Systems Dynamics Work Group
OPTN/UNOS Ad Hoc Systems Performance Committee
Meeting Minutes
December 18, 2018
Conference Call

Jeffrey Orlowski, MS, CPTC, Co-Chair
Stuart Sweet, MD, PhD, Co-Chair

Introduction

The Systems Dynamics Work Group met via Citrix GoTo teleconference on 12/18/2019 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Review What We Have Heard
2. Gather Additional Feedback
3. Goal of March Meeting
4. Next Steps

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

1. Review What We Have Heard

Data summary:

The Co-Chairs welcomed everyone to the meeting and went over the agenda. The Work Group Chairs met together a week ago to translate all the concepts that came out of the Chicago meeting into two or three strategies, drivers, or metrics that each Work Group could recommend to the broader community to drive performance improvement. They discussed beginning the process of formulating a presentation to the public for the March meeting. They were also able to begin distilling recommendations from discussions at the Chicago meeting, including a balanced scorecard, recommendation for the development of DSA/local level/joint OPO activity, etc.

Even though they are asking for a small number of key drivers to bring forward, they do not want to lose sight of other things that were discussed. Those will be kept in mind for work done in the future. In addition, any discussion that doesn't become an immediate focus will still be there. Some of those things might go to a standing committee to work on developing further.

A specific format will be used to take the key drivers so they can be articulated in a consistent fashion as to what the drivers are, where they come from, and how they are measured. The Work Groups over the next 2 months will translate their ideas into that format so they can be presented to the community in March.

There are four different categories of possible outcomes, which are 1) tools and technology, 2) collaborative improvement projects, 3) performance monitoring enhancements and 4) external recommendations to external stakeholders.

UNOS staff looked at key driver diagrams from each Work Group and came up with themes across the board.

1) Tools and technology.

There was a lot of feedback about dashboard and that there need to be better dashboards for self monitoring, adding data not collected by OPTN, and shared dashboards for quality measures between transplant centers and OPOs. There were also a lot of comments on enhanced predictive analytics, including better real-time decision-making tools for the staff to make sure they're not turning organs down that could benefit their patients.

2) Collaborative Improvement Projects.

Everyone expressed a desire to for more collaborative improvement projects like COIIN. Two main ideas were around DCD procurement and utilization, and overall donor management and procurement strategies and best practices. OPOs can procure all the DCD donors that they want, but the if the transplant hospitals are not accepting and utilizing those organs, it would be for naught. If the centers show a desire to utilize those organs, but the organs are not being procured, then the mark is also not being met. This is something everyone needs to work on. Procurement strategies need to be evaluated with all the different transplant centers, whether that will be feasible once allocation policies change, and whether they need to come up with better strategies to maximize capabilities.

3) Performance monitoring/Measurement enhancements.

There was much discussion on the balanced scorecard approach for performance monitoring. The idea is that more than 1-year graft survival is needed for transplant centers and more than just organ yield for OPO. When looking at system as a whole, it will be important to look at joint metrics that people should be held accountable to. Added OPO metrics need to be looked at to evaluate their performance.

Recommendations to external stakeholders are coordination of the national transportation system and payment models. There are many transportation issues, including not enough pilots, availability of flights, no direct flights to certain areas, and tracking. For purpose of the spreadsheet and metrics, the focus will be mainly on the first three categories. The staff would also like considerations from the Work Groups on the payment model.

2. Gather Additional Feedback

Summary of discussion

One comment is that under tools and technology, there were other ideas other than the dashboard were that were not mentioned. Those include leveraging technology with enhancements of electronic transmission of images (gross pictures or streaming of video), transmission of microscopic images of biopsies because biopsy reads are inconsistent and inaccurate, and other monitoring tools such as apps. Staff have captured ideas on leveraging technology on previous calls, so will be sure to take that into account when creating the spreadsheet and report to the Board.

A suggestion was made for the Work Group make a list of practices they would like to see become standard practices for OPOs. There was agreement that the work should be intentional and not haphazard.

One comment was on previous discussions about local procurement strategies and changing the paradigm from recipient team procures the majority of the organs to recipient team procuring organs as an exception. This is something that will require input from external stakeholders, but will still be led by OPTN.

A concern brought up was that there may be some allocation policy recommendations that come out of this process, particularly in light of discussions on expedited placement in Chicago, and whether this would fit into one of the four categories. UNOS staff expressed the same

concerns. For other than SPC, allocation and policy changes would be an external recommendation.

Perhaps they should eliminate "external" in external stakeholders. For example, OPOs can hire their own surgeons and change the paradigm. They're pretty much an external stakeholder. Similarly, a recommendation to a Committee or OPTN on changes on policies is not necessarily an external stakeholder, but other stakeholders. One member added changing "tools and technology" to "tools, technology, and process." Both language changes should be considered.

There seems to be a lot of parallel work going on. For example, there are parallel efforts on expedited allocation. It will be important to link some of those projects to avoid creating efforts for work that is already occurring. One member clarified that some of the work is additive. For example, the expedited placement comments are going out for public comment in January, so that work is fairly complete from the perspective of the OPO group. Also, those who involved in parallel efforts could provide some input into the overall final product so the Committee is aligning with what they're doing and not overlapping. This would help discover what the opportunities for alignment are. One thought is to invite them to the March meeting. The same goes for the COIIN project and those who have done this kind of work.

The Committee Chair described his plan to meet with the Chair of the metrics that spawned the Split Rock meeting. If any other member has contact with someone involved with parallel work, they should share that on Basecamp so they can reach out prior to the March meeting. This might include people who have received foundation grants to predict the future of metrics on another parallel pathway.

One Work Group member felt the Committee is headed in two directions: what is the product of this Group that OPTN and the community can thrive and the other is partnering with all these folks. It will be important to not lose the opportunity to make meaningful improvement to the OPTN process. He felt they should not spend too much time worrying about what other people are doing when there is much work they could do on their own. The Co-Chair reiterated one way to think of it is that those parallel projects, if they don't require input on this Committee's primary work product, should be put on hold with the idea that they should talk more with them at a future date. The fourth category is important to begin dialogue within the transplant center/OPTN world.

3. Goal of March Meeting

Data summary:

On a recent call, there was a lot of discussion on the exact setup of the March meeting and what that will look like. There will be some plenary sessions and possible breakouts, largely dependent on who the audience is.

The ultimate goal will be to identify:

1. What makes an effective transplant system
2. How to measure it
3. Have recommendations to the OPTN (or others) for projects or tools that can support measurement of the system effectiveness.

If the responsible party is OPTN or UNOS, then perhaps those are the things that could be addressed in a more timely fashion. For ideas that are not well fleshed out and still need measurements or deliverables, they will need more action from the Committee.

For example, leveraging data dashboards for quality improvement. OPTN is responsible here and there is an OPTN and community benefit. The action is to rework some decline codes beyond 830 to capture more meaningful data. The deliverable is to recommend production of

more useful/meaningful codes to better track and trend acceptance and decline practices. This will hopefully increase acceptance rates and decrease decline. This falls under the technology and tools category.

Staff will capture all the information, create a spreadsheet/rubric with all the top drivers and information from calls and notes, including the sheets filled out at the in-person meeting. Work Groups will them be asked to convene and select specific actionable recommendations with possible measures for those that are applicable, as well as if staff missed anything, make sure that it gets into the rubric. Co-Chairs will make sure staff gets responses from a good subset of the Work Group.

Summary of discussion

One member asked how things that were raised by more than one of the three groups would be included in the final product. Staff are aware of overlap between certain issues. There will likely be color-coding for each Work Group to address that fact that they're not reporting out on the same issue. These could be discussed more as a full Committee. At some point there will be a consensus final product.

Ideas not prioritized for March could still be used for collaborative improvement projects in the future.

4. Next Steps

The spreadsheet and rubric will be distributed to all Committee members. Member will evaluate those documents and fill in any blanks and provide any additional feedback.

There will be two more calls for this Work Group to finalize top drivers and priorities as a Committee and begin identifying potential metrics. Any ideas for top priorities should be sent to UNOS staff to help them jump start their process. In February they can come together to decide what they want to bring to the March meeting.

Upcoming Meeting

- January 8, 2019
- February 12, 2019 at 4 p.m. EDT
- March 11-12, 2019, in-person