

## National Quality Forum - CC | Appeals Board Orientation 04112022

---

Hey. So hello, everyone. For those who just joined, my name is Matt Pickering. We're going to get started here in about one more minute.

OK. All right. So we'll go ahead and get started. This meeting is being recorded, and my name is Matt Pickering. I'm a senior director here at NQF. And I'm working with this team, the NQF Appeals team, on this orientation as well as the Appeals board meeting that we'll be having at the end of the month.

So just a few housekeeping reminders, as you can see on the slides here. So we are using a web platform-- specifically, we're using Zoom for these meetings for both this orientation as well as the upcoming Appeals board meeting on the 29th.

Zoom has audio and video capabilities, obviously, so just like other webinar platforms you use, you can take yourself off mute, or you can, obviously, show your video camera if you'd like to talk or provide a question. We do encourage that in the upcoming proceedings with our Appeals board members specifically. There's also a chat feature and a raise hand feature.

So for the purposes of today, what we would like to ask is the questions in the chat really be reserved for our Appeals board members to ask questions related to the Appeals board orientation.

Again, this is an orientation for the Appeals board members. This is a public meeting, but we do ask that those who are just listening in attendance, if they're not on the Appeals board, to please reserve any questions. You can email us as well with those questions if you so wish. But the Appeals board is where we would want to reserve space and time for those members to ask questions on the process.

That being said, NQF does have separate prep calls for our stakeholders irrelevant to the appeal this cycle. So we have a prep call with the appellant, CSAC chairs. We also have a prep call with our developer. So that will be an opportunity for you all to ask any other questions after this orientation meeting gearing up for the April 29 meeting.

So just one more time, if you're not on the Appeals board, we kindly ask that you not use the chat feature. We want to reserve that for our Appeals board members. There will be other opportunities to ask questions in some of the prep calls, but you can also email us after the call as well at [NQFAppeals@QualityForum.org](mailto:NQFAppeals@QualityForum.org).

And for the Appeals board members-- yup, you can use the chat. There's also a Raise Hand feature if you'd like to use that Raise Hand feature to raise your hands and ask a question. We'll call on you as we see so on our participant list.

So we'll go to the next slide. OK. So again, welcome, everyone, to the Appeals Board Orientation. So in this orientation, we are not talking anything specifically to the appeal received this cycle. So we're not talking specifically anything mentioning the current appeal. This is just a broader orientation meeting about how the appeals board will function, its roles and responsibilities, and what will happen during the April 29 proceedings.

So again, we're not getting into the appeal today. This is an orientation that is applicable for all appeals board meetings if we do convene them. OK, next slide.

Once again, welcome. So we will go through the agenda, which is introductions. So we just want to see who on the call from the appeals board is present. There's no voting going on as far as, like, we need quorum or anything like that this meeting. So if certain appeals board members are not in attendance, this meeting is being recorded. We will share that recording and be posting it publicly.

After introductions, we'll go over the overview of the appeals process. In addition, we'll touch on the appeals board roles and responsibilities as well as the CSAC, or the Consensus Standards Approval Committee, chair and vice chair roles and responsibilities for this meeting, as well as the appeals board meeting procedures and then next steps.

And why focus on the CSAC chairs? Well, the appeals board is really determining whether or not to uphold or not uphold the CSAC decision. So it's the CSAC co-chair decision-- or not the co-chair of the decision. Excuse me. It's the CSAC decision that's being in question. So the CSAC chairs will be present, and that's why we're calling out specifically their role and responsibilities. Next slide.

So as far as the NQF staff, just you could see those listed here. These members are contributing to the NQF appeals process and are on the team. Dr. Elizabeth Drye, she's our Chief Scientific Officer. She, unfortunately, was not able to attend this call, but she looks forward to working with this group heading into the April 29 meeting. But she is providing strategic oversight of this project as well as Tricia Elliott, who's our Senior Managing Director.

Myself on this project is Matt Pickering, like I mentioned, a Senior Director here. We have Beth Flashner. She's our Manager on the project. You can probably see her waving on the camera. Thanks, Beth.

We also have Mike DiVecchia. He is our Project Manager-- or excuse me, PMP. He's our PMP, but he's a director helping us keep on track with timelines and deliverables. And then we also have Mary, who's on the call. She is our Analyst. So hi, Mary. And then Kim as well, who's our Executive Assistant. So this is our team here. You probably have received a series of emails from, well, one of us listed here. So thank you very much for your responsiveness as we gear up for the April 29 meeting.

Going to the next slide, just wanted to see who's on the call with us today. So you could see listed here appeals board members as well as alternates. We'll get into the differences between those two as we go through the slides today, but wanting to draw your attention to the top two individuals here. We have Lawrence Becker and Laurel Pickering. And no relation, for any of those who are curious. There's no relation with Laurel, but it is a nice last name.

So they are both of our co-chairs for the appeals board. So we want to thank them very much for their participation in being a co-chair. And we'll touch a little bit about their roles in the next coming slides.

But I'll go down the list here just to see who's present on the call. I'll start with Lawrence Becker. Are you present?

I am present.

And would you mind providing-- oh, sorry, Lawrence. Would you mind just stating your name, affiliation? And that would be great. Thank you, Lawrence. Go ahead.

So I'm Larry Becker. I'm actually retired now. At one point, I was on the NQF board. Worked for Xerox for a good number of years, and recently I was the acting COO at [INAUDIBLE].

Great. Thank you so much, Larry. Thanks for joining. Laurel, are you on?

I am.

Great. And would you mind stating your name and affiliation?

Sure. Laurel Pickering, and I'm currently Head of Strategic Alliances at Centivo. I am a former NQF board member and a former President and CEO of Northeast Business Group on Health for many years.

Great. Thank you so much. And Ashrith? Ashrith Amarnath, if I got that right?

Hi, everyone. Go with Ash. It's a lot easier. Ash Amarnath. I'm Medical Director at Covered California. I thought I was a former leadership consortium member but was recently reminded it's a two-year term, so actually, I'm a current leadership [INAUDIBLE] member. And also on the Surgery Standing Committee.

Great. Thank you so much, Ash.

Yeah.

William Golden, are you on?

Bill Golden. I'm one of the original NQF board members. Still Medical Director of Arkansas Medicaid and will not be able to attend the session at the end of the month. I have a conflict. I'll be at the ACP meeting in Chicago.

Thank you so much, Bill. And perfectly-- we knew this going into it, so thank you, Bill, for providing your availability. And that's why we have some alternates, and we'll talk a little bit about that as well.

I want to check in to see if David Shahian is on. I think he had some trouble with his audio. Dr. Shahian--

Right here.

Yup, great. Would you mind stating your name and affiliation, Dr. Shahian?

Sorry. Dave Shahian with the Society of Thoracic Surgeons and employed by Massachusetts General Hospital, where I'm Vice President for Quality and Safety. And I've served several terms on the NQF board and executive committee.

Great. Thank you so much, Dave. Moving to our alternates that we have listed, Thomas Kottke?

Yup, I'm here and I'm Medical Director for Wellbeing at Health Partners. And a couple of years ago I retired from practice in cardiology and served as co-chair of CSAC.

Great. Thank you so much. And Kristine Martin-Anderson, are you on? She may have had a conflict. Just one more time-- Kristine Martin-Anderson? OK. Well, great.

Well, thank you all very much for joining today. So going to the next slide. All right. So just talk about what we're doing today. So really, the purpose of this meeting today is really to introduce the appeals board members to their roles and responsibilities and the overall overview of the appeals board process, so that--

I'm frozen. Can anybody hear me?

Oh, hello? Sorry, who was that? Can you all hear me OK? Good?

Yes.

OK. All right. I'll ask the team to see if we could follow up with who's having some trouble with audio.

So talking about the appeals board process, that's really going to provide an overview of the meeting itself, including the process, quorum, and voting. So again, we are not going into the current appeal or the measure in question on today's meeting. This is just an overview of how the proceedings will flow. This would be something that we'd carry forward to any appeal that we receive.

So the purpose is really to orient the appeals board members. And so if the appeals board members do have any questions, the intent of this meeting is to answer those questions. Any questions from other stakeholders involved in the appeal process, we have separate prep calls scheduled for you all.

So you're more than welcome to listen in on today, but we kindly ask for questions to be reserved for the appeals board members. And then subsequent questions could be sent via email to us, or we do have those prep calls with each of the relevant stakeholders. OK, next slide.

So we'll talk a little bit about the overview of the appeals process. And we'll go to the next slide, please? All right.

So obviously, you all are somewhat familiar, or very familiar with NQF our Consensus Development Process, our CDP process. And that requires review of measures by a relevant standing committee. So a standing committee that has-- the measure has relevance in that topical area. And these are subject matter experts.

Some are methodologists, some are clinicians, and patients, consumers, et cetera. It's a multi-stakeholder group that recommends measures for endorsement or not based on our standard set of criteria. Those are recommendations. The standing committee recommends for endorsement or not, and those decisions, those recommendations, are then presented to our CSAC, our Consensus Standards Approval Committee.

The CSAC reviews the recommendations from the standing committee, and they're paying particular attention to consistency in process. So if the process was followed by NQF or if there is consistency in that process. And there's also a layer of whether or not the criteria were applied appropriately or not. The CSAC will then determine whether or not they would wish to uphold the standing committee's recommendations or not. And this is the final endorsement decision that is made on measures.

So from there, NQF has an appeals process, or appeals opportunity, where any endorsed measure-- it has to be an NQF-endorsed measure to gain an appeal. It's eligible for an appeal. And we post the CSAC decisions and the measures for 30-day appeals period commenting. And any member of the public can submit an appeal.

Going to the next slide. So there are two grounds for an appeal. So the appellant, whoever is submitting the appeal, should argue that there are either procedural errors reasonably likely to affect the outcome of the original endorsement decision. So those could be if NQF's Consensus Development Process was not followed in some way, there was a failure to follow that process. So there's a procedural issue that's in question.

And/or there is new information or evidence that was unavailable at the time of CSAC when the CSAC made their decision. So new evidence that was unavailable, not being considered in the previous proceedings that had happened prior to CSAC and also during the CSAC meetings. So if it's unavailable and it reasonably could affect the outcome, that is another ground for an appeal.

So there's two options. And again, it's only for endorsed measures that have passed CSAC endorsement for the current cycle. And any member of the public can submit an appeal on that endorsed measure. One is for procedural issues and/or any new evidence that was unavailable during the CSAC meeting. Next slide.

Matt?

Yes, David?

I may be misremembering here, but I seem to recall that a third option was debated in the past, and that is that the evidence that was presented during the initial measure presentation by the developer was subsequently found to be incorrect. It's not new in the sense that it's new data that's just come out, but the data were the basis of the endorsement decision were subsequently found to be somehow or another inaccurate. Am I-- anybody else recall that particular scenario?

So I'm not sure if anyone else who has previously served on the appeals board has any comments on that, but I will say that would something be included in that evidence discussion. But if the evidence is new or unavailable, I think there may be some area where any evidence which may be incorrect is something to consider.

However, keeping in mind that whatever the standing committee had available to them and also the CSAC to review should also be taken into account. But anyone else from the appeals board that used to serve on the appeals board have any additional comments on that, on Dave's?

David, it's Larry. I vaguely remember exactly what you're talking about. But not that fresh in my memory. But yes, I remember those discussions from years ago.

Yeah.

So Matt, I guess the question is, would there be a liberal enough interpretation of these two criteria that correction of previously submitted evidence might be regarded as new evidence or previously unavailable?

So right. So previously unavailable evidence or maybe evidence in error? Is that would fall under that evidence grounds for an appeal.

OK. Thank you.

Yeah, thank you. So Process Following Receipt of an Appeal. So after NQF does receive that appeal, again, within that 30-day appeal period, we then notify the relevant stakeholders. So that would include the standing committee, the measure developer and steward, the appeals board as well as the CSAC chairs. So we would notify those relevant stakeholders.

We then would post the appeal for a 10-day public comment period. So anyone from the public can comment on the appeal. And then we will coordinate with those stakeholders around the orientation meeting as well as the appeals board meeting itself, which we have done so in scheduling those meetings accordingly.

NQF will also consolidate all the materials for the appeals board meeting. So that will be inclusive of the appeal, the developer's response to the appeal, any public comments received on the appeal, and any relevant documentation related to the review of that measure and any relevant documentation that would help inform the decision-making of the appeals board.

NQF will then post the meeting materials to the Appeals Board page. So this meeting is public. So those materials will be public as well, and we will post them to the Appeals Board page as well as send out any subsequent meeting invites for those meetings, and then add those to the NQF calendar for the public to be aware of.

So after the appeals board meeting, we will then post the appeals board decision, which that decision is final, and the meeting summary, and finalize any of the respective reports related to the measure or measures under appeal. So those reports will be updated and then posted again publicly on our web page. Next slide.

So going into the roles and responsibilities of the appeals board. You can go into the next slide, please. So the appeals board is a governing body. It adjudicates all appeals submitted. So every appeal goes in front of the appeals board. The appeals board does consist currently of five members and two alternates.

And the alternates are reserved for if there's a potential conflict of interest from an appeals board member related to the measure under the appeal review or if there's an appeals board member that is unable to attend the appeals board meeting, such as Bill Golden had mentioned he's unable to attend. So one of our alternates will be stepping in to take that seat during the appeals board meeting.

And appeals board members are professionals, and they have diverse perspectives as well. They have experience, as what we've heard from you all. You have experience with our Consensus Development Process, and you have familiarity with NQF processes. And each member serves two-year terms, excuse me.

And the appeals board is comprised of NQF co-chairs, former members of CSAC, former members of the NQF board, and even current NQF standing committee members. So we, again, trying to have this group be familiar with our process, so they can adequately weigh in to see if any procedural issues did occur or looking at that evidence criteria specifically. Next slide.

OK. We also conduct disclosures of interest. So you've received emails from us. I'm so sorry for all of those emails getting disclosures of interest, but we need those. We both need an annual Disclosure of Interest from you all as well as a Measure-Specific Disclosure of Interest prior to the appeals board meeting.

So again, this is trying to identify if you have any conflicts with the measure. And so we would have to recuse you. We also have one other Disclosure of Interest form, which is for the appellant organization. So if you have any potential conflicts with the appellant organization or sign-on organizations from the appeal, we would also potentially need to recuse you as well.

And any recusals received are announced publicly before the appeal is considered. So during the April 29 meeting itself, we will be going through Disclosures of Interests, similar to how we do with all of our other NQF convened bodies, to evaluate measures. We'll be doing the same during the April 29 meeting. So if you don't have anything to disclose, that's perfectly fine, but we'll be looking for any potential conflicts with the developer, or steward, as well as the appellant organizations. OK, next slide.

We kindly ask that you review all the materials related to the measure appeal in advance of the meeting. So that appeals packet, which will include all the relevant information, will be sent to you leading up to the meeting. I believe we're sending it on April 21, so you'll be having that available to you. And again, the meeting's on April 29, so you'll have some time to review.

And we ask that you actively participate in the meeting, including asking any questions when appropriate, and then vote. So you'll have a vote that will happen during the meeting on the measure. And it's per NQF policy and procedure for an appeal on an endorsement decision, we do need to have a vote.

Next slide. Can you click the next slide, Mary? Seems to be having some technical issues. OK. All right. Thank you, Mary.

So going to the next slide, now we're talking about our co-chairs. So again, Larry and Laurel, thank you so much for being our co-chairs. So for our co-chairs, we just ask that you participate not only in just the appeals board meetings, but also we'll have separate prep calls with you just to talk through the appeals board meeting.

You'll also serve as a facilitator and potentially a lead discussant on items or issues related to the appeal and the appeals board meeting. And we provide expertise on any content-related issues for the appeals board as requested by project staff, and also ensuring that we keep the meeting going and staying on track, and mapping back to our objectives of the meeting. So keeping it moving, and keeping on track, and making sure we actually conclude and achieve the objectives we were intending to do. Next slide?

So for the alternates, as I mentioned earlier, alternates are those members that step up to serve on the appeals board if there is a potential conflict of interest from one of the appeals board members or if a member cannot attend the meeting.

Alternates during these appeals board meetings who are not sitting in for an appeals board member are non-voting members. So during the appeals board meeting, alternates are more than welcome to sit in, but if the appeals board is already seated at five, the alternates would be there to listen in, but non-voting. So non-voting members unless they are stepping in to serve instead of the appeals board member.

If an alternate is asked to serve, they follow these same requests and responsibilities to review those materials in advance of the meeting, to participate in the meeting, including asking any questions when appropriate, and then also voting. So you become a voting member once you are serving on the appeals board in replace of someone else on the appeals board due to a conflict or cannot attend the meeting. Next slide?

Just to touch on CSAC chair and vice chair. And so we'll go to the next slide. Thanks, Mary. So again, the appeals are related to a CSAC decision to endorse the measures is based on a standing committee's recommendations. So what we'll be focusing on is the CSAC proceedings and the decisions and discussions that did happen during CSAC. Again, one of those grounds for an appeal is of evidence that was unavailable, right, at the time at CSAC.

So it's the CSAC decision, and discussions, and deliberations that we'll be reviewing. However, CSAC chair and vice chair don't have a formal role as far as presenting any information. They are there to answer questions. So we may have one or both of them, but they are there to answer questions that the appeals board may have related to any decisions or proceedings that happen during the CSAC meeting. So they will be present, one or both, but there's no formal role, but they will be there to answer any questions of the appeals board. So we do thank them very much for their time. Next slide.

OK. So now we'll go into the meeting process, sort of the proceedings and voting procedures. Can we go to the next slide, Mary? Thank you. So the appeals board may render the following decisions, and you see those listed there. They can dismiss the appeal because it does not meet the grounds for an appeal.

So there's those items that we discussed previously. It may uphold the CSAC endorsement decision, or the appeals board may overturn the CSAC endorsement decision. I will note that there's no other type of conditions set on these decisions.

So the appeals board is not asked to uphold based on some sort of condition. You can make recommendations for either developer or other NQF-convened groups to consider if you make a decision to not keep the CSAC endorsement decision or decide to uphold it. You can make recommendations, but they are not tied to the decision in any way.

Your decision is really based on the information that's been presented to you. Do you feel there are sufficient grounds, and do you feel like the content and the argument of the appeal is sufficient enough to either overturn the CSAC decision or not overturn the CSAC decision, which would be upheld?

All votes require a simple majority vote to pass. So we're just looking for 51% as a simple majority. There's no consensus not reached threshold, as you've probably experienced before in other committees. There's no consensus not reached. And there are no tie votes. So we just want to drive to a decision, and 51% is the simple majority that we're looking for passing.

All decisions made by the appeals board are final, and the appeals board actions and decisions regarding an appeal are publicly available both on our web page and technical reports, et cetera.

And Larry, I think you had a question.

I did. Before we got to the meeting, I read through the slides, and I noted that at some point the meeting can be held with four, with as few as four. And that would say you could have a 2-2. What happens in that event?

You could. Great question. So this is where we're trying to drive to a 51%. So even if you had 2-2, so 2 voting yes, 2 voting no, that would not meet the 51%, and so that means that the decision would not pass.

So whatever the question is saying, if you don't meet that yes vote-- and we'll show the questions here in a little bit. But you can still have a 2-2, but since you're not having a simple majority, the decision does not move forward, because you did not meet a simple majority of 51% on the question. And we'll go through that, Larry, in the next few slides.

All right. OK. Let's go to the next slide. So again, the appeals board seats five members and two alternates. We would then need that minimum of four to have the meeting and including any alternates that may be deemed voting members for that meeting.

So again, what we are trying to achieve is a five-member body that's reviewing the measure or the appeal for a specific measure. And that's the alternates giving us more opportunities to still maintain that five. However, we can still move forward if need be with four non-recused appeals board members. And so that includes any alternates that may be stepping in to assist if needed. Next slide.

So we'll go through the procedure of how this will work. So at the beginning of the appeals board meeting, NQF staff will open up the meeting, we'll conduct disclosures of interest, like I mentioned previously, and will provide an overview of the measure and the appeal. After that point, the appellant gives an opening statement, so summarizing their appeal and the grounds that they've identified for the appeal, followed by a response from the developer.

So each party will have up to three representatives to speak on their behalf. So they will be identified, and those are the only three from each party to speak. Each party is also given up to seven minutes for their opening statements. So the appellant will have seven minutes. However, one or multiple of the three representatives can speak up during that seven-minute time window.

Once they are done, we then go to the developer. The developer has seven minutes, or up to seven minutes, to also provide their rebuttal. And again, only three representatives will be listed from the developer side.

And following those opening statements, the appeals board has an opportunity to ask any qualifying or clarifying questions to the measure developer, the appellant, or NQF staff. So after the opening remarks, we will be going around to see if there's any questions and clarifying questions based on those opening remarks, because the first vote that we'll be doing is whether or not there are sufficient grounds for the appeal.

So going to the next slide, and that sort of looks like this. So following those opening statements and those clarifying questions, if there are any, we ask the appeals board to move to a vote on the issues presented in the appeal and whether or not they meet one or both of the criteria for grounds for an appeal.



So the appeals board will vote on each of these criteria, and separately, you'll be asked whether or not you think the appeal has sufficient grounds for procedural errors reasonably likely to affect the outcome. And so you'll be asked to vote on that.

And again, if the question is if you feel like it does have grounds based on procedural issues-- Larry, in this instance where there was the 2-2 split, if the yes responses don't meet 51%, then it doesn't move forward. Right? So if you didn't get a simple majority on whether or not there was sufficient grounds based on procedural errors, then it won't move forward on that ground. It won't move forward on procedural issues.

We will then go forward to the next criteria here, which is the new information or evidence unavailable at the time of CSAC. So the question there would be whether or not you think there is sufficient grounds based on this criteria. And if 51% is met saying yes or if it's not met, it will go either way. So 51% saying yes, we will continue to move forward. If less than 51% do not say yes on that question, it will not move forward on that criteria or the grounds that's been listed there.

So that's listed on the bottom here. The outcome of the vote determines the next steps. So if both votes are no, the measure stays endorsed, there is no public comment, and the meeting concludes. If either vote is yes, saying that there are some grounds here, it's either going to be procedural issues and/or new information or evidence unavailable at CSAC-- so if either of those is yes, again, that's simple majority, the meeting moves forward with immediate further consideration and discussion of the appeal regarding the CSAC endorsement decision.

So there'll be two questions up front, and each question is based on one of those criteria. Do you feel like the appeal meets this criteria? Do you feel like it meets this criteria? You must have a simple majority of yes, 51%, for something to move forward. If we don't get a 51% majority on either one of those, the measure maintains its endorsement, and there's no public comment, and the meeting concludes.

Going to the next slide, so if it does move forward-- so the appeals board does think that one or both of those criteria are sufficient and the appeal has sufficient grounds to meet, then we'll proceed to discuss the actual merit of the appeal. You'll discuss more about what you think caused the procedural errors or the evidence issue, and you can ask questions of the appellant, the measure developer steward, the CSAC chairs, and NQF staff.

So if you have a question related to something that happened during a CSAC meeting as you were reviewing the appeal, you can ask that now. If you have questions related to the evidence, you can go into detail there. But that's where there's more discussion of the appeal happening after you vote, whether or not there's sufficient grounds.

After that discussion here, you'll go to another vote. But prior to that, prior to the final vote, the appeals board will open the meeting for public and member comment. So each member of the public, each speaker is allowed up to two minutes for their statement. So the appeals board, the appellant, measure developers, CSAC chairs, they do not respond to each individual public commenter.

Rather, after all the comments have been heard for public commenting, the appeals board moves to any final discussions. So any final discussions after everything that's been considered, including public comment-- again, we're not asking any of our stakeholders to respond to public commenters. But it's just an opportunity to hear everything from the public as well as everything else that's been discussed. And those are the final discussions. And then there'll be a vote after public comment.

The vote, as you see down there, will be based on review and discussion of the appeal. Do you agree to uphold the CSAC endorsement decision? Yes or no? A 51% or more saying yes, the vote is upheld for the CSAC endorsement decision. But if not, it will go the other way. And a no vote overturns the endorsement decision.

Any questions, or thoughts, comments? Larry, was that--

I understand. I guess I wonder whether you would ever allow a meeting to go forward with just four.

We do. We will try not to do that, but we can have it with just four. Again, that's why we wanted to build out our alternates. And for the meeting coming up on the 29th, we will have five members participating. OK. Any other questions or comments?

Yes, Matt, I don't know if this is the right time to ask this, but I'm wondering, how much will we get ahead of time to review? Because there are going to be opportunities for the comments and both sides to be presented on the call. Will we have some of that ahead of time to review? So just what will we have ahead of time so that we go into the call prepared?

Right. Great question, Laurel. Thank you. So we are looking to send materials to the appeals board as well as the other stakeholders on April 21. So in those materials, or that packet that you'll get, will be the cover letter. So it's going to be turned the NQF Appeals Memo. In that memo of that packet will be the cover letter sort of just teeing up and referring to the request of the appeals board.

But there also will be the appeal itself, the letter itself, the response from the developer to the appeal. We will also then hyperlink various different relevant documents that are publicly available on our website. So those documents would include meeting summaries from the measure evaluation meeting as well as the post-comment meeting as well as the CSAC meeting.

The CSAC materials, or the memo that specifically notes the measure under appeal, in addition to the CSAC voting, and any other relevant information that would be helpful for the appeals board to make an informed decision. And all of that will be posted and be publicly available and sent to the relevant stakeholders in advance of the meeting. And that will be the information that you'll be reviewing.

Great. Thank you.

Thank you. Sorry. I went to a different screen. I think there might have been a question in the chat. Yeah. OK. Yeah, just to circle back real quick, just to mention the public comments. So when we open it up for public comment towards the end of the meeting, we are asking speakers to limit their comments to no more than two minutes.

And this will be verbally stated. You can unmute yourself during that time, raise your hand, we will identify you in order, and then we will go down the order of participants who wish to share their comments, and you have up to two minutes to do so.

And again, for the voting, it's a 51% majority in favor of yes for the endorsement decision to be upheld. So we just wanted to circle back on that. Any other questions from our appeals board members? OK. We'll go to the next--

Yeah.

Sorry, go ahead, Tom.

So that's a little confusing to me. So sort of the default is that the CSAC endorsement stands, correct?

Yes. The question will be-- because it is an endorsed measure, so that's the ques-- right. Do you agree to uphold the CSAC endorsement decision?

So really, to overturn it, no needs 51%.

Correct.

OK.

OK. Going to the next slide, so we wanted to do a vote test just with everyone here. So earlier before the meeting, a Poll Everywhere link was emailed to you all. So including our alternates, if you're on, we would kindly ask to do the vote test just to make sure everybody's good to go in advance of the April 29 meeting.

So if you could pull that up, it's a Poll Everywhere link. And if you don't have it available to you, please speak up. Let us know. We can send it to you. It's just going to be a simple question.

Who was that sent from? What was the header on the--

Yeah.

I'm not seeing it.

Beth, I believe it was from our Appeals box?

Yeah. It was sent from the Appeals box. And the subject line is NQF Appeals Orientation Test Vote Link.

Got it.

Anyone else note have it? Sorry, Larry, it looks like you were talking, but you might be on mute. Oh. OK, you're still on mute, Larry.

The question is, do we have to accept the cookies?

Sorry. Is there any cookies, did you say?

Yeah, it wants me to accept cookies.

Oh, accept cookies. OK. You don't have to accept the cookies to do the vote test.

OK.

So my link, I think, is going into Microsoft Edge. I don't have the actual link itself to put into my Chrome box. Can we actually have the link, the actual URL?

Yes, I'll get that out.

Yeah, I'm not seeing that email in my box either.

Who said they're not seeing it?

I got that email, a Practice Test Vote Link. I went to it, I put my name in, and it says, Waiting for NQF Vote to 685's Presentation to Begin.

Right.

Right.

So we'll go ahead and ask [? Gabby ?] to open that voting link up.

Ah.

So just-- yeah, this is why we wanted to try to do it on our orientation with everyone, so you're familiar with how this will work.

Can you all see the voting screen here?

Yup.

Yup.

Yup.

OK.

All right.

So if you have the link open, you should be able to see it.

I just got out the full link, everybody, on the board. So it may take a minute or two for everyone to get it.

I'm not seeing a link anywhere.

There we go.

Who's talking?

Dave Shahian.

I didn't hear you, I'm sorry.

It was Dave Shahian.

Oh, Dave. OK. Let me try. Maybe--

Ah, wait a minute, I see a link now in the last email. OK, got it.

Awesome.

We're all on the edge of our seat whether or not a hot dog is a sandwich.

Yeah, this is too existential for a Monday afternoon.

Yeah, really.

[LAUGHS] We try to keep it interesting, I guess.

All right, it does look like we're at seven votes, so I'll go ahead and close the poll. And the moment we've been waiting for-- 71% of people said, yes, it is a sandwich, and 29% of people said, no, it is not a sandwich.

All right. So I wonder if there's any sort of decision-making like that that we could correlate to in the appeals board meeting. But 71%. OK. Thank you. Thank you, thank you.

We met the 51% threshold there.

You did, you did. So according to this, this group has determined that hot dog is a sandwich. All right. Awesome. All right, so I'll ask Mary to share the slides again. OK. So that will be the voting software that we use for the appeals board meeting. So you will get an email just like we just did in advance of the meeting. It will be the day of the meeting.

You'll get an email from our NQF Appeals box, it'll have a Poll Everywhere link. You'll open it up and you'll probably see a screen asking NQF to start the vote. So that will be like that until we actually go to vote and we open the vote, like [? Gabby ?] did. And then you can enter in your vote. OK.

We'll go to the next slide. So just want to touch on some next steps upcoming. Next slide, Mary, please. So like I mentioned, we'll have individual prep calls with relevant stakeholders, appeals board co-chairs, Larry and Laurel, as well as CSAC chairs.

And we'll have a call with the appellant and the measure developer and steward. Again, this is prior to the appeals board meeting to answer any questions they have and also just make sure everyone is aligned on the procedure.

Then we will also provide the appeals board meeting materials, like I mentioned previously. We'll post them to the website publicly, but we'll be sharing them directly with the appeals board members as well as well as the developer, the appellant, the CSAC chairs, et cetera.

The appeals board meeting will be on April 29. It is scheduled for 1:00 to 3:30 PM. The reason why we have an extra 30 minutes as opposed to two hours is just anticipating if there's a large number of public comments. Again, we're trying to limit presenters to two minutes each, but if there's a large amount of public comments or discussion, we wanted to build in a little bit of buffer.

I also will mention that you've probably seen communications come from us of a second meeting on May 2. That's from 5:00 to 6:00 PM Eastern, and this meeting is just tentatively scheduled in case we need it. So if anything happens during the appeals board meeting on the 29th and we are unable to get to a final vote with the appeals board members, we'll need to reconvene on Monday, May 2 at 5:00 PM to do the final vote.

But we'll try to keep to the 1:00 to 3:30 the best we can, but again, we wanted to build in extra time just in case there's a significant number of public comments if we get to that part of the agenda.

Lastly, if you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact us. You can see see the email address is [Appeals@QualityForum.org](mailto:Appeals@QualityForum.org). If you have any questions based on this call or anything leading up to the meeting, please don't hesitate to reach out. You can also visit our Appeals Board web page for any additional appeals information. You'll find there when the meeting dates and times are posted. Materials will also be posted under that meeting's web page.

But again, you can always reach out to us with any questions or anything for materials. But we will be sending all the materials out in advance of the meeting for review by the appeals board, and we're looking forward to having those prep calls with all the stakeholders as well.

Next slide. And that concludes the orientation for today. Do any of the appeals board members have any other questions?

I have a question. Are we allowed to talk to anybody about this, like on CSAC or otherwise?

I would say we want to limit some of that communication in advance of the meeting. We will have those participants available during the meeting, so if you do have some questions there, we kindly ask you to sort of reserve those types of questions for during the meeting itself, Laurel. Great question. Any other questions?

Matt, it's Tricia. I think one of our additional members, Kristina Anderson is unmuted now. I just wanted to give her the opportunity to speak up and get a sense for the connection.

Great. Thanks, Tricia. Hi, Kristine. Are you there?

Hi. Can you hear me now?

Yes.

I'm here. Can you hear me?

Yes, we can.

OK, good.

Yeah, hi, Kristine. Yeah, go ahead. Do you mind introducing yourself?

Sure. And I was able to hear the whole thing and test-vote, so I'm all good. I am the President of Booz Allen Hamilton's Civil Sector, and I am currently the co-chair of the Cost and Efficiency Committee. And I am also a former CSAC member. Glad to be with you all.

Thank you so much, Kristine, for joining. Great. Thanks, Tricia. Any other questions or comments? OK. All right.

Hearing none, thank you all very much for your time today. We'll give some time back in your busy schedules, I'm sure. Again, if you have any other questions, please don't hesitate to reach out, but we'll be looking forward to those prep calls as well as sending out those materials in advance of the April 29 meeting. But thank you, and have a great rest of your day.

Thank you, and thanks for all the hard work.

Yeah. Thanks, Matt.

Thanks, everyone.

Bye. Thank you.