

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Moderator: Care Coordination
May 16, 2017
2:00 p.m. ET

Operator: This is Conference #: 93986725.

Welcome, everyone. The webcast is about to begin. Please note today's call is being recorded. Please stand by.

(Katie Goodwin): Hi. Good afternoon, everyone. This is (Katie Goodwin) here at NQF and I'm also here with the rest of the Care Coordination team, (May), (Yetunde) and Peg. We'd like to thank you all for joining us today. This is the Care Coordination Standing Committee Post Comment call.

The purpose of today's meeting is to review post-evaluation public and member comments that we received. We won't be asking the committee to provide input on proposed responses to the comments and determine whether or not any other courses of action are warranted.

Before we proceed, I would like to pause and we'll take a quick roll to see who is on the call with us from the committee.

(May): OK. Samira Beckwith?

Samira Beckwith: Here.

(May): (Chris Dezii)? OK. (Carissa Patella)? OK. (Jeff Wyfitch)?

(Jeff Wyfitch): I'm here.

(May): OK. (Emma Coppola)?

(Emma Coppola): Hi. I'm here.

(May): OK. Don Casey?

Don Casey: Present.

(May): Gerri Lamb?

Gerri Lamb: Yes. I'm here.

(May): Rich Antonelli?

Rich Antonelli: Present.

(May): OK. (Colby Birch)? OK. (Ryan Color)?

(Ryan Color): Here.

(May): OK. (Cheri Erickson)? OK. Barbara Gage?

Barbara Gage: Here, but I have to leave at 3.

(May): OK. That's fine. Thanks for letting us know. (Dawn Hall)? Marcia James?
(Brenda Leeds)? Russell Leftwich?

Russell Leftwich: Here.

(May): OK. Lorna Lynn?

Lorna Lynn: Present.

(May): OK. (Karen Michael)? (Karen Pinelli)? And Ellen Schultz?

Ellen Schultz: Here.

(Katie Goodwin): Good. Thank you. Thanks, (May). And as a reminder, this call is open to the public and we also expect our developer colleagues to be on as well.

(Crosstalk)

(Dawn Hall): Oh, I'm sorry. This is (Dawn Hall). Just I got dialed in.

(Katie Goodwin): Hi, (Dawn).

(May): OK, thanks.

(Dawn Holly): Hi. Thank you.

(Chris Dezii): And (Chris Dezii) dialed in too.

(Katie Goodwin): OK. Hi, (Chris).

(Chris Dezii): Hi. Thank you.

(Katie Goodwin): OK. So, again, the purpose is today's call is to review the public comments that we received and also provide input on proposed responses to the comments.

As far as our process go, we did post the draft report for a 30-day public comment period that was from April 3rd to May 2nd. We received 20 comments on the various measures. Many of the comments were in agreement with the standing committee's recommendations. And then we were able to see several comments into three major schemes and Peg will be walking us through that in just a moment.

Male: All right.

(Katie Goodwin): So, for today's call, we will be basically walking you through the memo, summarizing the comments that we received and then we'd like to hear your feedback on our proposed responses and ask if you have any additional input that you would like us to add to the responses. Any questions on the process for today's call?

Barbara Gage: This is Barb Gage. I'm having trouble opening the memo on the – also the table now. I had the table opened a minute ago.

(Katie Goodwin): OK. I'm sorry. Who was that? We can ...

Female: Barbara Gage.

(Katie Goodwin): OK. Barbara, we can – we can send it to you again.

Barbara Gage: Thank you. I appreciate that.

(Katie Goodwin): Sure. OK. So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Peg, our senior director here, and she is going to start us off by going over the first theme.

Peg Terry: Thank you, (Katie). So, the first theme is we've themed it as support for the measure. And as you all know, one measure actually was recommended for endorsement and that was 0326 Advanced Care Plan. And we received two comments supporting the committee's recommendations to endorse this measure.

However, one comment noted that claims data do not reliably capture the care plan and the physicians does not always bill for this service. Another comment here suggested being mindful of the implementation challenges and any unintended consequences. During the in-person meeting, the committee did not express any concerns about the – with the validity of the measure or any unintended consequences or potential harm to patients because of this measure.

We did turn this measure over to the developer for a response and this is in a memo, but I am going to read it because I think it's important. We appreciate your support of endorsement for 0326 Advanced Care Plan as a clinician/group practice level measure. We understand the challenges which are (retrieving) this information to claim status and have expanded the list of codes that count towards the numerator of this measure.

This includes – this list includes CPT-2 codes and – I won't read the numbers – but numerous codes that have been added. Medicare began allowing reimbursement for Advanced Care planning discussions to the codes of 99497 and 99498 effective January 2016. We expect this to encourage more physicians to record these codes in providing the service.

We don't have any required action on this, but wondered if there are any comments or discussion on this one measure, the Advanced Care Plan, that did get recommended for endorsement or any other comments from the developer regarding this measure. OK.

Male: Looks good to me.

Peg Terry: OK. So then the second thing was the transition of care measures. As you may remember, we had four measures that really were what we recall transitions of care measures. These were all maintenance measures. For these measures, two commenters expressed their disappointment with the committee's decision not to recommend these four transition of care measures for continued endorsement.

And you – and I will just quickly name them. They're 0646, Reconciled Medication List Received by the Discharged Patients; 0647, Transition Care with Specified Elements Discharged by – Received by Discharged Patients; 0648, Timely Transmission of Transition of Record; and 0649, Transition Record with Specified Elements Received by Discharged Patients.

We have a proposed response from the committee. So, this is what we do. For people that may be new to the committee, this staff actually writes a proposed response and this is what it is proposed, and we ask you if this seems reasonable, if you want to make changes, you want to discuss this.

So, our response from the committee, our proposed response is, thank you for your comments. The committee recognizes the importance of transition of care measures and encourages the developer to monitor the performance of these measures. The committee did not recommend the four transition of care measures for continued endorsement because the developer did not provide updated performance status and sufficient liability testing for each measure as required per NQF measure evaluation criteria.

I'm just going to go on and say NQF's response being it (will) that performance scores on the measure specified a required for maintenance of endorsement per NQF criteria. In addition, the developer did not submit disparity status as required by NQF. Please note that NQF did not require

additional testing for maintenance measures if prior testing is adequate. However, prior testing must meet current NQF evaluation.

So, my question to the committee is, does the committee agree with our proposed response or do you want to discuss this?

Gerri Lamb: Hey. This is Gerri. I have just a question about sort of the approach to responding. You know, my view is that the response specifically says that this is an important measure and here is the reason we did not. Typically, what I would like to see is why it is so important to have updated performance data, why it's part of the criteria. Is that superfluous in NQF's experience?

Peg Terry: Well, you know, I think you make a good point and maybe we just assumed that and didn't write it. But if you think we should call it out, we certainly can call that out and say that it is important for ongoing maintenance measures to have updated performance data because that's critical to the use of measures going forward or something along those lines.

Lorna Lynn: Yes. This is Lorna Lynn. I agree completely with Gerri. I think that – as I'm sure you know, there are those who are critical of NQF thing, "Oh, it's just impossible to get through the whole process." And I think something that says, "The measures are important. We couldn't recommend continued endorsement for the following reasons. We have this criteria in order to fulfill, you know, our duty to the public to make sure that the measures are doing what they're supposed to do."

I mean I obviously don't have the language of the tip of my tongue, but I think something to explain the rationale would really be helpful.

Peg Terry: Great. Go ahead.

Samira Beckwith: This is Samira. And I do agree with this and I'll tell you why. Because I think this measure, about transition of care is so important that it doesn't need to be continued to be addressed and we need to have some standards here. So, I'm a little disappointed. The developers have not provided the data that's needed to that we can support these measures. And so, having that fluid explanation, I think that might be helpful.

Peg Terry: OK. We can do that and we can expand that to really point out the importance of these measures, which is what everybody is suggesting, and they certainly are important and why you will need to have current performance data to really show how the measures are performing today, and you know, accountability problems, wherever – how ever they're used and why that's important.

So, we can do that. I'm not going to – I'm not going to wordsmith that here, but we will do that following the call and send it out to you all.

Male: Yes. This is ...

Barbara Gage: This is ...

Peg Terry: Go ahead.

Barbara Gage: I was just going to ask a quick question. So, when we're asking for updated performance, what type of information? Are we asking whether the measure has topped out in its current use? Are we asking them to come back with the data so that the measure can continue to be used in whatever way it's being used?

Peg Terry: I would say both. You know, certainly, for some programs topping – measures topping out is an issue and you want to make sure that performance shows that they're not topped out that they're important just to continue the measure, whatever measure is measuring and also to see whether – I'm trying to think what your second point was, Barbara, but I think it was to basically show that there is an important – it remains important to measure. There's opportunity there to improve in this particular area.

Barbara Gage: Right. The second point was a concern that might get this continued. We might cause a bump – a decline in a few just because somebody says, "Oh it didn't get reissued." Are we – should we give them a hit as to whether they can continue using it and send the updated data.

- Peg Terry: So, the second reason you said if it's – if their – I'm sorry. So, basically you're asking if the measure is not doing well that there would be an opportunity for that you may not continue to use it. Is that what you're saying? I'm sorry, Barbara.
- Barbara Gage: Yes. If we don't – if we vote to not endorse it, then whoever is using it will stop using it for the moment and won't – potentially and won't understand that they can continue using this, that will be updated information and it can be – the question is can it be re-endorsed or is this the final stop for the year?
- Peg Terry: Well, if you're asking – if we don't endorse it, at this point in time, it can still be used in programs if that's what you're asking.
- Barbara Gage: OK. That is what I was asking.
- Peg Terry: Yes. It can be and some of these are already in use and some of them are not of these four measures.
- Diedra Gray: This is Diedra Gray from PCPI with the measure developers. Are we able to offer a comment?
- Peg Terry: Absolutely.
- Diedra Gray: Thank you.
- Peg Terry: Would you please state your organization as well Diedra?
- Diedra Gray: Yes. PCPI Foundation.
- Peg Terry: Great.
- Diedra Gray: So, I actually have two comments. The first is with regards to the reason for the four measures not being recommended for endorsements. I noted that the testing was a big reason – was one of the reasons why the measures – or two of the measures I think failed because of the reliability testing. And then you said that the other reason was disparities, no disparities data was submitted, but I wanted to note, I think it's important to note that the other two measures failed on performance gap which is a little different than disparities data and

because, you know, we talked about the lack of data for both things, for testing, as well as for performance gap because the measures were not measure implementers. We don't have an implementation vehicle, we're measure developers.

And so we, you know, to the last point that was made, we would hope that the measure – would remain in use which could essentially get us data so that we could test them and update the testing data and potentially resubmit them to NQF. But the reason why they failed was for, you know, the insufficient testing and the performance gap because we don't have data from implementation. So, we're hoping that people will continue to use them and implement them so that we can get data and potentially pursue endorsement again in the future.

Peg Terry: Well, thank you for that comment, and we'll make note of that.

Diedra Gray: Thank you.

Peg Terry: It's important ...

(Crosstalk)

(Chris Dezii): Yes. Hi, this is – this is (Chris). I appreciate that last comment. I was going to suggest that we (did) discuss the performance gap issue and it needs to be implemented.

I'd like some way to express that no one was probably more disappointed that this didn't go through than the panel perhaps. So, I'd like some agreement that we too are disappointed if you can.

And on the NQF response, however, prior testing must meet current NQF evaluation criteria. Do we need – could we add – and these measures did not meet the current NQF evaluation criteria, right?

Peg Terry: Yes. That would – that would be ...

(Chris Dezii): OK.

(Margaret Terry): ... an (existing) ...

(Chris Dezii): Yes. I would be specific with that. All right. That's all ...

Peg Terry: OK.

(Chris Dezii): ... I have to say. Thank you.

Peg Terry: Thank you. Anybody else?

Gerri Lamb: Hey, like (Chris), I was thinking to – and too wordsmith here but just to expand it a little bit – does this only go to the organizations that made the comment or does it go to all organizations in response to comments.

Peg Terry: This will go to – this will be a response to the comments here but it is – but it is also added publicly to our report and to the comment table. So, it is a response to the commenter but it's also a part of our public report.

Gerri Lamb: OK. So, in that regard and leaving the wordsmithing up to you all, I would like to see like (Chris) that this is – that we recognized the importance and that it is the priority for expanding our Care Coordination portfolio then to continue with – that is absolutely critical to meet the measurement criteria and if we can and it's appropriate is that this measure will remain in use and we hope to see a commitment to collect the data that's necessary to continue with use in the future or something like that.

I think I round it out a bit so that it's not just – it didn't meet the criteria period as much as – yes, this is important – this is why the criteria is important and here's what we hope will happen.

Peg Terry: OK. Good point.

(Don Casey): Yes. This is (Don). This is (Don). I'm sorry about the noise on this plane but let me – let me mute and I'll come back. I just have one quick comment about the use of the word use.

Rich Antonelli: This is Rich Antonelli. Can I jump in for a comment, please?

Peg Terry: Sure.

Rich Antonelli: So, I'd like to – the conversation today specifically – are not specifically about this measure, but I'm – for those of us that have enough memory about some of the measures that we've been asked to look at in the past in the Care Coordination Standing Committee. We often have – I've been really struggling with what are the gaps and what are some of the meaningful things to be able to fill the gaps and the comments that I'm about to say is not specific to this measure and the measure developers on the line, please underscore that this is not specific to this measure that we're talking about now.

I think in the past, the committee has really struggled with, “OK. There's a big gap. We've got to get something into that gap.” So, the more clarity, the more specificity that the NQF staff can embed in this response and that could be used going forward to leverage how we would address what I'm actually going to be predicting with the evolution of accountable care organizations in this arena of integration and care coordination, we have to get these criteria correct. So, we've got robust measures in arguably one of the biggest gap areas in American health care.

Peg Terry: OK.

(Don Casey): This is (Don). Can I just say ...

Peg Terry: Sure.

(Don Casey): ... that when we – when we say the measure can still be used, we should be careful about what we mean by that because it can't – because if it's a (inaudible) NQF endorsement be used for accountability according to criteria. So, which doesn't mean it can't be used for quality improvement or for further measure development.

I don't think we need to get into that but just people were saying it can still be used ...

(Off-Mic)

(Don Casey): ... that's an important nuisance to the committee to understand.

Peg Terry: It does depend on the program whether it's public accountability or not. So, thank you.

Others? And we're trying to take all these comments, (Don), and we have a recording. So, we will get all these comments. And we – I understand the importance of not just stopping with the idea that it wasn't past because it did not meet our criteria but really elaborating on that more and talking about the importance of these kinds of measures, these transition of care measures today and in the future. So, we will – we will work to incorporate the language that everybody is providing here.

So, what I think we'll do here is we will take this – we'll get all our comments together and probably, you know, get those out to people so they can take one last look and because it's – not we can't work to a (thousand) call here, we can put it together but we will do that.

So, I think what we can do here is – I think we're in general agreement but with a lot of expansiveness in terms of how we put the information out there so people can see that this will be – that these are important – committee agrees that these are important and the committee is also disappointed that these did not get through, but why, with some of the reasons why. So ...

(Don Casey): Great. Thank you.

(Margaret Terry): ... with that said, I'm going to go to the – if there are no other comments, I'm going to go to the last theme which is submission of additional data. And this is for two measures. Measures 3170, Proportion of Children with ED Visits for Asthma with Evidence of Primary Care Connection Before the ED Visit, and 3171, Percentage of Asthma ED Visits Followed by Evidence of Care Connection.

These measures received two comments expressing their concern with the developers' intent to present reliability results to the committee at the post-comment call.

For people on the call, the committee – the developer did not provide measure score reliability testings required for these composite measures. The commenters stated that they – that presenting new information at the end of a public and member commenting period that could lead to a change in the committee's recommendation would comply with NQF's CDP process.

The commenters recommended a second public and member commenting period of new data are presented. And so as you probably know, if you read the memo, the developer was unable to provide any additional data or any additional testing and sent us a very nice note to that extent letting us know the difficulties in dealing with getting the (stat) in the State of New York.

The measures as specified today, they do not meet NQF criteria and are not recommended for endorsement. And I think our response is just a response that as the measures stood that it does not meet the criteria because these are composite measures.

So, with that said, do people have any suggestions for changes in this wording?

Male: No.

Gerri Lamb: Peg, I have a question. This is Gerri, again. The response takes to the fact that the data weren't received. So, it's sort of a moot point.

Peg Terry: Right.

Gerri Lamb: But should we respond to the concern of, you know, enabling a developer to provide data after the comment period and just hit that one head on which is, you know, as long as it's accurate, is, you know, we – these are important measures than we want to provide all opportunity to get them into practice.

If they have provided the data, here's what the process would have been so that they know the process and it addresses the concern directly. This is, you know, we didn't get the data so it's not a concern anymore.

Peg Terry: Yes. Well, of course, we didn't have to deal with it, let me start with that. But in general, and I'm just sort of checking here with my colleagues to make sure I understand how we have dealt with this in the past. But I think in general when new information comes out and it's provided at the post call, we accept that information and we move forward that information. And so if there's a different – if anybody else has anything to add to that or to help with that but I think that's the process that we have used here in NQF in the past.

Rich Antonelli: This is Rich Antonelli. I generally agree with everything that Gerri Lamb says but I think I'm going to suggest a more cautious approach. I think there were some comments made at the in-person meeting at a high-level about the measure and some of those comments weren't really predicated on – well if we have the data, this is an important measure.

So with all the respect, Gerri, I'm not sure that I would necessarily use a specific adjective that would imply the desirability or the eligibility for importance or endorsement. I think the lack of the data probably prohibited a robust deep dive on the merits of the measure itself.

So if we wanted to attach an adjective, something about Care Coordination link to patients with this condition or something like that but I don't think it would be fair for the developer to hear us even imply something about the measure because we didn't, in my view, didn't do a robust approach because we were limited by data availability.

(Don Casey): You know, this is (Don), I'm still here but let me just jump in here. I am not going to get myself in the middle of a minor disagreement with Gerri and Rich ever but my point is that I don't think the goal here is to provide specific feedback for the measure developer. I think that's already been done and I know that generically any measure developer has an open source to communicate with NQF staff about technical issues past and present and future.

So, I would be reluctant to put too much more in here. I don't think we're trying to give instructions to the measure developer as much as we're trying to reflect our rationale for voting the way they did. So I would – I would favor just trying to keep it simple.

(Crosstalk)

Gerri Lamb: OK, here's my question (Don) and I can live with both of those perspectives. I was just raising the point that the answer basically took that we didn't get the data; therefore, subject closed, and what you both say make sense. Does anybody else have any questions or concern about the response?

Male: No.

(Crosstalk)

Lorna Lynn: This is Lorna again. I just – as much as in the – what I said about the last point, I think just adding a little bit that helps provide a rationale is a little bit softer in terms of encouraging by providing the reasons for the response would be helpful.

Rich Antonelli: Yes, this is Rich. I completely agree with that. I would not want the developer to in any way think that we've attached a rating or an assessment of the measure. We were clearly hampered by really circumstances that were out of their control as well.

And so the message back is, you know, here's the next cycle and if you decide to proceed, we will absolutely do due process to evaluate it respectfully. And I, you know, I know that the committee is fully committed to that.

Peg Terry: You know, I will share this with people on the phone. We have had contact with the developer, you know, during this period and there is indication on their part and we supported it and they had gone back and forth with him a little bit. As I mentioned, they sent a lovely letter actually, telling us that they weren't able to, you know, submit the data at this point and that they plan to look for opportunities in the future.

They were very complimentary of the committee frankly and their interest in these measures. And the time and the thoughtfulness that went into the deliberation, so I will share with you that they felt supported, the developer. They just were not able to get the data basically. But you know I just wanted to share that kind of what happened outside this meeting with you all, so you knew what happened.

Rich Antonelli: Thank you. I mean that ...

(Crosstalk)

(Don Casey): Peg, if I may, this is (Don) again, maybe I will for the little plug in to remind the committee as well that tomorrow and Thursday is a two-day Kaizen Event and I believe the purpose of that is to really look hard at the whole consensus, developer process, see if we can find ways, both (based a) narrow experience and what we think (this rationale) going forward to help NQF measure developers get across the finish line around issues like this.

And I think that – I think there's an expectation that NQF is really trying to move the needles, you know, more aggressively but more completely to help tough this process along. And so I think there's probably some nice lessons learned in this discussion that could help inform our attempt to make this whole process that we've been involved with better.

Peg Terry: Thank you. It fits right in, that's really worked. Thank you very much. So with regards to our comment, we will keep it simple. As we all said, we will – we will maybe soften the language just a little bit but, you know, just so you know the developers are very aware of our openness in working with them and this committee in particular. So, I'll think about how to – how to put that in there a little bit.

With that said, are there any other questions? Those are the main themes that came up and we only seven measures and as you all know six were not recommended and one was. Any other themes or any other issues you want to discuss regarding the measures and the comment?

OK, so I think with that said, we're going to turn the meeting over to the co-chairs for their closing remarks. Gerri and (Don)?

Gerri Lamb: (Don), are you still in a place you can give some (closing) ...

(Don Casey): Yes, I just want to say thank you all for putting up with my situation on this airplane but I think this committee has done a marvelous job. I know that we hunger for a lot more but I have – I certainly and I know Gerri shares my sentiment, I appreciate everyone's hard work and enthusiasm. And I think we're, you know, we're looking forward to what comes out of the next several weeks and months of how NQF is going to move forward with the – this whole process and hopefully that will help – help us to get further along than we had hope.

Peg Terry: And Gerri?

Gerri Lamb: Yes, I just like to add a few words to (Don). I am in total agreement. Thank you all for your work in this committee and in the cycle. I think it's noteworthy that the feedback really supported us, you know, supporting the evaluation criteria. And at the same time, it reflected the disappointment of this committee in not being able to move more measures forward. So, I think it was very supportive of our work and recognize the importance of it.

I'd also like to acknowledge our NQF team, that you all did a fabulous job, putting the report together, reflecting the comments, the post discussion. So, thank you all for that.

And like (Don), I would just say that I look forward to being able to continue to strength the Care Coordination portfolio and to future contracts where we can do that together. I believe (Don) was also saying in (inaudible) that there are some public sessions for the Kaizen that's going to happen tomorrow and the next day. So if you're available, please get on there and share what you had been thinking about the process as well.

And then I believe too we have an opportunity as kind of the template for off-cycle work is as we're waiting for new contracts that we have the opportunity

to get together off-cycle and (Don) and I have been thinking about that in terms of what would be meaningful to keep the needle moving on this.

So all to say, you know, thank you, committed to this work and we're going to be working with you all to expand and refine the portfolio, it's just so important. I think that's it Peg, that's my comment.

Peg Terry: Well, thank you very much Gerri and I – we're not over yet here on this call. But I do want to thank everybody for their time and commitment and for their thoughtfulness today on the call to help us make this really a better report and to reflect, you know, the feelings and the opinions of the committee and also for developers around the call who spoke.

I think we want to clarify one issue though. The Kaizen is Thursday and Friday not tomorrow.

Gerri Lamb: OK, good, thank you.

(Don Casey): Sorry, sorry.

(Katie Goodwin): And for those committee members who are interested in listening to the public sessions, we do have an agenda posted on our website. So please do – if you're interested, please do join us.

Peg Terry: It is an all NQF activity I will say that. So with that said, I think (May) has some comments here for our next steps.

(May): Hello, so to piggyback on the Kaizen, tomorrow, we actually have a measure developer ...

(Off-Mic)

(May): ... that's an all day workshop as well and I think the information is on the – on the public web page, so you can find that information there and feel free to listen in on that as well.

OK, so for next steps, we will revise our responses and send those back to you guys as soon as we are able to and then once we are in agreement of all the responses, then we're going to add this into our draft report.

And then at the end of May 30th to June 13th, we will actually have a member voting period. And afterwards, there will be the CSAC review on June 27th. If there is a need for an appeal, to have an appeal's month, which is from June 28 to July 28 and then the final report should be out in late August. So, we will certainly be in touch with all of you throughout the process.

Peg Terry: And I just want to say if anybody wants to reach out to any of us here, you know, how to reach us, if you have any comments or thoughts as we move forward. Again, thank you to everybody for getting on the call and – oh, we have to open this up now, yes, sorry.

Yetunde Ogungbemi: Operator, could you please open the lines and see if any one has any public comments please, thank you.

Operator: Yes, ma'am. At this time if you like to make a comment, please press star then the number one.

And there are no public comments at this time.

Peg Terry: OK, well thank you. If there are no other thoughts or comments, I want to thank everybody for joining us today and I'm glad (Don), you're able to get on for the whole call, that's great. And moving forward and more to come, I guess, especially as we go through some changes here in NQF, so thank you again. Have a great day.

(Don Casey): Thank you.

Female: You too, thank you.

(Crosstalk)

Female: Thank you.

Peg Terry: Bye.

Female: Bye.

(Crosstalk)

Gerri Lamb: Thanks, everybody.

Male: Thanks.

END