



## Process and Policy for Deferring, Rescheduling and Withdrawing Measures from Endorsement and Maintenance Consideration

---

### Deferring endorsement recommendation

The suspension of a measure's endorsement recommendation is based on suggestions and/or recommendations from a Standing Committee or the Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC). Measure deferment precludes a final endorsement decision until the stipulation(s) put forward by one of the aforementioned bodies are satisfied in an agreed upon timeline between the measure steward and the body rendering the decision.

### Process

1. A decision to defer a measure's endorsement recommendation can happen at three different points in the Consensus Development Process (CDP):
  - a. **Standing Committee Review:** During the in-person meeting the Standing Committee reviews the information provided and makes recommendations for measure enhancements to improve the quality of the submission. The Standing Committee, with guidance from NQF staff, proposes a timeframe in which their recommendations should be adhered to and the measure should be re-evaluated (e.g. within 3-6 months or next endorsement and maintenance project). The steward/developer must confirm the feasibility of the changes, agree to the timeline, and follow up with NQF staff within 14 days following the meeting with a plan and timeline to revise the measure as proposed by the Committee.
  - b. **CSAC Review:** The CSAC reviews the Standing Committee's endorsement recommendation but advises that there should be additional considerations addressed. The CSAC, with guidance from NQF staff, proposes a timeline in which their recommendations should be adhered to and the measure should be re-evaluated (e.g. within 3-6 months or next endorsement and maintenance project). The steward/developer must confirm the feasibility of the changes, agree to the timeline, and follow up with NQF staff within 14 days following the meeting with a plan and timeline to revise the measure as recommended by the CSAC. The Standing Committee will evaluate the updated information and forward its recommendation to the CSAC.

2. Upon agreement with deferment decision by the measure's steward/developer, the project staff suspends all further review activity until the established date of re-submission.
3. Project staff will update the measure's status in OPUS to designate it as being "deferred" and make a note to include the rationale behind the decision.

### **Re-scheduling endorsement and maintenance review**

The decision is made by NQF staff to reschedule a measure's endorsement and maintenance review. (The measure steward/developer or NQF staff may request postponement of the review). A measure's endorsement and maintenance review can be rescheduled for one of the following reasons:

- Updates to external guidelines that affect a measure's specifications at a time that is not aligned with the established timeline for the project in which the measure is assigned.
- Measure steward/developer's internal review process that affect a measure's specifications at a time that is not aligned with the established timeline for the project in which the measure is assigned.
- Number of anticipated or submitted measures to the project exceeds NQF's submission and review threshold (e.g. 25 measures per project).

### **Process**

1. NQF Maintenance staff will decide whether to reschedule a measure's review date in the event one of the reasons described above occurs.
2. NQF Maintenance staff will notify the appropriate project team and measure steward/developer of the rescheduled review date.

### **Measure Withdrawn by Developer**

All measures in NQF's portfolio are subject to maintenance review by a Standing Committee per [NQF's Maintenance Policy](#). A measure developer can decide to withdraw their measure from consideration at any point prior to the CSAC Review during the [Consensus Development Process](#) based on one or more of the following reasons:

1. Measure is no longer in use.
2. Measure is considered "topped out," meaning it no longer addresses a performance gap area.
3. There is no longer evidence to support the measure.
4. Measure is determined to no longer be reliable and/or valid.
5. Developer is no longer able to support measure.
6. Other