#27

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)

Started: Friday, August 31, 2018 11:10:12 AM Last Modified: Friday, August 31, 2018 11:15:02 AM

Time Spent: 00:04:50

Page 1

Q1 Proponent's Full Name* If this proposal is jointly developed by more than one Working Group member, please write the full names of all proponents involved.

Zak Muscovitch

Q2 What type of URS recommendation are you proposing?

Policy

Q3 What URS recommendation are you proposing?* Please be succinct as well as substantially specific and not general in nature.* One proposal for one recommendation only.

Revise URS Rule 6 to reflect the following new provision:

6(a) Each Provider shall maintain and publish a publicly available list of Examiners and their qualifications by way of publishing a current curriculum vitae updated on a regular basis.

Q4 What is your rationale for the proposal? (250 words max)

As per the Super Consolidated URS Topics Table at Section M(1), it was found that some providers do not seem to publish all of their examiner's CV's. Rule 6(a) merely requires the provider to list the panelist's qualifications. This should be clarified to expressly require a CV. Moreover, it is important that this CV be reasonably current, as some panelists have been around for 20 years and their CV may not have been updated since. Knowing a panelist's background of course informs parties and stakeholders as to their suitableness for appointment.

Q5 What evidence do you have in support of your proposal? Please detail the source of your evidence. (250 words max)

From a cursory review of panelist CV's on provider websites, it appears that some have not been updated in many years, whereas others apparently have been updated. For example, randomly looking at Carol Stoner's CV for example (http://www.adrforum.com/SearchPanelists#), it appears that it may not have been updated since 2010 (according to metadata, and assuming there is something to update since then), whereas for example, randomly looking at Jeffrey Samuels' CV, it appears to have been updated in 2018 (according to metadata). Further examination of this is required by way of making inquiries to the Providers.

Q6 Where and how has this issue been addressed (or not) by the Working Group or the Sub Teams to date? (250 words max)

As noted above, the Super Consolidated URS Topics Table at Section M(1), found that some providers do not seem to publish all of their examiner's CV's. Rule 6(a) merely requires the provider to list the panelist's qualifications, however the issue of having current CV's was not addressed.

Q7 Does the data collected and reviewed by the Sub Teams show a need to address this issue and develop recommendations accordingly? (250 words max)

Data was not collected on this issue.

Q8 If not already addressed above, on the basis of what information, gathered from what source or Sub Team, is this proposal based, if any? Please provide details. (250 words max)

n/a