

**OPTN Policy Oversight Committee
Benefit Scoring Subcommittee
Meeting Summary
January 26, 2023
Conference Call**

Lisa Stocks, RN, MSN, FNP, Chair

Introduction

The Benefit Scoring Subcommittee (“Subcommittee”) met via Citrix GoToMeeting teleconference on 01/26/2023 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Recap of Implemented Changes
2. Discussion of Impact
3. Potential Assessment of Risk

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

1. Recap of Implemented Changes

The Subcommittee reviewed the changes suggested at the previous meeting in the context of the most recent new project benefit survey.

Data summary:

At the previous meeting, the Subcommittee recommended:

- To remove Strategic Plan Alignment from benefit score
- To provide the sizes of the populations impacted by the population

The present variables are now:

- Measurability of project
- Population Size and %
- Whether vulnerable populations are impacted

Summary of discussion:

This item had no discussion.

Next steps:

Staff will review and present any further impacts from the changes.

2. Discussion of Impact

The Chair introduced the topic of impact in benefit scoring and provided a brief overview of how it could be applied in benefit scoring.

Summary of discussion:

A member wondered whether measurability was necessary to characterize the impact of a policy; they added that it was likely a good measurement to retain as when reviewing the project as whole but may

not be relevant to impact. Staff replied that this often reflected on the key metric of the project. A preliminary step in assessing the impact of a proposal is being able to measure it at all.

A second member considered that the impact on a certain vulnerable population can vary much more widely than the other metrics. They wondered if there were a way to ascertain the “quality” of the impact. Another member agreed and noted that they personally would consider a policy that has a very high impact on a small group of individuals more important than a policy that has a lesser impact on a much larger group. They suggested that there should be a more incremental scale for assessing impact to vulnerable populations. Staff clarified that the original intent of separating both population size and percent was to provide a rough estimate of that change in impact.

The Chair wondered if the way to improve scoring accuracy was to assess the amount of change in the anticipated key metric. Furthermore, they could request that committees bringing proposals to the Policy Oversight Committee (POC) have a more specific key metric to evaluate.

Next steps:

Staff will incorporate Subcommittee suggestions into the next benefit scoring iteration.

3. Potential Assessment of Risk

The Chair provided an overview of risk and its impact on the POC’s prioritization.

Data summary:

- Risk provides a counterpoint to benefit, providing a metric to track likelihood of the project remaining on schedule with the same scope
- This is in part performed by the sponsoring committee when determining whether to present the project to the POC

Summary of discussion:

A member expressed concern that committees could lack knowledge on how to create project proposals that do not have an excessive amount of risk. They suggested there should be a method or template by which proposals are created to help “check boxes” when assessing risk. The Chair of the POC noted that Staff members are already performing a risk analysis when the scope of the project is still being determined within the committee; this review of risk is not to determine whether there are risks the committee has not considered, but to determine if an adequate assessment has been performed.

The Chair of the POC asked for more clarity on how risk will be ascertained at the outset of a project. Frequently, they said, risks are not identified until the project is already underway. They urged that any assessment of risk being performed at the time of POC new project review be very specific and clear about what its assessing. The role of the POC, they continued, should not be to outline the areas that a project should not touch because it was too risky. Staff clarified that the oversight of the POC should really be limited to whether the approach taken by the committee is appropriate, rather than a subject matter review. Risk, in some ways, is also a measure of trust in the policymaking system – by consistently producing good policy proposals with careful oversight, trust is built in the system.

In addition, staff added that reviewing the proposed timelines among the POC could be considered an evaluation of risk. Part of a stable project is high confidence in its ability to meet targeted deadlines.

The Chair wondered if there should be a question like “have identified and predicted risks been addressed?” included on the project form the committee reviews. A member supported this idea, but wondered if the question was too vague, especially given all the avenues available to explore potential risk. Staff agreed that it was a very open-ended question, but added that, similar to the benefit score

itself, the question would be a tool the POC uses to investigate all areas of the project when discussing its approval.

The Chair suggested that potential risk be categorized under large subgenres: unintended consequences, legal or political risk, or timeline.

Next steps:

Staff will include a slide considering the potential risks of a project at the next new project approval discussion. Staff will also break these potential risks out into categories outlined by the committee.

Upcoming Meeting

- February 23, 2023

Attendance

- **Subcommittee Members**
 - Lisa Stocks
 - Andrew Flescher
 - Matthew Hartwig
 - Nicole Turgeon
 - Jesse Schold
- **HRSA Representatives**
 - Marilyn Levi
- **UNOS Staff**
 - Cole Fox
 - Isaac Hager
 - James Alcorn
 - Krissy Laurie