<div align="center">

OPTN Policy Oversight Committee
Post-Implementation Monitoring Subcommittee
Meeting Summary
January 24, 2023
Conference Call

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

</div>

Introduction

The Post-Implementation Monitoring Subcommittee ("Subcommittee") met via Citrix GoToMeeting teleconference on 01/24/2023 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. OPTN Post-Implementation Policy Evaluation Overview
2. Consistency of Committee Review and POC Oversight

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

1. OPTN Post-Implementation Policy Evaluation Overview

Staff presented a high-level summary on the existing OPTN post-implementation monitoring performed by Research staff.

Data summary:

Monitoring

- Most Board-approved OPTN policies receive a pdf monitoring report during their evaluation phase
- Frequency of the report changes – some are performed quarterly, some monthly; varies by policy
- There are currently 50+ reports planned for 2023
  - 2022 had 37 reports completed across 24 distinct projects
- These reports often take hundreds of staff hours across multiple departments

Approach to policy evaluation

- Often cover a large number of demographic groups
- Not as easy as rerunning reports on a cadence – often times these reports are updated based off of committee discussions
- Key metric is established by the sponsoring committee at the outset of project approval
  - These key metrics are evaluated at the conclusion of the project by the sponsoring committee to determine if the project was successful
    - Often times these are univariate analyses

How can this report be optimized?

- Metrics reporting – useful in instances where a the key metric does not change significantly in a short amount of time
- Dashboards – piloting an idea to create organ-specific public dashboards to follow patterns in "real" time

     o Staff noted that a benefit of the dashboards could be to break policy out by impact in certain demographic groups and geographic areas
- Scientific study – some large scale changes could receive a scientific study rather than the final report performed by Research

<u>Summary of discussion:</u>

The Chair emphasized that the role of the subcommittee was to identify gaps in the existing review process while not duplicating effort already being performed. They suggested that the role of the Subcommittee could be to have a more "objective" view than the sponsoring committee, given the POC's oversight position. Additionally, in this role, it could help the Policy Oversight Committee (POC) remain informed on the status of the project throughout all stages of the project life.

<u>Next steps:</u>

Staff will provide any update to the Subcommittee on the status of post-implementation dashboards

2. Consistency of Committee Review and POC Oversight

The POC is charged with "assessing the impact of implemented policy proposals". Staff suggested a discussion on how the POC can create and maintain a consistent committee review of implemented policies.

<u>Data summary:</u>

Projects could be reviewed for:

- Success according to the key metric
- Unintended consequences
- Mitigating factors or limitations in the monitoring analysis

For 2023:

- Projects must be presented to the POC with a key metric, ideally one that is measurable
- Mention any potentially limiting factors in their progression of the project
  - o After implementation, sponsoring committees could report out on monitoring reports to share any relevant information

The POC will determine when reviewing implemented projects:

- Whether there were any unintended consequences
- Whether there was any limitation to the post-implementation monitoring

Staff also noted that a constraint for the POC was time and resource management to prevent overburdening members. They also requested feedback on how white papers, concept papers, and guidance documents could be reviewed in this format.

<u>Summary of discussion:</u>

The Chair asked what, historically, has been the outcome of committees reviewing the post-implementation monitoring report, and what actions have been taken when unintended consequences were identified. An important factor in the monitoring of policies, they stated, was having a standard series of steps that can be broadly applied to each report if the POC identifies concerns.

They agreed with Staff's suggestion that POC members should report out on monitoring reports once they received their final two-year monitoring report. In doing so, the POC could provide feedback from a broader scope of subject matter experts than the isolated workgroup or subcommittee.

A member agreed with this approach and added that this work could be facilitated by the sponsoring committee building more depth into their key metric; additionally, they should do a pre-emptive analysis of any unintended consequences prior to returning to the POC. They were supportive of the POC only receiving reports at the conclusion of monitoring, as, otherwise, the burden on the POC could be excessive. It was also suggested that there should be a mechanism in place for which a committee other than the sponsoring committee can raise concerns with a specific policy (e.g. Pediatric Committee raising concerns on a Liver Committee policy).

A second member suggested that a high-level summary of the monitoring report could be presented to the committee prior to the meeting such that meeting time does not have to be dedicated to understanding the impact of the policy.

The Chair wondered if it was in-scope of the POC to suggest areas in which monitoring reports were potentially over-specific, in the context of being intentional with the relevancy of what's presented in the reports. They wondered if there could be better impact of these reports if they were condensed and presented to the committee, rather than providing multi-hundred-page reports that cannot be reviewed in a small amount of time. Staff agreed, noting, anecdotally, that committees seemed to rely more on the presentation given by Research staff rather than the report itself.

The Chair also asked if there was an established process by which a committee could be prioritized at the POC if they identified a concern with an implemented process. Staff noted the current process was more ad hoc; however, because committees receive frequent updates on their implemented policies, concerns are usually quickly identified and brought before the POC as a new project.

Next steps:

The POC will be reviewing projects' key metric for appropriate level of depth and measurability, as well as an assessment of potential unintended consequences of the policy.

Upcoming Meeting

- February 23, 2023

Attendance

- **Committee Members**
  - Jesse Schold
  - Gerald Morris
  - Jason Huff
  - Jim Kim
  - Natalie Blackwell
  - Rachel Engen
  - Scott Biggins
  - Stephanie Pouch
  - Vijay Gorantla
- **HRSA Representatives**
  - Shannon Dunne
- **UNOS Staff**
  - Amber Fritz
  - Isaac Hager
  - Cole Fox
  - Krissy Laurie
  - Lauren Mauk