

**OPTN Policy Oversight Committee
Post-Implementation Monitoring Subcommittee
Meeting Summary
November 29, 2022
Conference Call**

Jesse Schold, PhD, M.Stat., M.Ed., Chair

Introduction

The Post-Implementation Monitoring Subcommittee (“Subcommittee”) met via Citrix GoToMeeting teleconference on 11/29/2022 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Prioritization

The following is a summary of the Subcommittee’s discussions.

1. Prioritization

The OPTN Policy Oversight Committee (POC) is charged with reviewing implemented projects post hoc. Staff reintroduced the topics considered by the Subcommittee at their previous meeting. They also requested feedback on in which order the Subcommittee should proceed with the ideas suggested.

Summary of discussion:

The Chair also requested feedback on how frequently the Subcommittee should meet to review projects, what format that should take, as well as what data would be required for review. Furthermore, they reiterated that there should be a process by which more urgent projects can be reviewed ahead of less urgent projects.

A member suggested having a system that categorizes policies broadly into either “working” or “needs more review/data” to focus the Subcommittee’s attention on the policies that need review. The Chair supported this idea, and added that the policies that are identified in the second category could be reviewed with the sponsoring committee. This would allow the POC to have a more detailed understanding of the intended effects and the existing monitoring.

Another member wondered if this monitoring plan would be too much for the POC to handle alongside their existing duties. They asked if having a separate committee created to handle post-implementation review had been considered. The Chair contributed that a “freestanding” committee would also be more likely to engage members who were interested in improving the policy development process and were not limited in their time availability to do so.

The representative from the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) considered that a possible option could be for the OPTN Committees to perform the initial review which would free up time for the POC members. They suggested this based on the fact that the sponsoring committee would be the most familiar with the details of a project and could quickly identify any areas that were potentially problematic.

It was proposed that projects seeking POC approval include a statement that indicates what success would be (e.g. “This project will be considered successful if it achieves...”). This could be modified over the proposal’s development, but would be used by the POC once the proposal was implemented to

determine if it achieved its desired effect. Another member supported this, suggesting that it could take a similar format to a data safety monitoring board (DSMB). The Chair added that there should be a timeframe by which this metric is met for the success statement.

A member wondered whether the amount of data requests that could come out of the Subcommittee could slow down the rate of other data requests being considered. Staff replied that this would depend on the time frame that the Subcommittee would require.

The Chair asked what the actions the Subcommittee could take once a proposal was reviewed should be. They considered that the POC should be able to charge that a proposal is revisited if it does not achieve its desired effect, but requested the Subcommittee consider that question for future discussions.

Staff also asked how projects that do not have a quantitative measurement or impact should be reviewed post hoc. Guidance documents, for example, do not have a measurable impact that can be succinctly reviewed. A member replied that there should be some kind of way that guidance documents are filtered out to prevent the POC from having to determine success metrics for those types of proposals. A second member responded that the success of these projects could be driven by the community rather than be data-driven. A third member suggested having the monitoring plan entail that the sponsoring committee reviews the guidance document on a regular cadence to ensure it is accurate.

Next steps:

Staff will distribute invitations to the next two Subcommittee calls for 2023.

Upcoming Meeting

- TBD

Attendance

- **Committee Members**
 - Jesse Schold
 - Natalie Blackwell
 - Scott Biggins
 - Rachel Engen
 - Jason Huff
 - Stephanie Pouch
 - Jennifer Prinz
 - Jim Kim
- **HRSA Representatives**
 - Vanessa Arriola
 - Marilyn Levi
 - Chris McLaughlin
- **UNOS Staff**
 - Cole Fox
 - Amber Fritz
 - Isaac Hager
 - Darby Harris
 - Krissy Laurie
 - Lauren Mauk
 - Susan Tlusty