National Quality Forum

Moderator: Sheila Crawford
July 11, 2012
11:00 a.m. ET

(Lorelei Gorean): Good morning, everybody. And welcome to your first G.I.-G.U. – and welcome to the G.I.-G.U. steering committee.

My name is (Lorelei Gorean). On behalf of everybody here at NQF, we'd like to thank you for calling in today. You know, we're looking forward to working with you on this project.

Before we get started, just a few quick notes about call logistic. If you could please keep your phone muted when you're not speaking that helps with the audio for everybody. And also this call is open to the public, so if we have time at the end of the call when can take additional questions from members of the public and it is also being recorded. So if you want to go back afterward and listen to it or read to the transcript, you will be able to do so.

So with that, I'm (Lorelei). I'm a project manager helping out with the project and I will have the rest of my team introduce ourselves.

Ashlie, I think you're on the phone.

Ashlie Wilbon: Yes. Thanks, Lorelei. My name is Ashlie Wilbon. I'm going to be the senior project manager on this project. I'm looking forward to work with everyone and having you on board and (inaudible) board meeting everyone in August. And I'll hand it over to Taroon or Evan to introduce themselves.

Taroon Amin: Hi. My name is Taroon Amin. I'll be the senior director helping to support this project. Thank you all for (calling in) to participate in this event. Look forward to working with you as well.

Evan?

Evan Williamson: Evan Williamson. I'm the project analyst on the project. Again, I look forward to working with all of you.

(Inaudible).

(Lorelei Gorean): And we have two wonderful coaches, Andrew Baskin and Christopher Saigal. We have Andy in the room here with us. So if both of you just want to take a moment to introduce yourselves or maybe talk about your experience with NQF and GI-GU I think that would be wonderful.

Andrew Baskin: So Chris, I'll jump in first. This is Andy Baskin. I'm currently on the CSAC committee for NQF, but this is actually my first experience as one of the steering committees. So this will be a great learning experience for me as well although I have some experience with this process already.

And I just wanted to be clear and fully transparent, I'm an internist. Not a GI or GU specialist, but certainly in the evaluation of the measures I have (as much time) experience. So looking forward to this opportunity. Thank you.

(Lorelei Gorean): Great. Christopher, are you on the call? I know he was the first to call and so may be he'll join us momentarily.

So let's also go through the experience may list and if you could each give a very brief introduction with your name and where you were that will be a great. Starting with Liliana, I think I saw that you were on the phone.

Liliana Bordeianou: Yes I'm on. Good morning. I'm Liliana Bordeianou. I'm a colorectal surgeon so I know a lot about GI and less about GU. I practice at Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston.

And I've never participated in any NQF forums before, but I am a member of the Quality Committee at the American Society of Colorectal Surgery and

that's how I got to this panel. And I'm looking forward to the opportunity to work with everybody.

(Lorelei Gorean): Thank you. Robert, are you there?

Robert Ellis: I am. I'm Robert Ellis. I'm the director of Operations and Online Information Resources for Consumers' CHECKBOOK in the Center for the Study of Services, a nonprofit consumer group and I'm looking forward to working through this process. Thank you.

(Lorelei Gorean): Thanks, Robert.

(Nancy)?

OK. Edward, are you there?

Edward Gill: Yes. Hi, I'm Ed Gill. I'm a urogynecologist and I work at the VCU Medical Center in Richmond and a member of the American Urogynecologist Society.

(Lorelei Gorean): Great. And I know we have Kate Goodrich, but she has actually been replaced with Judy Tobin. So Judy will be on this committee moving forward. I don't believe that Judy is on the call. She's with staff yesterday. Judy, are you there?

Judy Tobin: I am actually. Thank you very much. I'm a technical adviser of the Office of Clinical Standards and Quality here at Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. As you just mentioned, I'll be serving to represent Kate Goodrich who is a physician and the team's technical adviser.

(Lorelei Gorean): Great. Thanks, Judy.

Johannes?

Johannes Koch: Yes. This is Joahhanes Koch. I'm a gastroenterologist and I practice at Virginia Mason in Seattle, Washington.

(Lorelei Gorean): (Jennifer)? (Ric)?

(Ric): Ric (inaudible). I'm a general internist and I'm currently working with the group, the (Formulary Management for Self-Insured Employers and Staff). And I'm a (inaudible).

(Lorelei Gorean): Thanks, (Ric).

Paul, I think I can see that you're on?

Paul Merguerian: Yes. My name is Paul Merguerian. I'm a pediatric urologist. I'm the chief of the Division of Urology at Seattle Children's Hospital. I'm interested in continuous process improvement and part of the continuous process improvement team at the Seattle Children's Department of Surgery. And also I have masters from Dartmouth Institute.

(Lorelei Gorean): Great. Thank you.

(Philip)? (Jerad)? Have I missed anybody who wants to introduce themselves?

OK. Great. Let's move to the next slide then.

Just to let you know that our agenda for today is to orient you to NQF. Some of you have worked with us before, but I think most of you haven't so we will discuss how our consensus development process or CDP were. We'll talk about this (field) with this project and how it's different from our usual CDP project. I will also give you a high-level introduction to our measure evaluation criteria, (peculiar accordance) criteria. And please feel free at any point during this presentation to jump in with question at any time.

So I'm actually going to hand it over to Evan now to go through review how our SharePoint site was. So (inaudible).

Evan Williamson: Hi, everyone. I know we've had a few issues with some of you getting log in to SharePoint, but we'll simply get that resolve over the next week and however, I think that SharePoint is going to be a great asset for us as we're working with the committee just to manage our documents, discussions, and calendar. So here I'll start screen sharing here.

It'll take just a second. The SharePoint site should be up now here for everybody. I'll resize it. There we go. And this is our homepage.

So the homepage will have – will have project shared documents, project calendar, your contacts and then project links and this will be continuously updated throughout the project. When we have measures to review then we'll go to the timeline. The measures close on Monday. Once we do initial review here, we'll get those posted and that'll be listed under the project link, so that'll be definitely a key area for you to go. So right here, under here will be a ton of links for measures and concepts that come into the project.

Up here, we have committee resources – I'm sorry – committee resources and then committee roster and bios. And, in the committee resources here – we'll load this up – we have both the developer guidebook which we will provide to the measure developers, modern development in conduct to the measures and then the steering committee guidebook, which you also saw under the meeting materials if you were able to log in. And that will be a key resource for you when you're acting your steering committee role. It's got a lot of great information in there for you to refer to.

(Inaudible) is it working for everybody?

Johannes Koch: This Johannes Koch. I'm on the site, but actually – and logged in. Looked like I'm (locked in) to the meeting of the (inaudible) but I actually don't see you manipulating the screen at all.

Male: Yes, nor do I.

Evan Williamson: OK.

Male: It works for me.

Evan Williamson: (Like us)? OK. Let's see, I'm not sure.

So for those of you who can't…

(Lorelei Gorean): For those of you who may be can't see the screen share, if you could go – if you have the link to the SharePoint site, you could follow on (inaudible).

(Inaudible).

Liliana Bordeianou: …by clicking on the web link that's provided on the…

(Lorelei Gorean): Exactly.

Liliana Bordeianou: …committee call orientation.

Male: OK.

(Lorelei Gorean): Yes. There should be a link to the left of that chat box where you see the sign and that will bring up the SharePoint site as well.

Evan Williamson: Yes. And if any of you – if you need any visual help, I can definitely help you walk through this, but mostly if you can pull it up, again, we'll try to make it as self explanatory as possible with what we're providing here on the SharePoint site on the part of shared document.

So we'll go back here. We have the – those are shared documents. We have the calendar here and we'll keep this continuously updated. But you can see here, today is the orientation. So click here on the orientation and it brings up a dialogue box without any information about it.

There is the start time, the end time when descriptions for certain things are enough for this. If you click here on meeting materials, it will bring you to another page. And this is where we're going to have all the – all the documents for our calls and meetings.

So when we have our in-person meeting at the end of August, all the documents we'll need for that will be posted in the meeting materials space for that meeting. So you can see here on the left – on the left of the site there are dates listed and each date corresponds – I mean we put into the calendar. So we have the two optional measure evaluation tutorials on the 12th and the 17th. Those are listed there and then we our in-person meeting on the 27th and so those will have specific information for that.

So you can see here for today we have our – we have our agenda. So, you know, we have our roll call orientation. We have the attendees with the staff here. And then we have – the flyers are posted as PDF as well as that committee guidance we have also posted in the shared documents and then our orientation agenda.

So this is a good way to share files. It doesn't clog up your inbox. You know, sometimes we get (bounced) back that the PDFs are too large. Some of these documents can be quite long. So we have to use SharePoint, because it provides secured downloading for you to download these documents.

Are there any questions on SharePoint so far?

Great. All right. So we'll go back to our project page. We can use the navigation up here. And, we also have our project discussion space and we're going to try to use this.

We post the discussion threads when we are having measures. If you have question, we can post it. You can address it to the staff. You can address it to fellow members. We'll send out messages to remind you if some (message) has been posted.

It's a good way to collaborate. It doesn't require long email chains. I know those kind of get burdensome sometimes. We have a discussion board here and it's really – it can be a great resource for us. I think it's exciting for us to be able to use to manage your documents and manage the events, everything project related here on SharePoint.

And, I think that – we'll do that for now on SharePoint. And if you kind of got problems of logging in or if you got problems with passwords and everything, please just send me an email and we'll try to get that resolve. I know I've been working with some of you to resolve that already and want to make sure everybody has the right information to connect to SharePoint and you can really participate fully in this project.

All right. So end of the (inaudible).

(Lorelei Gorean): And then we'll actually also go over with you with the steering committee guide that we'll put together so there will be something that you'll be referring to throughout this project.

(Inaudible).

Evan Williamson: So this is posted again – we posted these both under the shared documents and under the meeting materials. So this will be ubiquitous to the project everywhere. So we developed this for this project. I'm really filing these new two stages consensus development process and as part of this if you want to do some process improvement and we found that providing you guys with the guide would be helpful (inaudible) referred to your questions about your role and about what we're doing during this project.

So here we have – when you open it up, the bookmark will show up automatically and the more (inaudible) that we'll be going over today during the call. We have what is NQF. These are all hyperlinks. Why NQF endorse measures importance? So again, there's a lot of really good information here that we've, you know, gathered from our site and from different locations and put on one place so that's easy for you to attack us.

How do we endorse NQF measures? So something that you'll be intimately involved throughout this project, you know, actually endorsing these measures. So we've gone here the call for nomination. We're currently going to the call for candidate standards and in this case for the stage I we'll get into doing this orientation the concepts that we'll be going through.

And then there are some other parts of NQF here. We have our strategic partnerships which are the NPP and MAP and then (inaudible). So here, this supply is actually what you really want to focus on. What do I need to know as a steering team member? And so you have the role the steering team – role of the steering committee, the in-person meeting that we'll be having in August, how to evaluate candidate measures, all of that.

And then the next part is through nuts and bolts. What we're doing are the measure evaluation criteria. That's what we'll focus on in the second half of this call and on the arsenal evaluation tutorials are the real – the criteria and

guidance and that's going to be – as you evaluate the concepts and measures. So again, I'm not going to go through all this with you, but these are all hyperlinks here for, you know, intact all of that you can go through. And this will really guide you through the process of evaluating measures.

All right, (I'm full).

(Lorelei Gorean): OK. Great. Thank you, Evan.

Evan Williamson: And so I'm taking over the world right here and we'll continue with (this call).

(Lorelei Gorean): Great. Thanks. So does anybody have any questions on SharePoint or the guide book? OK. Bottom line (inaudible) sharing go back to the PowerPoint. So right now we're just going to go over some basic information about NQF.

What is NQF? I know as I said many of you are working with us. So we are a private nonprofit voluntary consensus standard setting organization. We're in a public-private partnership and our work is overseen by a board of directors. You may know at least many of your members that we have eight NQF member councils. So those councils include consumers, purchasers, health plan, professional providers, community-public health, supplier industry, quality measurement, research improvement.

And our mission here at NQF is to improve the quality of American healthcare b building consensus on national priorities and goals for performance improvement, endorsing national consensus standards for measuring and public labor pouring on performance which of course is where you come in, and promoting the attainment of national goals through education and outreach program.

Why are NQF endorsed measures important? When we talk about performance measurement, it's important to keep it in context and remember that measurement has never an end in itself. The goal is always to improve the quality of healthcare received by patient and ultimately to improve patient's outcome. Standardized performance measures we believe here are really needed in order to assess the quality that can be used to compare facilities and providers. So we strived through our endorsement process to

endorse measures that reflect rigorous scientific and evident space review, and that's where your participation will come in from looking a concept to (greater) measures.

I – sorry.

So the – so the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 designed voluntary consensus standard setting anybody with these five attributes; openness, balance of interest, due process, consensus, and an appeals process. And you can see here the definition of consensus and it's probably important to note that consensus does not necessarily have to equal unanimous agreements. But it does have to include a process for resolving objection and process for having public comment, fair hearing of the comment. And then the opportunity afterward for the committee to alter their votes based upon this comment.

So to put things in perspective in addition to performance measure, steering committee such as yourself we also convene with other multi-stakeholder groups such as the National Priority Partnership, NPP, which helps set national priorities and goals, and MAP, the Measures Application Partnership, which helps select – which helps to select measures for public reporting.

Are there any questions on NQF role and performance measurement?

So Ashlie, would you add anything?

Christopher Saigal: This is Chris Saigal. I just joined in. I couldn't get through.

Jennifer Lightdale: Jennifer Lightdale. I also just joined.

(Lorelei Gorean): Oh, great. OK. Who was that last one?

Jennifer Lightdale: Jennifer Lightdale from Boston.

(Lorelei Gorean): Oh, great. OK. Thank you. Welcome. We're just getting started.

(Inaudible).

(Lorelei Gorean): Yes. Would you like both introduce yourselves? May be we just gave a brief introduction wherever you're from and involvement with this work.

Christopher Saigal: Sure. I'm Chris Saigal. I'm actually the co-chair of this committee, the G.U. part of it. I'm a urologic oncologist working in UCLA. And I (inaudible) I've got a lot of research interest in quality of care and I've (inaudible) NQF committee in the past.

(Lorelei Gorean): Great.

Jennifer Lightdale: And I'm Jennifer Lightdale. I'm excited to be on this. I'm a pediatric gastroenterologist at Boston Children's Hospital and involved in quality work at both our institution and certainly within the G.I. world, pediatric G.I. world in particular.

(Lorelei Gorean): Great. Thanks. We're excited to have both of you.

Christopher Saigal: Are you guys on PDF or what are you going through right now?

(Lorelei Gorean): We're going through – are you able to access the (compartner) site? We're just going through our PowerPoint presentation right now. Actually just gotten up to start what we will talk about this pilot project.

Christopher Saigal: (Inaudible) give me a link. I don't have it.

(Lorelei Gorean): Sure. OK, Evan will send you the link right now.

So before we start talking about this pilot project in particular just in general, NQF endorses measures through an eight-step process that ensures plan input from all of our stakeholders, from experts and members of the public. So we start with the call for nominations, which you've all been through, because that's how we speed our steering committee. And then we have a call for candidate standard to our measures or (NSC) concept.

And then we have our review of those standards or concept. We include all of the discussions, your deliberations in the draft report that is posted on our website for public and member comment and then the members off to have an opportunity to vote on the recommendations from the steering committee.

And then ultimately thus those recommendations go to CSAC and then the board and then there's also an opportunity for an appeal process. So that is how we endorsed measures.

This process was a bit different. We're proposing a choose-stage endorsement process. Many of you might know that usually a measure comes to us already fully specified and it's evaluated in its entirety with the criteria that we used. We look at performance and scientific acceptability and usability and feasibility and that all happens sort of at once. The steering committee looked at those things at once.

So those proposed two-stage process is separating out, looking at a fully specified measure versus a concept. So we're in stage I more where we're looking at a measure concept, which is just important to measure and report criteria, which includes the numerator and denominator statements and a conclusion statement that does not get into the detail – the detailed measure specifications or adjustment methodology or the validity or reliability of measure. The idea is that this measure concept will come in and you'll look at it and determine the importance to move forward and then be fully evaluated on scientific susceptibility and usability and feasibility.

So the process is that we'll have a 30-day comment period after you approved the measure concept. And then it will still go to CSAC and board approval. And then afterward if it's approved, the developer will then have 18 months to bring that concept back fully specified.

So the important thing to remember here is that it could be a completely new concept that's come in and actually does not have measure specification. But it also could be a concept that's come in but already does have measure specifications, because it's being reviewed as part of our maintenance process which happens every three years. So we'll have a combination of both of those then we'll talk about that in a little bit more detail later on.

So then stage II as it comes back, it's coming back to the fully specified measure. And as I said, you know, the process you might already be used to where you would evaluate the scientific susceptibility, the feasibility, the

usability and so on. And that will follow a similar process as I mentioned before, but it will also have a two-week member vote then goes for CSAC approval on board ratification and ultimately possibly endorsement.

So Evan, did you want to sort of walk through some of these changes to the timeline? And ask me – feel free to jump in as well if you have anything to ask.

Female: Yes. I think we should pause there for questions, because that's kind of – that was kind of a lot especially for people who are kind of new to the process then may we should just pause there before we move forward.

Evan Williamson: Do we have any questions?

Andrew Baskin: There may be for me. I happen to be (inaudible). So in the first phase process, because this is really the first time it's going to happen, is there an expectation that a concept would come in or may be those some back and forth between the steering committee and whoever is (putting) in the concept, and that measure then may get reshaped and still not move its place in the line. In other words it would then still be on the complete stage I process at that same setting, not wait until the next go round in other words.

So in other words, you know, something will come in, something could – there will be some give and take and then there may be some alteration and then if approved then it will go on to phase II, but all of the same, you know, all in the same stage I or it doesn't like (inaudible) stage I. You have (inaudible) like that. Is that correct? Actually do you want to join handle it?

Ashlie Wilbon: Yes. So actually – Andy, that's a great question. And one of the things we've been struggling with through this process is how much back and forth we actually allow, because those back and forth really kind of tends to extend the timeline, because we have to give, you know, the developer time to go back a lot of times to their committee which, you know, require time to convene them and, you know, make a final decision on whether or they're going to make those changes.

So our assumption in this process is actually that there will be minimal changes that would need to be made particularly the concept level, because the actual concept is only the numerator and denominator statement. They don't give any code or anything that, you know, the changes that we need to be made would be pretty minor like may be wording changes.

And that's the real (neat) of your recommendations potentially for measure development. It would be – OK, you need to consider, I don't know, testing, you know, including this population and then your specification so that, you know, your codes would be, you know, broader – to include broader population or something like that.

So, you know, I get the answers yes or no that the changes that we would allow the concept level will be pretty minor just because it is only a concept. And that we would hope that if they're willing to make those changes, if they could do that we got a very short period of time that wouldn't, you know, require us to changing the timeline or give, you know, large amount of time for them to make changes then go back to the committee to step forward.

So I'm not quite sure if I answered your question, but we're going to try our best to work with people within the timeline of the project and then going forward. You know, because this is a pilot project, we're hoping that this would be something that would be initiated like this project would occur on an annual basis. So if they did – if you guys, you know, voted that the concept would not be approved that it would – it would only have to wait a year to bring it back.

So I'm not sure of that if it answers your question fully.

Andrew Baskin: Yes. You know, your answers did pretty well. But even worse specifically, part of phase I process is identifying related or competing measures. Now if related measures come in, it would seem that that in that stage I there would be an opportunity for those two measured developers who make some perhaps significant changes and still stay within the stage I process.

So that timeline can be a little tight for two developers to do that, because, you know, if we identify a related and they know only one is going make it and

they rather work together I think that's something we would encourage. And we wouldn't want a thing to say they come next year.

Ashlie Wilbon: Yes. I think how we somewhat (inaudible) is that I think you make a great plan. I think how we (inaudible) is that those issues would be identified in phase I and that particularly for this project. A lot of the concepts that are coming in are really just concepts. They're not – they haven't really been fully specified.

So if, you know, you guys identified two measures that, you know, probably worth similar enough that needs to be harmonized or should be one measure, there would be – need to be a decision on whether or not the concept will be approved and then say, "Hey, before you bring this measure back to stage II, not the stage II that kind of be following in the next month, but for stage II that will happen next year, you guys need to bring us back a measure," a fully – you know, one fully specified measure that combined or, and then one of the approved concepts with, you know, drop off or whatever for, you know, bring back two harmonized measures for evaluation at that point.

And so, again, I think it's going to be somewhat of a learning experience to figure out how what really work based on how the developers structure their work and what work in our process. But, you know, we're really hopeful for you guys to try to help us kind of work through that and figure out what's the best way to – what's the best for your time for that work to really occur. So I think we're still trying to figure that up ourselves.

Andrew Baskin: Thank you.

Judy Tobin: Hi. This is Judith Tobin from CMS. Just a thought and it may get more developers as you go long in your material. I think where a lot of questions may potentially come up is how well developed, how it may develop (inaudible) that needs to be accessible. And hopefully it will be a little bit more (inaudible) that definition (inaudible).

(Lorelei Gorean): Yes. That is actually coming up very shortly. That's a great point. And again, I want to kind of point out that this is a pilot process and I think part of – it's not that you have double duty for today but transition to evaluating

measures. We really want to use you guys for feedback and we'll actually have construct your time at the in-person meeting when you come in August with us to give us feedback on how this process works.

You know, it is a pilot. We're trying to kind of improve our consensus development process which is kind of our real life action time to see how well these ideas that we put together based on how other CDPs have worked in the past. So it wasn't that we just kind of fully, you know, pulled it out the air but we're hoping that based on our experience with other CDPs and some of them (inaudible) the developers have identified in the past with, you know, getting fully specifying the measure and spending, you know, money and time and then not even making it through the important criteria that, you know, dividing this process in two stages will be a better kind of middle ground for both the developers and for NQF.

So your feedback throughout this process on how we define the concept whether or not that's enough information for you in making decision or approve the concept that's definitely critical. You know, whether or not, you know, the point in time we're saying harmonization should occur. You know, all of those issues I think we're definitely going to need your feedback on. So we're looking forward to hearing and learning from you guys to this process as well.

Judy Tobin: OK. Thank you.

(Lorelei Gorean): Yes. I let you guys – Evan or whoever is going to the next slide. Do ahead.

Evan Williamson: Yes. All right. So let's go over the proposed process here. And again, I mean we've done over this a little bit. The fact that it's looks very similar to, you know, the past process that you are involved but you knew it's was new to you anyway, who has the – we currently have a technical assistance period and this is new.

This (inaudible) that we're hoping is going to provide hard quality submissions for you guys to be able to review and just, you know, where we've been working with the measured developers to really make sure that's

complete in responsive to the questions that we're asking on the submission form.

And that's been 30 days prior to submission online which is on Monday. So for the last 30 days, we've been working with the developers on their concepts to make sure that when they submit that we have all the submissions that we need for you guys to review. And then we'll go to review the reprocess. So we have our in-person meetings scheduled on the 27th and 28th and we'll be getting this measures out to you to submit preliminary evaluations and we'll be assigning a lead discussion and certain measures to be reviewed that are in your area of expertise.

Based on that meeting, we'll develop a draft report so the recommendations that you guys come up with at the meeting will put down the report and that will go out for public comment and we'll get the comments back and we'll adjudicate those with all of you. We'll develop response to those comments and then it will go through CSAC and board approval.

All right. So for the stage I evaluation, what is the measured concept. So the measured concept includes the numerator and denominator, the exclusions under consideration, risk adjustments variables, the preliminary specifications. So we don't want – we don't ask for codes but just preliminary specifications. The plans used of the measure (inaudible) taxonomy so the post process analysis data source change of care in topic area and then important to measure report.

So this is all under our criteria. This is basically criteria one, so just important to measure and the evidence.

Ashlie Wilbon: So Evan, this is Ashlie. I'll just ask is it important to measure a report criteria you're evaluating high impact whether there is an opportunity for improvement so does this measure a draft gap in performance for this particular topic area (inaudible) and the evidence. Is there evidence to support that this measure is important?

Evan Williamson: Yes. Thank you, Ashlie. All right. So, you know, following the stage of the post, so we have the – again another technical assistance period. Soon after I

mean the context is gone through stage I, we have a measure submission. So we must demonstrate that the checklist for stage II has been – has been met. So they'll – other concept has been approved and will be eligible to submit for stage II and then it will go through another review process.

Naturally, we'll do a full review we'll do a full review of the scientific susceptibility, the usability and feasibility of measure which are criteria two, three and four which we're going to go over later in depth. Again we do another draft report I'll go up and pull up comments. And this time we'll go to a boarding period where it'll go out to the (inaudible) membership submit their votes and then for CSAC and board approval.

All right. So we will be evaluating the stage II. So this is the fully specified measure and again the data under the remaining three criteria which again are listed there.

Ashlie Wilbon: And I would just add that, so when we get to stage II we're actually going to have another kind of orientation to kind of get you guys ready to move in to the next stage. So this is really just going to focus on stage I. But just to give you a bit of a preview, what we're thinking is that once the concept has been approve in stage I that stage II will really just be focused on the remaining three criteria that we won't be going back so important.

The checklist that Evan referred to is really going to focus on making sure that there has been – well in this case most of the concepts that will be coming forward will be a month after. But in the future potentially developers will have up to 18 months to bring back and approve concepts fully specified for review in the stage two of the project.

And at that point we will be checking to make sure that there has been to changes in the evidence that what was the approved concept that they're bringing back in the fully specified measure is really consistent with what was actually approved so they can make any, you know, drastic changes to what was actually approved in that timeframe between stage I and III – excuse me – stage II.

So again stage II is really just to focus on the three remaining criteria and I just want to point out we're not going to be reevaluating the importance. The idea is that that's done in other way. We can, you know, bring forward information done and remind you and drive your memory about, you know, what happen and what was approved, but that the focus of the evaluation is really on the three remaining criteria.

Evan Williamson: Good. Great. That's definitely great to clarify here. We'll move on the key points (inaudible). And as Ashlie just mentioned, again those developers would have 18 months to bring back the full specification of testing result. But here we have maintained these measures. So there will be maintenance measure here in this project. These are measures that were already endorsed have been through in evaluation.

But measures go to remain every three years, so they were evaluating again the previous version the NQF criteria. And so when a measure goes to remain it still must meet – it must meet the new criteria it doesn't matter if it was previously endorsed and must meet what were currently uses criteria and to some measures will not meet that criteria from permitted measures.

So make sure you review it against the current criteria. And again as Ashlie mentioned if the measure is not – context is not permitted within 18 months of being approved, it requires permission for stage I review again. All right.

All right. So this is the pilot and we'll go also this so we want to – we want to test the effectiveness of technical assistance period and to revised measure form, so that's something thing we'll be going through with you all to see the measure that they submitted at the technical assistance period (inaudible) resulted in better submissions and whether or not we can scale this concept evaluation across all of our CDP project. And for stage II we wanted to determine the effectiveness of cross improvements and the staging so these two-stage process of this evaluation process.

All right. So now we're getting into (inaudible) G.I.-G.U. here. We want to stick to endorsed G.I.-G.U. measures for accountability and quality improvement. And again we want to evaluate G.I.-G.U. standards that were

previously endorsed so those our maintenance measures that will be under maintenance in this project.

Ashlie Wilbon: OK. Evan, let's take us pause again. So if you just finished all the stuff about the few stage process, make sure there are any questions. It's kind of lot of information. I just want to make sure that we're all on the same page and if anyone has questions, we can certainly talk through more about, you know, the two-stage (lesson), you know, your role and how that will pay out. So any questions do you have are certainly welcome.

Evan Williamson: Is there any questions?

Chris Saigal: This is Chris Saigal. What you're saying is after the first meeting and we have another meetings set in the year following based if we look at the follow up?

Evan Williamson: Yes.

Chris Saigal: OK.

Ashlie Wilbon: Yes, that's correct. And once we have the – we're still (sitting) from additional (steering) committee members. Once we have the committee before fully seated we will identify the date for next year so that you'll have them all in your calendar well in advance on when will happen, because we've have some so many sitting process has extended beyond when we anticipate it. We just want to make sure we have availability for everyone involved. So we will definitely get those on a counter (inaudible).

Evan Williamson: Do you have other questions?

We'll take some public question. We have measure developer I guess question. Operator, can we open up the questions?

Operator: At this time if you would like to ask the question, please press star-one on your telephone keypad. We have a question form (Erin Jenovi).

Erin Giovannetti: Hi. My name is Erin Giovannetti. I'm with NCQA. I had two questions. The first one is about the checklist between stage I and stage II. NCQ, to measures

NCQA (inaudible) endorsed our measures that are already endorsed and growing up maintenance. If the steering committee proposes changes to these measures during stage I and our measurement and adviser (inaudible) NCQA decline those changes or the measure users CMS that are declined to make those changes, will the measure be dropped from endorsement process?

Ashlie Wilbon: That would depend on whether or not the changes would, you know, if the committee feels that those changes are important enough for the measure to pass its important. So somewhat the whole process importance is a must pass criteria.

And so if the committee felt that, you know, the changes that need to be made in order for them to feel comfortable for the measure to pass importance then I would assume again this is depending on what those recommendations where I can't really think of any opposite example off the top my head. But we would just have to see whether or not those changes would, you know, the impact direct their vote on importance. This is what it comes out through.

Erin Giovannetti: And when would the steering committee make that decision or would NQF makes that decision?

Ashlie Wilbon: No, the steering committee makes that decision.

Erin Giovannetti: And they would make that decision in stage II? Or prior…

Ashlie Wilbon: No, that happens on the stage I. So just like the concepts of measures that aren't fully specified, the maintenance measure will go through a concept review as well. So they will review the concepts of your fully specified measure against the important criteria and all the information that needs the important criteria and depending on, you know, their evaluation of that that would, you know, determine whether or not this measure will move forward for stage II.

Taroon Amin: Hi. This is Taroon Amin. I'm just going to add to real quick, Ashlie. When we evaluate similar to our process currently, we evaluate what measure developer submit in their submission form. Depending on what you submit

on the submission form, the committee will make a determination of whether or not it passes the criteria, the current process and in its proposed new stage.

If there are recommendations for enhancement that would be for annual review or sometime in future, the committee can make those suggestions but those needs to be done in future. We don't expect that, you know, we expect of what submitted is what is endorsed and that's currently what we're under. That's the same process we have for all of our CDP projects. That will not change in the two-stage process. We don't expect the committee to go back to evaluate important space on any recommendations they have for the future.

Erin Giovannetti: I guess and I'm just confused. What if they've already voted on important measure, pass the important criteria, what's in the checklist that must be acted upon?

Taroon Amin: If there are small changes and specifications with the developers, test can be made during the time between stage I and stage II. We're also looking for considerations of submitting into stage II will be evaluated to the checklist. And also potentially looking at what the harmonization issues which were identified in stage I that we recommend that the developers go back, discuss with various other developers and, you know, if there are others issues that are raised during stage I related to harmonization, those may be part of the checklist going to stage II.

That is why we allow developers to come back within 18 months. Potentially, if you're not able to make those changes by the time stage II occurs, you'll have an opportunity within 18 months to submit again. As opposed to our current process which all of those changes we need to occur during the project, this allow the developers much more time and in the stage approach to address those concerns prior to going back to the steering committee.

Erin Giovannetti: Thank you. And just one other question, how many measures in this project are new versus maintenance of endorsed measure?

Taroon Amin: Actually, we'll get into that in the project purpose here but I don't have actually the number of, I know we have 18 new concepts and we have eight

maintenance measures. So Evan will actually start with over all description in this project.

Erin Giovannetti: Thank you very much.

Evan Williamson: Do we have any further questions?

Operator: No further enough with the question at this time.

Evan Williamson: Great. All right, so we'll move in the more description about the project here you'll be working on. So as one of the project purpose, the dull scope we're covering both gastrointestinal and genitourinary conditions so you see the fullest here, I will run through it for you. It's a wide range of conditions here within the two scopes. So here we have the time line, so this is the stage one and you can see where (inaudible) through this. So the required tech assistance day line the 25th of June.

And so that was when a developer had submitted their concept or started working the process with our team here, working through those concepts and the actual concept submission deadline is the 16th of July, so that's next Monday. And at the point we'll be working here on R.N. to get them ready for you to review and we will be getting them out too. We also have a member comment period on the concepts so we'll run the current with your evaluation.

So we have an in-person meeting here. It's actually the 27th to 28th. So that date is saved already and at that point we'll be voting on the measure. We'll have two-day in-person where we'll review in depth of these measures. And following that we'll have the – we'll develop the draft report have member and public comment period. And then we CSAC review following that board approval and then we'll transition to stage two.

And then in stage two here these days are all alternative. So we have attendant meeting set up for February, but we want you to have full committee seated. We will be finalizing the (inaudible) can have well in advance. So the measure we're going to have another technical assistance period, measure submission deadline and we'll go to the whole process.

Ashlie Wilbon: So Evan, I'll just add something to that. So the number comments period that Evan mentioned that happen before the end part of the meeting that's also kind of a new feature that we were piloting in this process and the purpose is to add benefit for members to comments on the measure as you guys are evaluating them.

Those comments will be compiling and bringing to in-person meeting for you guys to consider along with the evaluation of the important criteria and the other concepts that are submitted. So it's new feature that we've added to the process in this pilot so that we'll also be comfortable, be kind of picking your feedback on and how that integrating those comments and hear evaluation actually operational (inaudible).

Evan Williamson: Great. Yes, thank you. OK. So for this project we have eight maintenance measures and that's is put evenly between G.I. and G.U. and then we have 18 concepts for your eight G.I. concepts mostly are infectious inflammatory, bowel disease, colonoscopy screening and surveillance. And then we have the G.U. concepts with a stress urinary incontinence and pelvic floor repair.

Once we – the deadline is we start compiling up here we'll be giving them out to you to be evaluated and for you to submit preliminary evaluations before the meeting and then you'll submit your recommendations at the in-person meeting in August.

And here are the lists of maintenance measures (inaudible) you got to go through them. All of the specs for this are listed on the site. You can go through them. We'll getting them out to you in evaluation forms and (inaudible) between G.I and G.U.

All right. So the role of the steering committee, what do you need to know? So in your all year really representing the multi-stakeholder membership for a specific project. We try to get a wide range of perspectives on the committee. As you all heard when you're introducing yourselves, we have a good range of perspectives here between purchasers, consumers, G.I experts, G.U. experts. So we want to get all of your input on these measures.

So you work with us to achieve the goals of this project. We'll be working with you very closely over the next years or so on this project to really to a deep dive on these measures and to submit your recommendation. Again we were evaluating measures against the criteria and we'll go in depth in the criteria a little later on this call and the subsequent evaluation tutorials. And you'll make recommendations and respond to a comment that's really critical aspect of this process, do you want to know what the public thinks and what NQF membership think on the role you guys do.

And then the coach here represents the steering committee at the CSAC meeting which Andy knows all about. And then for the pilot, we want to have you guys write input on this two-stage process. Again this is new for us and we think it's really going to improve our process. We want to, you know, make sure that it is and want to get your input on it and just the quality of measure mission and the structure and utility of this two-stage process to see if it really makes sense and it really work in a real road setting.

Any question there?

Male: (Inaudible) I just want to make one comment on the far side about making a recommendation and approve of contents, things like that. Just reminding everybody, you're making a recommendation at as an individual, as an individual expert you're not representing a constituency or representing your particular employer or, you know, any state holder here. You're all individual experts so, you know, just remember that, that's the way it works and keeps this (inaudible) much cleaner process and we get a better result this way.

Evan Williamson: Great. Thanks for clarifying that.

All right. So we have some expectations. We want you guys to attend meeting and some conference calls. The (inaudible) works this year to present and we know that great response from all of you when we were trying set up our meeting and calls for your availability so we really appreciate that.

We want to make sure you guys identified acknowledge, potential biases. We'll have a disclosure session at the in-person meeting where we will disclose potential conflicts and we want to make sure that we take that

seriously. And even the perception of a bias can be potentially a problem so we want to make sure that we identify those and the (inaudible) individually evaluate all the measures against the criteria and submit evaluation in the tools we've provided, we'll be giving you guys,.

We use survey monthly for our preliminary evaluation and we're running you through the process on that. And then we'll begin using SharePoint to distribute our materials and make sure that – so as you saw really there are large number measures and concepts here so we have the eight maintenance and 18 concepts. So we'll be assigning guys a sub-set of those measures for in-depth review and evaluation base on your expertise. And then we expect you participate in the discussion and vote at the meeting for all the measures.

Even the ones that you don't do an in-depth review on it, we still expect you to review them and look over them and be familiar with them and then at the meeting someone who did do in-depth to dive on those measures will be presenting them and really got your through it. And then following that we want you review the main summaries and draft reports and the public comments and response as we go to those adjudication calls.

Do you have any questions about the expectation of our steering committee members?

Great. I do have additional resources here and we'll be posting these on the SharePoint site. They're currently available on the NQF website, but I will make it easy for you and I'll post on my SharePoint site. So we have our guidance for evaluating the evidence, guidance of measure testing, measure harmonization, related and competing measures. We have guidance – guidance documents and we'll have those post and available for you in the committee resource section of the SharePoint site.

So we have some anticipated challenges here. We will make positive measure being submitted for this process to what we'll be reviewing that. And then as far as relating – the competing and related measures, we have identified some already and so we want to make sure that we work on that process and we

talked a little about that already. But those are some anticipated challenges that we've seen for this project so far.

All right. So we just completed the first half of our orientation call. Do we have any question so far? We've gone to a lot of material here and we'll be available through email to answer questions if something comes up later. We have the steering committee guide all that information again to review back. But do you have any question at this point?

Great. I'll turn it back over to (Lorelei) and we'll start going to the measure evaluation criteria.

(Lorelei Gorean): Great. Thank you, Evan.

So before measures or concepts even get to you to review and (inaudible) to make sure that our conditions for consideration has been in that and so these conditions include the fact that a measure or concepts towards agreement has been singed such as the developers declare that they intended use of the measure includes public reporting as well as quality improvement and that they've thought about harmonization and competing measure and that the concepts and measures submissions is complete and responsive. And again that's where the technical assistance for this particular project is going coming to play.

So we have four major endorsement criteria that we've mentioned a few throughout the call. First the most important for you for this first stage is the importance to measuring the fourth criteria, which includes high impact of that of the national goal, our priority how many people are affected by this conditions of same measure if there're the performance staff and then opportunity for improvement so is there any variations of performance, is there any disparity in care that are known about and then the evidence criteria which includes quantity, quality and consistency. So that's all part of importance.

Either (inaudible) we're going to some more details about the importance criteria later on in the call. And then we have the scientific acceptability of measure properties where you'll show really be doing a deep into stage two.

So that's where we – you talked about whether the measure is reliable and valid and assessed. The risk adjustment methodology (inaudible) has been used if this is applicable.

And then you also discussed whether team measure is usable and feasible. So the need each of the major criteria or sub-criteria that you'll end eventually consider enough to (inaudible) we're really talk about in a few moments here especially regarding the importance criteria. And you're evaluation of those sub-criteria then roll up into one and whether the measure passes each of the major criteria.

So as I went over this a little bit before, but we have differences between new and endorse measures. All measure as we said have to go through our current evaluation process and meet the current criteria and guidance. Endorse measures also have to provide data from having been implemented and how they've been use since they've been endorse by NQF.

And the reliability and validity testing are expected to have been extended and unless they made a high rating when they first look back. And then we also look at how they've been used and actually use some public reporting and other accountability and improvement program. And we also will ask you to discuss what is if any unintended consequences have occurred from the implementation and use of this measures.

So there are there any questions from that very, very high level overview of the criteria before I hand it over to Taroon?

Taroon Amin: OK. So we're going to go into really thinking about the evaluation of how you will evaluate this, evaluate all the variant concepts that you receive to this project. Again I just want to reiterate the concepts has going to include the numerator statement, the denominator statement, the exclusion of the appropriateness of the exclusion, the risk of adjustment variable, (preliminate) specification plans use in the (taxonomy).

And then you will evaluate these components which will be submitted to you in our concepts submission form against the importance measure and report criteria which is broken down into three sub criteria which will be high

impact, the performance gap and the evidence. Some of the guidance reports here that will be helpful for as you're thinking about the evaluation are listed here particularly evidence for focus of measurement and importance to measure move forward.

We expect that they will be evaluated against the updated evaluation criteria with specific rating skill through evidence, reliability before they will go through the individual rating scale for evidence. So the impact which is the first important criteria actually, so these are the, just important criteria to the extent, the importance criteria, the extent to which the measure focus as evidence base importance in making significant gains in health care quality and improving health care outcomes where specific high impact aspect is care.

And then it'll be broken down into three sub-criteria, high impact gaps and evidence. The high impact we'll use a generic weighting scale of high, moderate, low and insufficient and we will look at its relationship between a national health care goal and data on number of people affected in the high resource use and severity of illness.

The second we'll look at the performance gap and the opportunity for improvement. This will also use a generic weighting scale of high, moderate, low and here you'll look at the data demonstrating considerable variation and performance, data under disparity of care. I'll note here for measures that are currently endorsed or maintenance measures, we will expect to see information on the performance variation using the measure itself in the field, as (Lorelie) described prior.

And third which I will go into much more detail is that there's specific weighting scale for looking at evidence which evaluates the quality, quantity, and consistency of the body of evidence. So as I described, the generic rating scale for high impact and performance gap will actually use high moderate, low and insufficient. And specifically I wanted to spend a little of time here focusing on the rating scale for evidence which will look at quality, quantity, consistency which will look at high-moderate low but has a specific formula for how high-moderate low should be evaluated.

So when you're looking at quantity of the body of evidence, we expect that there will be a total number of studies not just articles or papers. A five-foot studies that represent the evidence of the measure focus and, yes, of the measure focus. When you're looking at the quality of evidence, high is really defined by the direct evidence for the measured focus adequate size to obtain for size estimates of the effect without serious lost that introduced by it. So we expect that the measure developers would submit information describing the quality of the body of evidence that exist. And as you can see, the rating scale kind of described each of the different criteria here.

And again, describing how quality is evaluating looking at the type of the study, the directness to the specific measure and how precise the actual as demonstrated in the evidence. Finally, you'll have the consistency of the evidence is what we want to make sure is that there's ability in both the direction and magnitude of a clinically and practically significant benefit to ensure that we're actually putting out in the field the National Consensus Standard which actually described very consistently which was supported by the consistent – which is supported by the evidence. And so, once you're evaluating the quantity, quality and consistency there's an algorithm that we use to define whether it actually passes the sub-criteria 1-C which is the evidence.

And I'll actually point you to the last – to the lowest role here which basically disregards how this criteria does not pass which is where there's no consistency or there's low consistency which would cause a measure to not pass criteria, sub-criteria 1-C which is the evidence. And so, we'll talk to this position logic of how the evidence would actually be rated in the committee meeting again. But we just wanted to make sure that everybody was aware of how we look at evidence across quality, quantity and consistency in the evidence that's presented by the developers.

We described here a little more on distinguishing between low in position which is often a current question that we received, which is that a low rating generally means that the evidence that was demonstrated that the criteria is not met. And the insufficient evidence really describes a situation where the evidence does exist, but was not presented and we expect that you'll use your

clinical expertise here to bring, you know, to evaluate whether it was actually insufficient based on the evidence that's out there in the literature. Or the submission is incomplete or deficient in presenting the information.

Again one of the elements that we'll be testing for this pilot is an upfront or we're calling a technical review period where low evaluate each of the submissions to ensure that they're complete prior to the steering committee evaluation, which has not been our process in the past.

So we hope that you will not see submissions that are incomplete or deficient prior to your evaluation. And again, each individual steering committee member will be asked to submit a preliminary evaluation and will – you rate the measures based on the evidence submitted and note if there's additional evidence that you are aware of. But really we expect the measure submission to stand on their own when they're submitted.

And there are – there is an exception to the evidence, rule of the evidence criteria of the quality, quantity, consistency in which there's an exception for health outcomes in which their health outcome measures where there's clearly a rationale that supports the relationship between the healthcare outcome and at least one health care structured process or intervention.

And I will stop at there at this point. There's a few components that I'll just add in closing here which is that you're supported by a strong group of staff here at NQF both that are looking from the technical review period which is Alexis Morgan and Karen Pace and then from the CDP team which you heard from all of us today, myself, Ashlie Wilbon. And I also just wanted to keep – just reiterate a few overarching comment here which is that we are continuing to pilot this two-stage process. There are tools that we are developing to support you as a committee. But we just ask and keep in mind that this is a new process for us and we going to continue to help support as best as we can.

And we will also – and also just to keep in mind for the tutorial call that we'll be having later on this week and next week. Goal of the tutorial call is to provide some examples of information that will be submitted for each of the commission items to help describe how to evaluate each of these individual

measures. As in one of things that Andy Baskin mentioned at the beginning of this call which I think is very helpful is that one of the real ways you'll be able to get experience with the evaluation criteria is by actually doing an evaluation and really walking through that process in the systematic way.

So our effort to the tutorial call is to give you a little bit more description of the criteria and some examples not necessarily from this project but just from high level illustration of what type of information will be provided in each of the different submission item component. So obviously that's a lot of information that we presented and kind of a short period of time here. But we wanted to make sure that we use – the remaining portion of the call we talk through any other questions that you may have and we can kind of go from there.

Are there any questions, comment?

(Lorelei Gorean): (Amy), we can also open it up for any public comment. People may ask.

Operator: If you would like to ask a question, please press star-one. There are no questions from my end.

Ashlie Wilbon: Taroon, this is Ashlie. I just wanted to add that the two tutorial calls that are offered, one is tomorrow afternoon and the other is on the 17th. While they're optional particularly if this is your first time for just sitting on the NQF committee, we strongly, strongly recommend that you pick one to attend. It's really going to be helpful. We're going to go through some of the materials that we've given to the developers on guidance on how they should be submitting information and the type of questions you should be asking yourself when you're evaluating the measure. So I just wanted to kind of plug those tutorials. This is for any people.

Male: Will those tutorials be available online afterwards?

Ashlie Wilbon: Yes, as well as the materials.

Male: OK, thanks.

Male: And will the web link be sent to us to get?

Ashlie Wilbon: We will – we can do that. Most likely we'll – we're going to try to use the SharePoint site as much as possible…

Male: OK.

Ashlie Wilbon: Just because sometimes the name link and information on those with the audio file and stuff can use the file they're too big to send via email, so more than likely it will be on the SharePoint site. But we'll keep you guys updated via email on when stuff is posted and how to access it.

Male: OK.

Male: For me, (inaudible) almost a material the second sort of bring up the phone number will be really helpful sometimes to call in.

Ashlie Wilbon: OK.

Male: Ashlie, I'll just add one thing since we have a little bit of time here and I want to be respectful to everybody. So one of the things that the way we structured these calls is to really – these protocols and I wanted at this point use the material. I know Evan really describe it earlier today. But if you look at the steering committee guidebook which we have now on the screen share, I think you'll all be able to see this. But if you scroll down on the left side within the bookmark you'll see the steering committee evaluation guide.

And this is a new – a new tool that we're using that we actually develop for most of our, for our measured developers to kind of give them an example of the type of information we would expect to see for each of the different sub-criteria. And so what, what we'll basically be doing during the call and, you know, in the case that you may not be able to attend or you want to actually see what information we're going to be over, we'll really be going over all these examples to explain what, you know, again we'll be focusing on high impact and opportunity for improvement along with evidence for process number one or process number two.

So we will through this information to describe the type of information we expect to see and how you'll then use this information to, again, the evaluation criteria to make your recommendation free to the concepts. So this is the – this is where the information is located. I would highly recommend that you take in advance look at this information and we'll use the quality (dense) really kind of answer any questions that you may have.

And I can't stress enough the clearest way to really understand our criteria is by trying to apply it, so if you take this easy example and then really use our evaluation criteria to spend, use them side by side to then try to apply the information, you'll be at a much better position to evaluate the measures and the concepts as they are come in through our project.

So again, we'll go over that information. I won't go much more into detail there and any other question that you may have, feel free to use any additional time here on the call or our project staff we're happy to answer those question through email. If there any other question, we're happy to take them.

Johannes Koch: So this is Johannes Koch in Seattle. So it's a very exciting process and I'm really looking forward to it. Right now it's a little bit daunting obviously lot of information. So I look forward to those tutorials. Is there any information specifically about the in-person meeting in terms of the exact timing of when we should try to come in and out for some of us coming from the West Coast might be a little bit more challenged?

Male: Well yes. The meeting, we usually get started on 8:30 a.m. on the first day. So, and now two schedules on Monday and Tuesday, but that would seem to be when most people indicate that they were available. So it's quite (inaudible) before, but we should start 8:30 a.m. on Monday and wind about 4 o'clock on the second day.

Johannes Koch: OK. Thank You.

Ashlie Wilbon: And, I'll just add to that. Our meeting's department should be contacting each of you very soon with travel information. We have a travel website where you would go in and schedule your travel, your flight and all that stuff. And we also have work with travel agents that can help…

Johannes Koch: OK.

Ashlie Wilbon: … going to travel. So all that information will be forthcoming along with, you know, instruction on, you know, how to get your reimbursement and all that stuff for food and all that stuff. So that is all coming very soon.

Male: Great, thank you.

Operation: We have a question from Erin Giovannetti.

Erin Giovannetti: Hi. This is Erin from NCQA again. Can you just tell me what's the dates of steering committee meeting are?

Male: Yes. They are August 27th to 28th.

Erin Giovannetti: OK. Thank you very much.

Male: No problem.

Liliana Bordeianou: And will the meeting be focused on G.I. one day and G.U. another day or will they be mixed? This is Liliana Bordeianou from Boston.

Male: At this point we don't know yet. We haven't developed the agenda. We kind of need to actually see what actually comes in and make some decisions about logical caring of what would make the, you know, what would actually flow, you know, how the flow would actually play out.

Male: It's a question of whether maintenance should be done all together, both G.I. and G.U. with (Endo1) to new measures or but within and even if we do that maintenance we would do G.I. and G.U., you know, separately as I'm not going to go back to forth between the two.

Male: (Inaudible) respectful of the measures developers time (inaudible) kind of fair make sure all the measures are handled same time (inaudible) measured over the two days. So, but we'll developing that. We'll be consulting you on the developing the agenda. We want to make sure that you make it (big as much time) as possible.

Liliana Bordeianou: OK, thank you.

Andy Baskin: And this is Andy Baskin. And I just want to make one practical statement which is important to me but ever since to be important to anybody else at this stage with no one ever talk about this kind of thing, but, you know, this are pretty intense meeting. This is (inaudible) two full days of work. We want people to be comfortable. We want people to enjoy this time. How much do you spend (inaudible) but more importantly we're not well worthy.

But separately I got to tell you, I'm not a big guy for wearing a tie and I'm not wearing one right now just like everyone else in the room having went on. Listen, this is casual fine. If you want you like to wear suit and a tie or an uncle length dress be my guest, but it's not mandatory, you know, use your judgment but this is casual perfectly OK. These are long days isn't it? It's a lot of work.

Ashlie Wilbon: Thank you. We got actually good, a very good place especially it's summertime and if you haven't been busy in August before, you'll definitely want to be comfortable.

Male: OK. Good. Any other questions? And I thought I reiterate again. For the SharePoint site, we – I know we have some pushes this morning. If you have certain problems then please definitely contact me and we will get it sorted out. We don't want to be using that. We know that once we get those sorted out that definitely be a great asset for us, managing your documents and the discussion threads. So again please contact me out I'll make sure it work this afternoon, tomorrow to get everybody up to speed on SharePoint.

(Lorelei Gorean): And once this presentation as well, we'll be compiling to that file. We'll put that on to SharePoint site if you want it to review as well as we'll have audio for this, too.

Male: OK. Well, thank you all for your time. We know that, you know, we appreciate you as volunteers, this effort on and we want to be respectful to that. So thank you again and we look forward to continue on for the tutorial calls and to meet all of you here in person in Washington in August.

Thank you very much.

Male/Female: Thank you.

END