OPTN Policy Oversight Committee
Benefit Scoring Subcommittee
Meeting Summary
March 16, 2023
Conference Call

Lisa Stocks, RN, MSN, FNP, Chair

Introduction

The Benefit Scoring Subcommittee ("Subcommittee") met via Citrix GoToMeeting teleconference on 03/16/2023 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Review of Benefit Scoring Changes
2. Discussion – Bundling Projects

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

1. Review of Benefit Scoring Changes

The Subcommittee reviewed the benefit scoring of six potential new projects seeking POC approval. These projects included a score for "impact", per the last Subcommittee discussion.

Summary of discussion:

Staff introduced the scores that each project received, viewed across each benefit category. They noted that the areas the Subcommittee had requested more detail on became more consistent through this round of scoring.

The Chair explained that, following the discussion on policy priority alignment from the last meeting, she carefully considered whether each project aligned. However, because some of the projects were not within her field of expertise, she was still unsure about their alignment. She advocated for having the ability to modify responses based on explanation or discussion lead by the sponsoring committee's vice-chair. They added that histocompatibility may be a bit of an exception because it is such a niche field with extreme depth, even amongst transplant experts.

Staff asked if the information could be better shared or if the questions in the survey could be more specific. Two members felt that the questions were sufficient, but that explanation and presentation by the sponsoring vice-chairs provided much more context than the project form provided.

Staff posed a hypothetical scenario. If the committee had to prioritize a limited number of projects, do the benefit scores received align with the Subcommittee's instinctive prioritizations? Additionally, was it helpful to consider the projects adjacent to one another, rather than in isolation?

A member felt that it was extremely helpful to consider projects adjacent to one another. By reviewing each project next to each other, the member could return to previous answers in which they now felt surer of their response. This was especially true when considering whether a project was a policy priority. The Chair agreed that bundling provided valuable context when the projects were placed next to one another. They endorsed having project review sequenced every three months.

Staff reviewed the impact score each project received; they noted that some of the projects which received high impact scores received lower total scores. A member replied that that may be revealing of

a high impact project for a small group. In this case, a calculated percent of reactive antibodies (CPRA) form change would not impact most candidates but could have a large impact on those candidates that relied on that form.

Staff asked if members had opinions on whether there should be a pathway to retroactively change their responses after hearing the discussion on a committee call. Three members supported this option. Staff also asked if the function of benefit score should be as a data point to be used in the discussion of project prioritization, or whether it should reflect the project as a whole; in the case of the second option, could the committee prioritize exclusively off benefit score? A member felt the benefit score should be as a data point, rather than reflect the project. If a project received a low benefit score, there should be a pathway in which the POC can still consider it a reasonable project. A second member agreed with this philosophy.

Next steps:

Staff will return the Subcommittee's feedback about bundling projects to the full Committee.

2. Discussion – Bundling Projects

Staff introduced a discussion on the pros and cons of bundling projects. Additionally, the Subcommittee reviewed an idea to have the Subcommittee discuss all new projects ahead of full Committee calls.

Data summary:

Pros of bundling projects:

- Easier to compare across projects when there are more than one or two
- May be more efficient for the POC's time

Cons of bundling projects:

- Need to ensure time sensitive projects are reviewed in a timely manner
- Higher workload for specific meetings

Pros of Subcommittee review:

- Subcommittee can guide discussion on benefit in full committee meetings
- Pre-assessment may help with project review

Cons of Subcommittee review:

- If done more than quarterly, could be too much of a time ask for members

Summary of discussion:

The Chair supported having a Subcommittee review of projects ahead of full Committee review, provided it was not too time intensive for members.

Next steps:

Staff will present the Subcommittee's thoughts on bundling to POC Leadership.

Upcoming Meeting

- April 27, 2023

Attendance

- **Committee Members**
  - Lisa Stocks
  - Kimberly Koontz
  - Dolamu Olaitain
  - Stevan Gonzalez
  - JD Menteer
- **HRSA Representatives**
  - Marilyn Levi
  - Jim Bowman
  - Shannon Dunne
- **SRTR Staff**
  - Jon Snyder
- **UNOS Staff**
  - Cole Fox
  - Isaac Hager
  - Krissy Laurie
  - Stryker-Ann Vosteen