Comment from Project Consultants Daniel Ho, David Marcus, and Gerald Ray on *Quality Assurance Systems in Agency Adjudication*
October 26, 2021

We wanted to pass along some comments to the Recommendation draft.

- The last eleven words in 3 are an important point but don't really go with the rest of what is discussed in 3 and may fit better under Timing and Process (8 and 9) than under Development of QA Standards, or should be a standalone point under the Development section.

- Under 9(c), we should probably weave this into the report, but it is possible to do a more targeted sampling that is not random, like the focused reviews.

- 11 should be broadened to include data analytics and data visualizations. The reference to AI should be "data science and AI," as most agencies will get a big return by simpler data analytics (e.g., the heat maps).

- It might be helpful if there was a recommendation entirely devoted to peer review, given that this is a significant point of difference between this report and Jerry Mashaw's original take. Perhaps something like:

  "Agencies should investigate whether formal or informal models will help improve quality review and enhance collaborative learning within the agency. In particular, agencies should explore how adjudicators can help their peers with ongoing cases and how line-level decision-makers can provide feedback to the quality review team."

- We aren't entirely sure what the posited risk in recommendation 8 is. Pre-decisional review (or pre-effectuation review) would still be looking for legal/factual issues.

- The standard of review is not mentioned and that seems critical for transparency of any disclosure about QA results.

Daniel Ho, David Marcus, and Gerald Ray