OPTN/UNOS Policy Oversight Committee
Meeting Minutes
March 16, 2017
Conference Call

Sue Dunn, RN, BSN, MBA, Chair
Jennifer Milton, BSN, CCTC, MBA, Vice Chair

Introduction

The Policy Oversight Committee (POC) met via Citrix GoTo on March 16, 2017 to review a public comment proposal from the Ad Hoc Diseases Transmission Advisory Committee (DTAC) and to discuss several items regarding the POC's review of committee projects.

1. Committee Projects

The POC has no currently active committee projects.

2. Other Significant Items

Public Comment Proposal Review

The Committee reviewed the public comment proposal Guidance on Explaining Risk Related to Use of Increased Risk Donor Organs When Considering Organ Offers (Ad hoc Disease Transmission Advisory Committee) to make a recommendation to the Executive Committee about whether this proposal should be released for a special 30-day public comment period beginning March 27, 2017.

The project was identified as a Goal 1 (increase transplants) project and the POC members discussed the guidance document for over 40 minutes before taking a vote. The POC voted unanimously to recommend approval for public comment to the Executive Committee and offered these comments:

- DTAC should engage the OPO Committee for input as a key stakeholder during the public comment period, particularly in regards to protecting the donor's private health information and confidentiality, while ensuring informed consent to recipients. Goal is for standardized guidelines on communications to recipients and donor families.

- DTAC should reach out to Minority Affairs Committee during public comment period for input regarding effectively communicating with minority and non-English speaking populations.

The Vice Chair of DTAC agreed that they should ensure that these Committees provide input to the guidance document during the public comment period. The OPO Vice Chair and MAC Vice Chair were on the conference call, and established that they would get input from their Committees during the public comment period.

The POC's recommendations for this proposal were presented to the Executive Committee at their March 20, 2017 conference call.

Project Review Discussions:

- The committee project review survey: We asked the POC members if any of the questions in the survey are challenging for them. Is it always clear how to answer the questions?

  POC members only had about 15 minutes to discuss the current survey questions. The group started the discussion with the first question in the survey *Rate how well the*

proposal aligns with the identified primary OPTN Strategic Goal and several members asked if maybe we should assign projects to more than one goal. The idea is that some projects may touch more than one strategic goal and that is not adequately addressed with the assignment to a single strategic primary goal. The Committee liaison explained that in the past the projects had been assigned across multiple goals with a weight assigned to the goals. This made it difficult to get an accurate picture of alignment with the strategic plan, and also made resource allocation difficult, so leadership made the decision to require a primary goal to assign the project to. The Policy Director added that this information could be collected, and that we could ask for other strategic goals that they felt were addressed by the proposal. A POC member specifically suggested that the question be split into two so that the first part of the question chose the primary goal and the second was a checklist of the other goals that could be checked if the reviewer felt the proposal addressed any of those goals.

Several Committee members also mentioned that the third question, *Is there sufficient evidence to support the problem statement?,* was difficult to answer sometimes. They reported that for brand new projects, often the data or evidence to support the project had not yet been collected. Or, that part of the project was to actually collect the data to support the problem. They suggested that perhaps the word "evidence" is too strict and that we should rephrase the question to ask *Is there sufficient evidence or rationale to support the problem statement?* Several Committee members agreed.

The Committee then briefly touched on next question in the survey: *Rate the impact on the identified target population, including OPTN members and the general public*. They noted that there might be a sub-population that is really affected; it may affect all of the population or just some of the population, but the impact on that group is substantial. The group recommended that this question could be split into two questions, one that gets to how much of the population is affected and the second that gets to how much impact the project will have. These are different things and should be broken out into different questions.

A POC member also reported that it's also sometimes difficult to answer some of the questions depending on where the project is in the process. Sometimes information is incomplete; sometimes the timeline is not really there or complete. The Policy Director commented that this is great feedback to give to the sponsoring Committee during the review.

- Two other questions about committee projects were not addressed, since we ran out of time:
    1. Measuring the benefit of a project: How can we (and should we) measure the benefit of a proposed committee project? How could benefit be used when considering project alignment with the strategic plan?
    2. "Access" projects (Strategic Plan Goal 2): Think about future access projects, including multi-organ.

Upcoming Meetings

- April 20, 2017, 12:00 PM EST, conference call
- Monday, May 15, 2017 – Orientation (New POC members only), Richmond, VA
- Tuesday, May 16, 2017 – Full Committee Meeting, Richmond, VA