

**OPTN Membership and Professional Standards Committee
OPO Performance Monitoring Enhancement Work Group
Meeting Summary
August 17, 2023
Conference Call**

Rick Hasz, Chair

Introduction

The MPSC OPO Performance Monitoring Enhancement Work Group met in open session virtually via Webex on August 17, 2023, to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Project Background, Purpose, and Scope
2. OPO Performance Monitoring and Data
3. Next Steps

The following is a summary of the Work Group's discussions.

1. Project Background, Purpose, and Scope

OPTN Contractor staff summarized the Membership and Professional Standards Committee's (MPSC) discussions of the project and the MPSC's initial charge to the work group. The MPSC feels the OPTN needs separate metrics from Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) but acknowledges any metrics should be complimentary, preferably more focused metrics that measure parts of the donation and transplantation rate. The MPSC will incorporate most of the principles the MPSC used to select transplant program performance metrics, specifically that the metrics should measure activities that are clearly within the OPTN authority, that the OPO is responsible for and can impact, that have a clearly desired outcome and that are risk adjusted. In the OPO space, additional OPTN data collection is required prior to development of metrics. The MPSC charged the work group with initially focusing on defining standard processes and consistent definitions for essential data points for the referral to authorization phases of the donation process and developing a proposal for new data collection.

Summary of discussion:

The work group did not have any questions or comments.

2. OPO Performance Monitoring and Data

The Director of the Scientific Registry of Transplant Recipients (SRTR) reviewed a process flow data capture algorithm and data capture document developed as part of a pilot sponsored by the Association of Organ Procurement Organizations (AOPO) with the OPOs in Region 8. The work group chair described his OPO's donor tracking tool within the electronic donor record. The donor tracking tool includes algorithms that allows the frontline staff to answer yes or no questions and have the algorithm guide them to the next step relieving the frontline staff from making judgement calls and promoting consistency in the data capture. The tool also includes several periodic quality control checks that identify if the data provided does not logically match the outcome. The Chair also reviewed data dashboards that are populated by the data from the donor tracking tool.

The Chair requested feedback from the work group on the development of a process flow like those described including consistent definitions, use of yes or no question logic, and algorithms to guide

frontline staff through the process. The work group could then partner with the electronic donor record vendors to incorporate the resulting data capture tool into their products and the data could be uploaded from those systems to the OPTN computer system. He asked whether any of the work group members identified any questions or data that were not included in these two examples that would be useful for purposes of evaluating performance.

Summary of Discussion:

Decision #1: The Chair and the SRTR Director will review the two examples presented to develop a draft process flow and data definitions that will be provided to the work group to gather feedback prior to the next work group meeting.

Decision #2: Work group will investigate collecting data from transplant hospitals on in-hospital deaths or other sources of hospital death information that can be used to validate data submitted by the OPOs to combat concerns about self-reported data.

Decision #1: The Chair and the SRTR Director will review the two examples presented to develop a draft process flow and data definitions that will be provided to the work group to gather feedback prior to the next work group meeting.

Work group members supported the development of a standardized process flow with data definitions and yes or no question logic imbedded. Representatives from two OPOs that participated in the Region 8 pilot noted that the big takeaways from that effort were standardization of processes and how data points were defined. The OPOs determined in the beginning that even though they thought they were all doing things the same way, they were not. All Region 8 OPOs working together to create a set of standards on data documentation and collection was critical to the success of that project and development of standards and consistent definitions will be critical to the success of this project. Members believed that standardizing process and data definitions and incorporating logic will help address concerns raised about the quality of self-reported data by removing the need for individual frontline staff to make potentially inconsistent judgement calls. The work group supported incorporating this process flow and data capture into the OPOs' electronic donor records.

The work group supported the next step of the Chair and SRTR Director combining the two presented examples into a draft process flow and data definitions for review by the work group. The process flow and data definitions will be sent to the work group for feedback through a survey prior to the next work group meeting.

Decision #2: Work group will investigate collecting data from transplant hospitals on in-hospital deaths or other sources of hospital death information that can be used to validate data submitted by the OPOs to combat concerns about self-reported data.

In response to the work group discussion of recent criticism of OPO data as self-reported data, the Chair suggested potentially requiring transplant hospitals to report all deaths and include ventilatory status and ICD-10 codes to provide data for validation of OPO data and also serve as a demonstration project for future collection from all donor hospitals. Work group members were supportive of investigating this as a possible option to include in the concept paper.

Next Steps:

The Work Group chair and SRTR Director will compare the two process flow and data definition examples and develop a draft process flow and data definitions to be sent to work group members with a feedback survey prior to the next work group meeting that will be set in late September.

Upcoming Meetings

- TBD Late September

Attendance

- **Work Group Members**
 - Richard Hasz, Work Group Chair
 - Kristine Browning
 - Doug Butler
 - Ashley Cardenas
 - Anil Chandraker
 - Micah Davis
 - Chad Ezzel
 - Kyle Herber
 - Vicki Hunter
 - Raymond Lee
 - Lori Markham
 - Deborah McRann
 - Candy Wells
- **HRSA Representatives**
 - Marilyn Levi
 - Arjun Naik
 - Kala Rochelle
 - Daniel Thompson
- **SRTR Staff**
 - Ryo Hirose
 - Jon Miller
 - Jon Snyder
 - Bryn Thompson
- **UNOS Staff**
 - Sally Aungier
 - Rebecca Brookman
 - Robyn DiSalvo
 - Nadine Hoffman
 - Sevgin Hunt
 - Krissy Laurie
 - Ann-Marie Leary
 - Eric Messick
 - Samantha Noreen
 - Jacqui O'Keefe
 - Melissa Santos
 - Sharon Shepherd
 - Kim Uccellini
 - Betsy Warnick
 - Joe Watson
- **Other Attendees**
 - None