential application of criteria would require a further in-depth study of all CPE applications and would require not only the missing documentation but also require interviewing all of the evaluators and not just the two remaining employees of the evaluation teams.

At this point, it does not seem possible for a more in-depth study to be done, yet it is important that the process of resolving the contention set moves forward.

I, therefore, abstain from this motion.