

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

**Moderator: Sheila Crawford
September 5, 2019
2:00 pm ET**

Ashlie Wilbon: Good afternoon everyone.

Woman: Hi.

Ashlie Wilbon: Hi, good afternoon. I wanted to welcome everyone to the Webinar this afternoon. This is the second part or installment of a two-part Webinar series where we are discussing the Measure Feedback Loop Pilot Option. So, welcome back to all the committee members and our co-chairs, Rose and Eddie. I do believe Eddie is going to be a little bit late. He'll be joining us as soon as he is able.

But let's just get started with a quick roll call to see who's on the call with us so far. We are going to pick up where we left off on Tuesday, or on -- Tuesday, yes, (unintelligible) Monday, right -- where we finished with looking at - starting to look at the various categories of strategies that we had grouped together.

And today we'll pick up with looking at some of the strategies that we thought should be implemented with any pilot, and then we'll move in to a discussion

of the two very different pilot options that we have proposed so far, and then look to get some committee input particularly on whether or not there are other options or approaches for coming up with other pilot options for CMS consideration.

So, with that, let me go ahead and just do a quick roll call here to see who's there. Was there a question, before I get started?

Okay. I thought I heard someone. Thanks. So, Rose, are you there?

Rose Baez: I'm here. Hello.

Ashlie Wilbon: Thanks. Eddie? I don't think he's joined us yet, but - okay. (Connie Anderson)?

(Connie Anderson): I'm here.

Ashlie Wilbon: Hi. (Robert Centaur)? (Elvia Chevaria)? (Dan Kulicka)? (Melody Vanko-Holsenbach)?

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): I'm here.

Ashlie Wilbon: Welcome. (Anne Deutsche)?

(Anne Deutsche): Here.

Ashlie Wilbon: (Trisha Eliot)? (Lee Fleischer)? (Mark Wang)? (Joe Kunish)?

(Joe Kunish): Here.

Ashlie Wilbon: Hi, (Joe). (Claire Noelle-Miller)? (Esda Punwani)?

(Esda Punwani): Yes, I'm here. Thanks.

Ashlie Wilbon: Hi. (Karin Rubin)? (Beth Rubenstein)? (Jill Schumacher)?

(Jill Schumacher): Here.

Ashlie Wilbon: Did I pronounce your name right? Can you say it for me please?

(Jill Schumacher): (Schumacher).

Ashlie Wilbon: (Schumacher). Thank you. (Heather Smith)? (Deborah Strue)?

(Deborah Strue): Here.

Ashlie Wilbon: And (Sara Toomey). Okay. I think we have quite a few members that have not had an opportunity yet to join us. We'll go ahead and dive in, and hopefully folks will get a chance to join us as we get into the discussion here.

So with that, I'm going to hop ahead here and give another brief refresher of where we left off on Tuesday. So we did make it through a good portion of the first part of the Webinar where we discussed our approach for rating and weighing the cost and benefit of each of the strategies. We gave a summary overview of where all of the strategies landed with their cost/benefit analysis.

And then we started to discuss - or we spent a good bit of time discussing some of the strategies that were pulled by certain committee members, and had discussion over how the ratings for cost and benefit analysis might be

adjusted to better reflect the impact and potential feasibility of some of those strategies.

So we made it through those, and just started the discussion on our approach to grouping the strategies and the various options and categories for consideration. The first category of strategies was strategies that we did not include in any pilot option, and we heard some committee discussions. In general there was agreement, with the exception of option or strategy two which is listed here. And we got feedback from the committee that certainly there should be some strategy within the pilot that addresses the measure developers' need to respond to commenters in a timely manner, and we got some suggestions on how we might do that. So we will be reincorporating that into the strategy options or the pilot options going forward.

Our next set of discussion items was around strategies that NQF will continue to do that are part of our existing process, that we really felt like were kind of core foundational pieces of our existing process that we would continue to do with any pilot that would be implemented. And so we discussed about 11 of those strategies and there seemed to be pretty good agreement amongst the committee that those were also worth continuing to do with the pilot that is selected.

So the next discussion that we wanted to roll into was this discussion around pilot - I'm sorry, strategies that would be implemented with any pilot option. And these were specific strategies that also had a very good kind of cost/benefit comparison analysis, if you will, but also that we felt that were so important and imperative or impactful for the success of any pilot, that we didn't want to have to make a choice between - or want to present CMS with a choice of to have to implement it or not. And so the recommendation that

we're putting forward for the committee to consider is that this set of strategies would be implemented with any pilot option we propose.

So with that, I will give an overview of the options, or sorry, of the strategies that we have proposed for this kind of bucket, if you will, and then we'll pause for a little bit of discussion and see where the committee is - how the committee feels about this set of proposed strategies.

So the first one, looking at Row 17 or Strategy Number 17, I'll also just remind folks that there was a spreadsheet attached to the email and to the meeting invitation for this Webinar that has - that will allow you to filter and sort on the various strategies, see the summary scores and the individual ratings for each category of cost and benefit, if you'd like a more detailed view as we're going through this.

So, going back here to Strategy Number 17, this is one that focuses on communicating expectations for commenters and those who provide feedback on how their feedback may or may not be acted upon during the current phase of measure development or the maintenance lifecycle.

And this was really a strategy that came out of many of the committee discussions where, and I think we also discussed this on the Webinar on Tuesday, that comments submitted particularly during the measure endorsement process, that there shouldn't necessarily be an expectation that developers will be making changes to measures while they are under review for endorsement, and certainly, you know, comments or feedback that are submitted after endorsement while the measure is in its maintenance phase, or, you know, that post-endorsement phase, that, you know, the flexibility and consideration for feedback is certainly broader than it is within the endorsement process, and having some sort of communication either on the

commenting page or FAQ document or something like that, that would make sure that folks who are submitting feedback and comments understand how their - how and when their feedback might be considered based on when it is submitted.

The next one, Strategy Number 18, is around NQF staff ensuring that comments are carried from one maintenance review cycle to the next. And this is to make sure that committees can track the relevant comments and feedback and themes of feedback that emerge over time with particular measures, and to be able to follow up with developers on action that they expected perhaps to happen in a previous measure evaluation cycle that perhaps they would expect to be addressed in a follow-up maintenance review. So I think this one is pretty straightforward, but the idea that NQF would be more consistent about carrying those comments forward so that there's a more longitudinal view of feedback that's been submitted for measures.

NQF will expand its marketing communication strategy to promote the use of the commenting and feedback tools for measure users. Again this is a pretty broad strategy and we did have some specific ways to do that that we discussed on the earlier Webinar, but again this is one that we think needs to happen regardless of the pilot as selected.

Another strategy here, Number 21, is around the inclusion of instructions on the Web page via embedded links or rollovers, with the instructions on how to submit feedback, to make sure that folks understand where to put certain types of commentaries that they may have or feedback that they may have, so that it's organized and instructional and easy to follow when folks actually get to the commenting page.

Strategy 16 is around the development of educational resources and opportunities to inform individuals of where and how they can provide feedback, and then again, making sure that that feedback is tailored towards the needs of the stakeholder perspective.

Recommended strategies, again, that we wouldn't implement. Continuing on, Strategy Number 21, is around making an access point for the feedback tool more prominent and visible on the homepage. We had a lot of discussion about that, and so certainly I think that's something that should happen, regardless of whatever option is selected.

That we would also revise and - the measure submission form to clarify questions and modify to correspond with any change of evaluation criteria, as well as to just make sure that the questions that are asked in the submission form are clear to developers so that we are receiving the information and the submission form from the developer, that we are actually looking for, that aligns with the actual need we're trying to meet.

Strategy Number 23 is around providing a structure for those submitted feedback, that aligns with NQF criteria. Again we had some discussion about this on a prior Webinar, where we discussed - that was in each - several of the NQF evaluation criteria. There are sub-criteria that are specifically focused on feedback that is provided by developers, or that they may have gained from folks who are using the measures around improvement data, around the feasibility of the measure, around who's using the measure, how it's being used, how many entities are using it within a particular geographical region, and things like that.

So, all of those pieces of information essentially sit or embedded within certain NQF criteria. And the idea would be that, going forward, as we look

to collect feedback, that we will be soliciting feedback that would align with those categories so that it's more easily translatable to those evaluating measures to see how that feedback relates to how the measure would be evaluated.

Strategy 24 is around the standardized collection of all comments and feedback collected by NQF in the same format tool and interface. So this is one that was discussed as a part of, again, around the goal that we added, which was to make sure that there is standardized collection of the feedback. As we discussed, our current platforms, there are two different ways or two different kind of interfaces that are used to submit comments at this time. One is through the Measure Feedback Tool and the other is a separate interface that commenters will see when they go to submit comments for measures that are currently under endorsement review.

And so the idea would be that we would try to merge those tools or combine those commenting collection tools into one tool so that anytime anyone can just submit - to submit feedback, they would be familiar and be able to see the same page, they were being asked - they're being asked for their input in the same way, and so it becomes familiar to those who are submitting feedback on a regular basis potentially.

So with that, I'm going to just pause and see if there's any comment or thoughts around this set of strategies that we are suggesting would be implemented with any pilot option.

I'm hearing silence as agreement or if maybe I should say, are there any strategies that any members of the committee would disagree that would - that should not be implemented with any pilot or that you feel like could be slotted

in to either one of the proposed pilot options or other pilot options or a different pilot option?

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): This is (Melody). I think, you know, maybe we need to look at what you have proposed and kind of go from there to see if there are any additions or alternatives to that.

Ashlie Wilbon: Sure. That makes a lot of sense. Do other folks agree with that? Are we okay to kind of press on to the other pilot options and then we can pause for questions after that?

Man: Yes, it sounds good.

Ashlie Wilbon: Okay.

Woman: It sounds good. Yes, agree.

Ashlie Wilbon: Okay. Just give me one second here.

So the first pilot option that we are proposing is focused on enhancing partnerships to promote the feedback loop. And as we mentioned on the Webinar on Tuesday, this option are the same that was really used to group strategies. This option was really based on the idea that activities that would be taking place during the pilot would be really focused on doing outreach to other partners within the Quality Measurement Enterprise to make sure that they were aware of the commenting tool, that we were sharing information, sharing access to the feedback tool, and making sure that folks were aware of commenting and feedback options. So that's generally the theme of this pilot.

So with that, I'll kind of talk through at a high level some of the strategies here and then we'll pause again for committee discussion.

So, Strategy 25 is around this exploration of opportunities to partner with EHR vendors, and other tools used by measure implementers, which may be the QCDRs, the registries, so, corporate links to the feedback tool and to the user interface, again with this idea of making it more accessible where people are doing the work, so that it's readily available and to not necessarily have to require folks to come to the NQF Web site to access the feedback tool or to be triggered, if you will, to provide feedback.

Strategy 26 is around encouraging measure developers and stewards with NQF-endorsed measures to use the measure feedback tool with - to collect feedback on their measures that are endorsed, particularly during the maintenance period, so that they can all be collected in one place.

Strategy 27 is around the exploration of activities for adding links to other organizations' Web pages for easy access. We talked quite a bit about this on Tuesday. And then the final one on this slide is around partnering with specialty societies and relevant organizations to identify opportunity for using the feedback tool as a standardized way to collect feedback on NQF-endorsed measures.

And then the last two strategies for this pilot would include regularizing the solicitation of outreach for comments, particularly for measures that are not currently under review. So I think we also talked a bit about this on Tuesday, that particularly during the maintenance phase, that once measures are endorsed, there is an opportunity for folks to come to NQF's Web site currently and provide feedback. But there is no active outreach at this point to solicit feedback throughout that three-year period from NQF. So this strategy

is really around finding a way to outreach at a more regular - on a more regular basis on maintenance measures, such that we are kind of constantly getting boluses of feedback on measures of particular topic areas.

The final one is around modifying the feedback tool and Web site to enable simple, accessible viewing of all the comments submitted on any endorsed measures. Again, this strategy is centered on trying to ensure that not only is feedback collected but then it's visible, so that other folks who come to, you know, potentially comment or feedback on a measure where there have already been several other comments, that those can be viewed by other commenters, so that they can see what's already been submitted, and have it be more of a communication tool for those who are submitting feedback and for those who - and for developers going to see what feedback has been submitted on their measures.

So this is an opportunity to have some committee discussion, but I wonder, do folks feel that this would be a good time to discuss or do you feel the need to hear more about the second pilot option before we have a discussion? We can be flexible about that depending on how folks are feeling about providing input at this point.

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): This is (Melody). I think I need to understand a little bit more about, you know, what - well, I know we have the basic topics that are going into them, but like under the strategies and stuff like that. I guess, it's kind of - it's such a broad thing. Is there almost comparison, you know, if we do go over the second one, are there overlapping, is there something that's showing us comparison, or will we just have to kind of look at that going through? You know, are they the same measures included, are they all different measures included?

Ashlie Wilbon: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Ashlie Wilbon: Each option is actually there's separate - there's no overlap between the options. So what the strategies that are in pilot option one are not in option two. Is that helpful?

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): Helpful but I don't know if ideal. So we'll walk through it and see.

Ashlie Wilbon: Okay, fair enough.

(Connie Anderson): This is (Connie). I'd like to see pilot option two before - so I can get my head around what's in both of the options, before we talk about what strategy should be added or removed or whatever. It'd be easier for me to know what both the options are, the pilots are, I mean.

Ashlie Wilbon: Fair enough. I think that makes a lot of sense. We will press on.

So, pilot option two is centered on enhancing NQF stewardship of the feedback loop. And this, the strategies within this option are really focused on NQF staff and NQF's organizations being more involved in the actual collection of feedback. So, for example, Strategy 31, NQF staff would be conducting literature sources to identify published or implementation - published implementations of measures and any impact that was identified.

Strategy Number 32 is around automating responses to commenters from NQF, from the Measure Feedback Tool. And this again was to just make the process more timely in terms of ensuring that the loop is closed between

commenters and developers so that commenters know when their comment has been received, that there's an acknowledgement of that, and just more communication again with the commenter.

And Number 33 is around NQF staff again doing more work to actually find various information about the measures, and external tools, like JIRA, impact report, and other resources for implementation feedback to incorporate into the committee materials.

And then 34 is around collaborating with developers to find and identify external stakeholders that potentially should be targeted for outreach of solicited feedback, either during the measure evaluation period or even during the maintenance phase.

Strategy 35 is around considering the - using the feedback tool as an online form, a bulletin board, where it would be more of an interactive tool where folks who came to submit comments for a particular measure could see again what other folks are submitting but also then be able to submit comments and respond to what's been submitted, perhaps, you know, like or give a thumbs-up or something to acknowledge that they are potentially experiencing the same thing or would like to submit a comment or share feedback that will be similar to what's already been submitted.

Thirty-six is around again working with developers, particularly around measures where there has not been a lot of feedback within a certain period of time, and we have here five years. But this, you know, giving some period of time to trigger NQF to reach out to the developers to say, you know, "Hey, we haven't gotten any feedback on your measures. Let's see if there's a way for us to collaborate to see how we can be a little bit more proactive about

identifying a strategy or other approaches to collecting feedback on particular measures."

The other strategy was to consider ways that NQF might be able to incentivize users or others to provide feedback, and certainly there would need to be a little bit more safety on this strategy. But I think the idea is that, in order for any of this to work, that users have to be invested enough to be able to come to NQF or to click on that link to enter their input and provide feedback, so to really explore ways that there might be some sort of incentive program for that to promote users to do that.

The final strategies for this option include modifying the feedback tool, again to automatically send measure stewards comments so they can see what's, you know, to let them know that things are available on the Web site or that comments had been submitted, and then enabling measure stewards to be able to respond via that link so that it's easier for them to be able to contact the commenter and provide a response, again providing more mechanisms for us to kind of help to facilitate closing the loop with commenters, and getting feedback into the process and providing responses.

Another strategy that we have talked a great deal about is to modify the Web site to remove the log-in requirements to submit comments, so that there is not as much of a barrier to do that. And then finally, partnering with CMS to receive the annual report of feedback collected through JIRA, and to distribute this to developers or even to take that feedback integrated into the forms for committee deliberation during measure evaluation and maintenance review.

So those are the options. Certainly it's a lot to digest. I will, I don't know if Eddie has been able to join us yet, but I will hand it over to the co-chairs at this point to help us think through these pilot options. And what I may do is

jump a bit ahead before I hand it over just to have this on the table as well for thinking through options, that we would certainly also be looking for other pilot options that should be considered or other recommendations on how we might think about theming or grouping the strategies together and, you know, thinking about some of the pros and cons of all these options and kind of the benefits and kind of compromises that we might make by kind of grouping some of the strategies together in one pilot option.

So I'll put all that on the table and hand it over to Rose and Eddie, and we'll see - maybe talk through the best way to have the discussion at this point.

Rose Baez: Okay. Thanks, Ashlie. This is Rose.

You know, what I think might help, and Ashlie, you did a good job of summarizing the first meeting, but I wonder if it would help if you all look at your - that Excel spreadsheet. I think that was a really nice way for me to look at the 40 strategies and really understand what's being recommended and for discussion. You know, when you go back to the first few strategies, one through four, those seem to be grouped as the strategies not recommended for inclusion. Ashlie, you summarized that, from feedback from yesterday's meeting, we would look to keep Strategy Number 2 of those four strategies.

And then strategies 5 through 15 are existing and will continue to be kept. And then strategies 16 through 24 are those that we reviewed on Tuesday for recommendation for inclusion. And I believe we came out with agreement that those would - could be included regardless of which pilot option would be chosen. So we're really now looking at strategies 25 through 30, I believe, for pilot option one, and then strategies 31 through 40 for pilot option number two.

And as Ashlie had summarized, you know, option one is more about educating stakeholders, whereas option two is more - involve more of NQF staff being more actively involved in collecting feedback. So I wonder if, you know, that sort of clarifies where we need to take this discussion.

I do see a hand raised. (Esda), do you want to make a comment here?

(Esda Punwani): Yes. No, thank you so much. No, I appreciate the summary. And my question is more, and maybe I missed it, but why are we separating like option one and two? Is it based on the resourcing, like we can only take one of the actions, or would we consider doing like a hybrid? Because it seems that we want to do both. We would want to, you know, improve NQF resources and engagement but we would also, at the same time, want to educate, you know, the stakeholders. I guess, I'm trying to understand, do we have to pick one or is there a hybrid approach, or was there a reason to do that? I just, maybe I missed that.

Ashlie Wilbon: Hi, (Esda). This is Ashlie from NQF. You bring up a good question. It's something that we struggle with as well. So, essentially, without being too overly simplistic, so we have to submit multiple options to CMS to consider. And so we were trying to find ways to group the strategies into different options, right?

(Esda Punwani): I got you. Okay.

Ashlie Wilbon: So we could present one option but that doesn't give them much of a choice.

(Esda Punwani): Right.

Ashlie Wilbon: And so, you know, if there are other ways, I mean that certainly could be one of the options, would be a hybrid, but I think it, you know, just to make sure we're - we are consistent with what's being asked by CMS, is that they have a few different choices to choose from. Maybe there's like a light version or like an all-in version or, you know...

(Esda Punwani): Right.

Ashlie Wilbon: ...however we come up with it I think it's fine, but I think we just - we do need to have more than one option.

(Esda Punwani): Okay. No, that's very helpful, thank you. And I did not put that together.

So then I was - I mean, I don't know what everybody else thinks. I would, you know, I think that we - if we can submit multiple actions, I think one would be, you know, where we do some type of combination of the hybrid and maybe that means, you know, some of those recommendations that had maybe a higher cost and low benefit, you know, we kind of mix those or whatever. But I do think that there probably needs to be a combination of both of these strategies, that's kind of how I see them, in one of the options.

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): And this is (Melody). I agree, kind of got to make the same type of comments, you know, asking about the choices splitting, and I think a hybrid option - actually, you know, all of these things are - seem very important, but combining them, because I'm looking at the two different pages, and for example, Strategy 21 could really be coupled with strategies 39 and possibly 38 of option two. So, 21 of option one with 38 and 39 of option two.

In pilot option one, you could somehow fit in option, you know, Strategy 22, 23 and 24 together. So, you know, you're clarifying questions and, you know, and modifying is needed to correspond with any changes to criteria. But in doing that, you're providing structure to submit the feedback and standardizing the collection. You know, so by standardizing the collection of all the comments, by putting them in a submission form with, you know, drop-downs of different options, so those could kind of be grouped together to make one section.

And then 26, 27 and 28, encouraging measure stewardship of the NQF-endorsed measures to share the link, to the feedback tool with known users, could be kind of coupled with, you know, the exploration of where to additionally add the link. And you can look to specialty societies to help you recognize, you know, and/or organizations, to help you recognize where those other opportunities are. So that's where I see those three and, you know, possibly being combined in option one.

And then on option two, number 33, in preparation of endorsement of the maintenance review, to access JIRA for staff, if you look at 38, that's looking at modifying the measure feedback tool so that comments submitted are automatically sent to the measure stewards. So if there's something that could be automated in the - you know, you're talking about the automation in that JIRA information, and then you're talking about, you know, staff searching it, so, is that something that can be combined with that one?

And then, let's see, for 40 -- I'm trying to trace my tracks back here -- NQF partner with CMS to receive annual export of feedback. Again, that's kind of combining, do you go out and search or, you know, kind of an either/or, do you have to go out and search at JIRA and other Web sites that are getting feedback, or is that something that you can reach out to CMS and other

societies that are supporting the measures to get that feedback sent to you at certain time periods or frames, which, you know, kind of falls in line with 33?

Thirty-four, measure developers should collaborate with NQF and identify key external stakeholders. Again, I think that aligns with 27 and 28 in option one.

So I think there's just a lot of alignment that can happen. And it would really be optimal to show an option to CMS that has - is a combination of options one and option two as a hybrid, maybe with the combination of those measures to make it so that it's not so many steps, but includes the key components of each one of those strategies.

Rose Baez: Okay. Thank you, (Melody). (Joseph), I see your hand raised.

(Joseph): Yes. Hi. I agree, you know, with everything that (Melody) just said. But, you know, when I'm looking at these and kind of how they're separated out, it seems to me like really option one you need to do because the end-goal is to, or at least in my opinion, to really enhance and improve the feedback that you're getting, especially from people that aren't participating right now in the clinical domain. And so, you know, the primary way of doing that is you have to make it accessible and you have to make it readily available to them. And that's really option one speaks to doing that, whereas option two, it's almost like you really need option one before you can even go and start in option two, because a lot of what's in option two already exist or there's already process I could speak to, JIRA and the other ones.

So this is, also I kind of had a question, this is assuming that we have a feedback tool to go out and promote, correct? Like, there would...

Rose Baez: Yes.

(Joseph): ...something in place that NQF builds that knowledge, this new way of entering feedback than what exists today.

Ashlie Wilbon: Hi, this is Ashlie from NQF. Yes, I would agree that this - the IT piece is pretty foundational and that would be the basis for, I think, both of these options. Certainly we could still collect feedback from external sources like JIRA and the feedback reports without having that in place, but I think it's such a fundamental piece of other folks being able to come to NQF or link to NQF in some way and to kind of put everything in one place that it would be pretty instrumental to making any of that happen.

Rose Baez: Uh-huh. (Connie), I see your hands raised.

(Connie Anderson): Oops. I forgot to take myself off mute. Yes. And this is more maybe a global comment than anything. Part of the discussion that we had early on is in - when I'm looking at the options, and just trying to go back to see if I'm missing something here, they're really focused on feedback for those that are in the maintenance cycle.

I think from a perspective of at least - from the renal committee, part of it is, how do we provide feedback prior to a measure coming to NQF for endorsement if there's concerns about the measures? And I don't see any mechanism focused on how in these pilot options we're going to get feedback consistently to a developer from the community before the measure comes before the committee for endorsement.

And I'm concerned that we've missed a big portion of what the committee struggled with in terms of it's already too late by the time they're being

presented at the committee for endorsement to make any changes. And I can't seem to put my hands around where that is in any of the options. It sounds and looks like most of the comments and feedbacks are for those that are in the maintenance mode. Am I missing something?

Ashlie Wilbon: Hi. This is Ashlie from NQF. No. So that it's - I'm trying to think of the best way to maybe describe. So the way that we kind of consider measures before they come in to NQF, we do have a couple of mechanisms for doing that. We have an intent to submit, we have a submit a measure anytime where folks can go in and start a measure submission to let us know that they are, you know, intending to submit the NQF at some point in the future. There is, you know, a desire certainly to - for NQF to have what we call kind of a pipeline of - so a sense of kind of what measures are coming in within a particular - within a particular topic area within, you know, six months or a year's timeframe, so that we can have a sense not only to prepare our process and our committees for what may be coming each cycle, so that we have a sense of what may be kind of being added to the portfolio for each topic area.

I think the way that we had scoped the feedback loop, and perhaps this is something that the committee should discuss, but the way that we had been envisioning scoping this is that it would be based on measures that were already in the process. And perhaps that was not the right assumption, but I think it would be helpful to hear feedback from the committee on whether that is the appropriate assumption to assume, that the feedback loop is based on the NQF endorsement maintenance process and which we would have to have a signal that a measure would be submitted to NQF before we could actually do any sort of, you know, outreach or anything about that measure.

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): This is (Melody). I actually agree that there should be something prior to the implementation. I'm not sure if that, you know, I

would see that as part of this process in some way but maybe not. You know, if it's not part of this, there needs to be something else developed. Maybe that's when someone is submitting a measure, that they have to have a certain amount of organizations documented approval of it in its current state before it, you know, goes before your committee. That may help, so that people aren't, you know, being blindsided by measures that are, you know, that the intent is there to be positive but they have those negative outcomes or problems with collection, things like that. You know, I just think there has to be some kind of a feedback mechanism to start.

Because once the measures are out there, and I'm going by some of the proposed rules by CMS right now, is - and that is, for quality measures, taking away the paper reporting or the paper reporting period prior to (pay per) performance. So when - there's measures out there that no one's seen before and now you're responsible whether they caused - you feel that they caused harm to, you know, patients or not, or they're valued or not, you're now going to be held accountable for them.

So I definitely, in the movement of value-based care and the way that policy is going, feel that there needs to be something put into place to review measures prior to implementation, as well as, you know, during the review process.

(Connie Anderson): And I also think, this is (Connie) again, I also think it gives the measure developers an opportunity to hear from the communities what the concerns are about the measures and hopefully able to make adjustments to the measures prior to them coming up for endorsement and/or out there, some measures have not been endorsed by NQF but had been out there in the (pay per) performance arena as a quality measure. So I think we're missing a big component of feedback that might help the process significantly be improved in terms of what comes before the committees for endorsement.

Ashlie Wilbon: Hi, this is Ashlie from NQF. I just, I have a question, particularly for some of the developers on the line, and maybe, I apologize if some of those folks that had been speaking are developers, I don't know everyone's background. But we do know that developers do solicit feedback on their measures before they submit them. Many developers have processes where they post their measures for comment before they're finalized on their own Web site, they have their own mechanisms for doing that. Our submission form does ask and collect, particularly for new measures, ask them to include information and feedback they collected during the testing process or the testing implementation phase of the measures.

So I'm just curious on kind of where the line is between, you know, particularly from a developer perspective, where the line is between what developers are doing during their development process and where NQF perhaps would come in.

Rose Baez: (Trisha), I see your hand is raised. I believe you're a measure developer.

(Trisha Eliot): Perfect timing. Yes, thank you. So I raised it just before (Ashley's) question, and that was my point exactly.

So here at the joint commission, we do have, well, we feel it's a robust process, but we do put our - all of our measures out for public comment during the implementation, so, during the early stages and then as we're, you know, finalizing testing and the specifications and everything. So if we're bringing that forth to NQF as part of the endorsement process, would we then have to - because I feel like this is going to add a lot of time and possible barriers for us if we've already done all of that as part of our process.

Rose Baez: (Anne), I see your hand is raised.

(Anne): Yes, thank you. Yes, I'm also a measure developer. So it is correct that, you know, it is, I think, the responsibility of the measure developer to get input and like (proof of) CMS measures. There's like the blueprint or some regulatory version of, you know, asking for feedback that happens as part of the development. And then also there are expert panel meetings, so, experts from the field, you know, sometimes 10, sometimes, you know, maybe up to 20 people providing input.

To me, you know, I have brought up this issue before because I do feel like, you know, the measure developer absolutely has a role in asking for feedback and doing their best to get input from experts and, you know, any stakeholders in order to make sure the measure specifications are as good as they can be.

To me, I thought that maybe this process might end up identifying additional stakeholders. And so that's why I have previously brought up a concern that, you know, as a measure developer, I would not want to go to NQF and then have all of this request for solicitation for feedback, and then find out, you know, there's people who want to change a spec here or there, which means, you know, you're starting from scratch doing all your reliability, validity testing with, you know, a new exclusion criteria perhaps, or some - or a new risk adjuster.

I guess it would be helpful for me to better understand, you know, is this supposed to be complementary as a process? And it's really the feedback that NQF would get would be, you know, substantive, like, so, it would require measure specification changes. Doing that at least a year before it's actually due to NQF seems like the right timing to me, at a minimum. So, some of my thoughts.

And I guess, like, I guess one other point, because this is pilot testing, I personally do like the idea of starting to look at the measures that are already endorsed, because you kind of have a pathway forward with those measures, and so it does seem like a, you know, from a pilot perspective, good way to kind of start to understand the process, how people could provide good feedback and then, you know, it could be expanded to new measures and, you know, there'd be a lot of lessons learned, I'm sure.

I hope that's helpful.

Eddie Machado: Hi, this is Eddie, the other co-chair. I apologize I'm joining a little late. Thanks for your comment.

I think we see (Sara) also raising her hand.

(Sara): Yes. Hi. I'm another one of the measure developers. I would agree completely with the last comment. And I would just say, I think that the role of some of the feedback in regards to new measures versus in the context of sort of maintenance measures is I think very different. I think in the process of the initial development of the measure, we're often going around and getting key stakeholder input in really trying to understand what's important. And how that gets integrated in is hopefully very clear in the applications that we submit.

I think that one of the challenges that I was, at least in my mind I thought this was supposed to be providing, is actually in the context of measures that have already been developed and are out there, and how are we streamlining, making ways for people to give feedback to measures that are in use. And that has always been challenging, in particular having pediatrics for measures

for which there aren't large sort of accountability programs or other publicly available uses of the measures for which we can get feedback. So, just to tag onto the prior comment. I think that there are very different considerations in this context.

Eddie Machado: Yes. Thank you, (Sara). I think those are very good points. (Melody), I see your hands jump right up as well. Okay.

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): Sorry, on mute. Yes. And I do agree with a couple of points and I have, you know, a couple of additional. So I do agree that, with coming from a pilot perspective, from this, it may be good to start with those measures that are being, you know, reviewed to do the pilot process through, and then expanding to new measures. I don't know that we should take the new measure piece totally out.

When you're talking about, you know, that you have 20 stakeholders, I guess my question is, what level, you know, who are the stakeholders and at what level are they in the organizations they're in? Because what we have found with different quality measures is it looks good on paper until you get down to the details of it. And there's something, so, there's some reason that it looks like you should be able to easily collect this out of an EMR but there's a reason that you can't.

So, are the EMR vendors, and is it actually people who are understanding and building the code, or is it an administrator that says, yes, we can do that, thinking, or, you know, because they have a higher level? Is it a provider who actually has to document and talk to patients and knows that, you know, it's not always appropriate to talk about these measures during certain types of appointments or visits, or with these certain disease processes that is, you know, giving the feedback, or again, is it someone who has done practice in

the past but now they're fully, you know, administrative and they're looking and saying, "Oh, yes, that seems, you know, like a reasonable measure," again not understanding those details?

So, and I think that's where, when they come under review, those things are more well-understood by the frontline people that are doing the work and expected to complete the measures.

So that's just my comments on that. I don't know how to fix it or in what way, to get the measures out there. And I do understand that you may have to go back and look at validity and so forth. But when measures are already being - they're already out there being used and then you get feedback to change, what do you have to do and how is that affecting everything, if they're changed midstream? So, just a few additional comments for thought.

Rose Baez: Thank you, (Melody). Ashlie, is there an opportunity to sort of change the scope and look at within this project, new measures?

Ashlie Wilbon: So, actually, you're - I was actually just thinking about that. And, you know, just even looking at the strategy, and this is something actually I will say that NQF has done a lot of thinking about. Certainly we're interested in learning more about measures that are in development, you know, potentially why some come to NQF and why don't - and why they don't. You know, I think that to me seems like a whole - a very much expanded scope, and I don't know that the strategies we have been working on and the discussions we've been having really address what would need to happen to really tap into that side of kind of measure use and feedback for measures that, you know, are in use but haven't been brought to NQF.

You know, our feedback tool, for example, only includes measures that we have information about, right? Because we have to have a way to, you know, they have to go into our systems (unintelligible) you know, they're linked to a number that we can then track and we know who the developer is. And so, you know, tapping into an area where we're potentially expanding the scope beyond measures that haven't even been considered or submitted to NQF yet I think adds a level of complexity that I don't think at this point in the project we can shift.

I think it's something we can certainly add to the report as a future consideration and maybe another phase of work that is considered to find ways to collect feedback on measures before, you know, during implementation, potentially before endorsement. So I think, again, our scope as NQF, and what we've been focused on so far, has been our strategies for measures that we have some purview over in some way, so we know the specifications, we know who the developer is, you know, they have - and made some - the developer has made - expressed some intent to enter the process, and that way we have some connection to them rather than there being, you know, seeking out involvement in measure development or feedback for measures that we haven't had any contact with.

So at this point I would say I think it is a bit out of scope, but it's certainly something that we agree with. It's in alignment with our thinking, but I think for this project and for this timing, I think it would be more of a future state recommendation.

Eddie Machado: Thanks, Ashlie. I guess in light of your comments, is there maybe alternatively an opportunity to, I don't know, make the add, some of the strategies that are listed under the different pilot options to both in some cases? Because it sounds like the committee also doesn't want to necessarily

choose either/or per se. And some of that may stem from the fact that some of those strategies, you know, might be lost if you go with one option versus the other. I don't know if that's a potential way to address some of the concerns from the committee.

Ashlie Wilbon: Sure. I think we have, you know, everything that we've submitted at this point are kind of strawman considerations for the committee to consider, potentially around the options. So if there are, you know, recommendations for alternative strategies or things like that, we're certainly open to that. We would just want to make sure again that they tie back to the goals and that, you know, we're being consistent in the way that we're kind of, you know, applying them and grouping them together within a particular option.

Eddie Machado: Yes. Thanks, Ashlie. I mean, what does the group think? I mean, is that one way of sort of trying to address some of the concerns that have been raised or does it not quite go for it?

(Connie), I see your hand is raised.

(Connie Anderson): Yes. I think, you know, based on the discussion that we've just had, I think it would be good, and (Melody) I think was the one who took the strategies and kind of said, you know, these could be combined under - into a hybrid with - and I think it'd be good to do that, so that there's a third option that kind of combines some of those recommendations. And I like how (Melody) did that, in combining some of the strategies together. I think that would make it, you know, it's not just, you know, lose some of the direction if you pick pilot option one versus pilot option two. It's a hybrid of both of them that kind of takes elements out of both, that would make it more, I think, useful and helpful.

Eddie Machado: Thanks, (Connie). I think that sounds like a reasonable way to go. What do other folks think? Do others agree on maybe exploring that approach?

(Joe): This is (Joe). I can go along with that approach.

Eddie Machado: We have a couple of raised hands. I guess we'll go with Mark and then (Melody).

Mark, are you on mute?

Mark Huang: I sure am. So I was thinking, I agree with, you know, the statements so far. I think that you almost, you know, the way the options were categorized initially, and I think it's a good grouping of what the strategies are, but you almost feel like the most effective is really a hybrid of those. So I don't know if it's really a matter of option - changing options, option one being all in on everything, right, okay, as your ideal, and then option two being the sort of a culled list of, okay, here are the NQF more focused internal strategies and here are the other, you know, promoting communication, you know, strategies and sort of a (smattering) of those as far as option two. Of course, the challenge in that case is, which one is a pick from each one?

Eddie Machado: Sure. Good point. (Melody), do you want to add to the discussion?

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): Yes, and that's where I was looking at, you know, how many could be, within each pilot, could be combined? And then, you know, within the two pilot options to make the hybrid, you know, include all of the measures but combine them so you don't have as many?

So, like for example, in option one, combine 26, 27 and 28 to make one strategy, possibly combine 22, 23 and 24 together to make one, and then add

the additional, you know, some of the additional strategies from option two. Some of those can be combined with option one, where they would link out and maybe, instead of just a short strategy, make it a multi-layered strategy, including the different components, so that you could get that hybrid option with - or, yes, hybrid option, with all of the strategies in it as compared to the other two strategies that are singled out.

Rose Baez: Ashlie, a question, you know, just logistically, if we were to combine strategies, the way we've calculated the benefits and costs, is that going to pose a challenge?

Ashlie Wilbon: I don't think so. I think, again, I think the breaking of the - or the kind of grouping of the strategies was more of an attempt to have multiple options and find kind of common theme among the strategies that we grouped together to, you know, to show they kind of, you know, hang together in some way to make a coherent option. But I like, you know, where the committee is going. I think having a hybrid makes a lot of sense and it adds to the option. So I think that works.

Rose Baez: Great. Any other feedback? I'm not seeing any new hands raised. I'm not sure if there's additional comments from (Connie), Mark or (Melody). I'm still seeing your hands raised.

Okay.

Ashlie Wilbon: So, Rose and Eddie, this is Ashlie again. Can I just repeat back what I think I've heard, just to make sure that staff were kind of on the right path to reflecting the committee's recommendations on the report?

So, (Melody's) recommendation is to look at the strategies and certainly there are several that could be merged that have - that are kind of thematically similar, kind of merge them into one overarching strategy with kind of sub-bullets.

And then I guess one of the main clarification points I have is that there would still would be presenting three options. I know Mark I think suggested presenting two options. But I just want to kind of make sure we're clear, would there still be kind of an option one, option two, and then option three which is a hybrid? Or would the committee lean more maybe to where Mark was going where there's the one kind of hybrid option and then, as option one, for example, and then option two would be a subset of - some selected subset of strategies from that kind of mega-option?

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): This is (Melody). I mean, I could support the full option and then a subset of it. Because I think if you go with adding options one and two, now that I think about it, you're still missing, like if you go with option one the way it is presented now, or option two the way it's presented, you are missing a major piece either way.

Ashlie Wilbon: So with the mega option, the hybrid option would be option one, and then option two would be a subset of strategies from both option one, the current option one and option two. Is that what you're saying? I just want to make sure I'm...

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): Correct. Or a subset - yes, basically.

Ashlie Wilbon: Okay.

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): So, maybe instead of the combined options with the different bullet points, it would be options one and two combined that do not have those combined bullet points. If that made sense.

Ashlie Wilbon: I'm not sure I quite - when you say combined bullet points, you mean the - were you describing kind of grouping some of the similar strategies together?

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): Yes. Yes. So in the mega strategy, we'd have the combined strategies, you said, with some, you know, some bullet points. Whereas in option two, taking, you know, the main options or main strategies from option one and two that are not combined and having a subset of those that was presented as option two.

Ashlie Wilbon: Okay.

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): I guess we just have to figure out which ones we would want to eliminate in the second, you know, in the second option. If we had to eliminate some, what would they be?

Ashlie Wilbon: Right. Okay. So it almost sounds like there's like the - a light version of the combined - of combined option one and two as they exist now, and then like the full-on version, which would be option two, which would be kind of everything that we're proposing currently for option one and option two. Am I...

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): Yes.

Ashlie Wilbon: ...interpreting that correctly? Okay.

How do other committee members - how does that resonate with others? And certainly, I feel like (Melody) and I are having our own conversation, but if we need to clarify for other folks, please let us know, but I'm curious to hear others' input as well.

(Connie Anderson): This is (Connie). I guess I'm confused now. So my understanding is that, if we did a hybrid option, proposed option, it would take some of the strategies out of proposed option one and proposed option two and combine those that could be combined together, that seem to complement one another. But then I'm not sure what the second option would be, those strategies that weren't combined? I'm confused.

(Melody Vanko-Holsenbach): So let's say in the mega option, it's including all strategies but some may be combined. Like on option one, we combine 26, 27 and 28, to include all those components but do it in one comprehensive strategy. So, for option two then, maybe we pick out options, you know, 21, 24, and I'm just pulling these out of the air, 21, 24, 27 of option one, and 35, 37, 38 and 39 of option 2 type of things that - and so those as a skinny down minimum. This is - at the minimum, this is what we would like to see option.

Rose Baez: Okay, okay, I get it. Thank you for the clarification. I understand.

Woman: Sure. Sorry, I was not clear before.

Rose Baez: Oh no, it's okay. Thank you. I support that. I like that idea.

Woman: Are there any concerns from committee members with that approach?

Eddie Machado: There are - this is Eddie. There are no - Mark, you just raised your hand?

Mark Huang: So I was going to say that potentially to help us sort of pick up, you know, from the super stat I guess, from the mega option to help us prioritize is if we can get sort of a revamp scoring of - a lot of the things we discussed on Tuesday's call, the revamp scoring and some of those weighted options that we discussed that we thought needed higher weight.

And then we can look at that sort of final list and say, I don't know - of course, the question is you can pick an arbitrary cutoff like if - you know, the top 6 of each, you know, in terms of whatever scored best and the top 6 of each and just take a look at that and see if it made sense for your sort of trimmed-down Option 2 or whatever that may be.

Did that make sense or like, you know, from the current proposed scale or the proposed pilot Option 1 which is enhancing national communication and then from 2 which is enhancing NQF stewardship, you know, take the best six of each and then that will then be your mini Option 2. Did that make sense?

Eddie Machado: So, Mark, I think what you're proposing is an alternative way to get at the skinny version, right? One where we would base it upon ...

Mark Huang: Right, you base it on the summary score. I guess you're - well, they're independent, right? The benefit summary and cost summary? So just trying to get your one that's scored the best on those and then maybe, you know, you can rework or re-prioritize just based on the scoring. And then within - and then in that way, you can then say that we're going to pick for the smaller version, but then use the re-weighted ones that we - from what we discussed Tuesday.

Eddie Machado: So I - this is Eddie again - I think that considering the revived weighting would probably be helpful in coming up on that ...

Mark Huang: Right, right, because, you know, we talked about some of this we thought needed higher weight for the benefit, so we would need those - the benefit summary score redone for the ones that we discussed as a committee to then help us say, all right, this is - you know, we feel this should have received higher score so we rescored them and then put them back in the matrix.

Woman: Yes. In doing so - and again I wanted to defer to Ashlie and the team, the staff to see if that's feasible. But I want to assume that we would be looking at revised scoring. We'll - but limit the universe still from strategies that were called out as part of the proposed Option 1 and Option 2 groupings, right? So that we're still limiting it to what was included - what will ultimately be included as part of the mega - or are you looking - are you asking us to reconsider all the strategies as a whole in coming up with excellent list?

Mark Huang: I wasn't considering that. I was just, you know, taking what you had within your proposed pilots, but I know some of the things were pulled out for individual discussion.

Eddie Machado: Okay.

Mark Huang: So I guess what currently exists in your current model is - you know, in terms of the pilot, whatever the options were initially considered in Option 1 and then the ones that are considered initially in Option 2, taking a look at those, making sure those have been re-scored.

And then, you know, from that would be - you know, the new Option 1 would be, okay, a combination of what exists for both groupings, and then the trimmed-down version being, okay, here are the top 6 to 8, whatever that may be from Option 1 and then top 6 or 8 from the current Option 2, and then

looking at those and then we can - I think that will give us a better idea what makes sense first. And then you can then still have the option of saying, all right, we - does the committee want to look at any of the other things that were discussed and put them in there as well?

Eddie Machado: Okay, thanks for the clarification, Mark. I guess, Ashlie or others from the NQF staff, do you guys want to react to that - to Mark's suggestion?

Ashlie Wilbon: Sure, this is Ashlie. I actually really like that idea. It gives us some very kind of quantitative grounding for selecting kind of that narrower step, and I think that's very doable and I like that suggestion.

Eddie Machado: Other committee comments or suggestions on the approach? Do folks agree or feel comfortable?

Woman: I think that's, you know, a fair approach.

Woman: I agree, it's a fair approach.

Woman: The only caution that I would have is to look at it once we do the scoring to get - because sometimes numbers lie, but, you know, to make sure there's not like one major component that's really important to the process that's being missed. But other than that, I think that's a good approach.

Eddie Machado: Okay, so it sounds like the groups identified a path to move forward. I guess I'm just interested in knowing maybe how we make this happen, or would we just propose using the same model which we did before which is just, you know, send out a survey via email and have to do the scoring that way and then maybe report back the results, or continue virtually, or - I'm not sure

what's the options are from the staff in terms of getting the information you need to follow through on these options have been put forth.

Woman: Sure, Eddie. I think that it's probably a good start. I think we're kind of chatting amongst ourselves here and the team, and I think what we would want to do is take all the committee feedback, rescore everything and potentially send back out like an updated spreadsheet and then a survey to see ...

We would send out an updated spreadsheet where you could see the options and maybe even like a one pager to say like this is Option 1, this is Option 2 and give some information about how we landed on figurally on the strategy within Option 2 which would be kind of the light version and accompany that with a survey just to get committee kind of agreement on where we landed based on all the input.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: I think that would be good because when - to look through, you really - it's hard to do when you're on a phone talking and hear - trying to hear other's conversation when you really want to concentrate and match things up, so I think that that would be a good approach.

I think it would also be helpful for myself at least if you had talked about some other measures and strategies in there that you thought you would include in either versions, if you would have kind of that core set of this is what we're putting in both versions and these are the additional components for 1 and 2 options, you know, with their scores would be very helpful.

Woman: Sure, we'll do that.

Ashlie Wilbon: Sounds good, I think we have a good plan forward, but this has been super helpful. I think we, the staff, I think we're feeling pretty good about the path forward and getting things turned around to you guys, so thank you.

Eddie Machado: I think it's helpful when you send out the rescoring matrix that we do that like having a master sheet to say, all right, here are all the options and then maybe here is the current ranking or score.

That's really helpful because as soon as when you score things in isolation and then you're, "Oh, well, how come this is actually lower than this? I really think this is more important," so seeing that whole Rubik is kind of helpful to kind of put pushback then in terms of how you individually scored an item and then having to be able to see where it currently scores in relation to others that are actually important.

So I think just having that list when you send it out it's actually going to be helpful even if it's like a separate document, so that way you can kind of refer back to it when you're trying to rescore.

Ashlie Wilbon: Yes, yes, we have - we will send out another version of the spreadsheet which I think for us has been really helpful, and we'll figure out a way to display the updated score as well there and use that as a master document. But we'll also figure out a way to kind of pull things out in some sort of kind of list format so you can see things a little bit easier as well.

So we'll come up with the two different views. Maybe we'll propose to Eddie a bit to figure out what's the best way to present that information and be able to see different options by looking at the data.

Mark Huang: So this might be a big ask, but like let's say when you do your survey, the score, but like you can say, "All right, here's the measure, here's the current score, you know, cost and overall benefit, and then what's the ranking right now."

So, like, right now this one ranks 2 out of 40, you know, and then - so that it can give the person context as they're scoring, "okay, I think this is appropriate, we'll keep it at 2, or, well, this needs to moved down or up."

Ashlie Wilbon: Okay, so you're - let me just - actually, Mark, what you said actually struck an idea for me. So I think maybe what we were assuming and maybe this is just to clarify that staff would do the scoring and you guys would kind of review the scoring.

But I think what you're suggesting, Mark, is that this committee would actually do the scoring, is that what I'm hearing? And that's fine with us, we just want to make sure that we kind of prepare the survey in a way that allows that type of feedback.

Mark Huang: I guess, you know, we are - you already have scores up here so the initial scores that we have. I think we can use that as a foundation, all right. So, you know, using those initial scores, you can have a master Rubik that you can send us as a separate document that says, "Okay, here's all the ranking, whatever," so you can see it all at once.

Ashlie Wilbon: Okay.

Mark Huang: And then as you go through each individual measure, you know, you can almost have a reference saying, "okay, this is all I can say, this is going to say this is 31 - Strategy 31. The current benefit score is 2.2. The current cost

score is 2.5. This is the ranking overall.” And then you - they could then take that and say, “All right, I might want to rescore either of those things based on what I think is after looking at it again. So they may decide to agree and make no change, or they may decide to not agree and move - try and move it up or down on either those scales. Does that sound reasonable? I don't know, I mean, I'm just trying to throw that.

Ashlie Wilbon: Yes, I think it does. I think what you're suggesting I think is something we haven't done yet which is to rank all of the strategies and that's something I do think might be helpful particularly as we go through the exercise of doing the light version. So I think that makes a lot of sense.

(Maddie): I think - this is (Maddie). I think ranking would also help weigh things when you're combining measures, because if you're combining a measure that ranks 2 and another that ranks 20, it gives you a better, you know, average - a different weighting for each one to help figure out if that combination should be weighted more or not.

Ashlie Wilbon: Right. I think the challenge may come where they may be a lot of ties like, you know, strategies that may have the same cost scores, summary score, or benefit summary score, and so it makes a little bit tricky, but I think we can figure it out. But I just kind of wanted to point that out that, you know, as we go through, it may not really be kind of clear and easy winners if you will.

Woman: Right.

Ashlie Wilbon: So, okay, I think we have a good path forward here. We're certainly going to take this back and do something in our end about how best to put this back to you guys, and we will try to have something out probably by the end of next week. So we'll work on this then you'll hear from us February next year.

Eddie Machado: Great. Thank you, Ashlie. Rose, any other things we need to cover you think or are we okay?

Rose Baez: No, I think we're good and I agree we've got a good path forward.

Ashlie Wilbon: So at this time, are there any other committee thoughts or recommendations on the path forward? We can open it up for public comments? Hannah, are you there, or Jean-Luc?

Hannah Ingber: Hi, yes, this is Hannah.

Jean-Luc Tilly: Great. And so all lines are open so at this point, if there any public comments, please feel free to go ahead. All right, great, well, I don't see any comments on the deliverables so we will have the opportunity as well, and I'll turn it back to you, Ashlie.

Ashlie Wilbon: Thanks. I'm actually going to turn it over to Hannah or Jean-Luc just over next steps and then we can adjourn early.

Jean-Luc Tilly: Yes, okay, great. So, right, so, I mean, yes, as we just kind of talked about, you know, we'll be in touch with - I think it is definitely needed so we'll be in touch with a committee survey to kind of help, you know, differentiate between the strategies and help us finalize the different pilot options.

We will - you know, having completed that survey which we have done in the month of September, we're planning to publish the pilot options draft report for, you know, the 14-day public comment period from early October, October 7th through the 21st and then pass it on to CMS on November 11th.

And then we'll convene for our final web meeting, web meeting 8th on November 19th to review the implementation plan. So that is going to be really, at least in my opinion, our more challenging work is, you know, having selected an option, having selected the strategy, turning our attention now to the actual nuts and bolts of implementing this.

So, you know, I mean, this was really the moment where we answered a lot of those questions that have come up here today about, well, does having this particular strategy apply to different - to new versus maintenance measures and so on, you know, how is that in respect to particular sort of (CEP)? You know, all these kinds of questions we'll be presenting to you all and then eventually writing up in the (interim) report and so on.

So, you know, those are things to include in next steps. I guess, you know, if there are any final remarks from Rose and Eddie, yes, do you have anything?

Eddie Machado: Thanks, Jean-Luc. So from my perspective, again I just I want thank the committee for their feedback. I think you provided a very good approach and hopefully, you know, it will both satisfy the committee's expectations and desires, but on the same hand, (founded) against what CMS has requested from NQF for this project, so thank you.

Rose Baez: Yes, and I'll echo Eddie's comments and also just say thank you again to NQF. I think this has been a good experience so far and looking forward to next steps.

Ashlie Wilbon: This is Ashlie from NQF. I just wanted to thank everyone for your input, and for being flexible, and suggesting a lot of information. Your input was super helpful today and we're looking forward to seeing where we'll land with the pilot options. So thanks everyone for your work today.

Rose Baez: Thank you for listening.

Eddie Machado: Thank you.

Woman: Have a good afternoon, everyone. Bye.

Woman: Thank you. Bye, everybody.

Man: All right, sounds a good meeting.

Woman: Yes.

Man: Okay, great. (Unintelligible).

END