



A New Potential Donor Audit

Andrew Broderick

Lead Nurse - Service Development





Background

- Potential Donor Audit introduced in 2003
- Originally in paper before development of EOS
- Updated in 2009 which changed some of the wording of the questions being asked, to aid clarity, and the definitions of terms used
- Updated again in 2015 for the introduction of deemed consent legislation in Wales
- A PDA is completed for each patient that dies in a critical care unit (intensive care or emergency department) in all UK hospitals.
- Approximately 36,000 cases reviewed each year



Requirement to enter data outside of real time activity

SNOD time spent inputting

Blood and Transplant

difficult to

not reflecting

Itants initials and not the

Itering

No SNOD consent rate

Easy to hide data

Too many left in draft

test - should not be a missed BSDT

Doesn't identify who competed PDA

Causes of death - needs to be reviewed - no option for perf bowed

PTA patients and closing of PDA if die on ward - unclear to all

Does not capture pt who was supported to BSDT but too unstable to

ency with inputting data due to familiarity / multi-systems data

Does not currently capture non proceeding donors who die on the ward

frustrating that if a proceeding donor, you can't put the referral on EOS until the end of the process. Also frustrating that sometimes you have to input 'pretend data' in order to get to the free text box

at the end, where you can put info to help your colleagues who are finishing the referral. Doesn't tell

ou what each report contains therefore is sometimes confusing as to which one to run e.g.

Drop down boxes can be restrictive and not always more

ר א אפעופרונס פווע טוטטווע טו רטא וו עופ טוו איפוע - עווטפפו עוט אפ אפאר לחות אפ אפאר לחות

SWOT analysis feedback

Uncontrolled deaths recorded as "missed" potential donors – shouldn't be included -actively dying Limited data collection on neonatal units – time, resource HI Leads not utilised effectively for ideas/ development Th Leaus IIUL Unitsed energinvery for needs were very interest of the section needs more detail to capture more what occurs, what -tability for testing?" - rather than current question Clinicians don't have immediate access to the data Was restricted, Which coroner - run reports Add in "Can you maintain haemody Multiple systems for data entry, open to transcription errors Whole DCD section needs re-writi DCD Donors - doesn't take into account those screened out 250 SNODS inputting data – inco Imminent death/WLST - questions are unclear and confusing Definitions (different practice ac Inaccuracies inputting causes additional work Don't know the ICU bed availat Subjective in some parts - questions are interpreted differently across regions and in teams Subjective reasons for not..... Easy to bury data Haemodynamic instability – No spell check Ability to capture length of t Comments box from Referral to PDA doesn't prepopulate – currently No national guidance docu need to copy & paste PDA should be used to car No interaction with other interfaces/software PDA & NxTD don't match esp with Donors at beginning/end of month Reporting access Limited resources for internal audit No quality control • Not capturing 'Novel' donations – Neonates / pregnancy / NIV Poorly filled in at times – esp comments section



SWOT analysis feedback – high level

- PDA questions very subjective 250 SN-OD's interpretation will differ
 - Causes of death no longer suitable common causes of death not available options

Blood and Transplant

No SNOD consent rate

- Numerous problems in determining which patients should have undergone BSD testing to confirm death
- Potential and eligible DCD donors need clarification method of WLST, application of DCD exclusions and screening
- The "approach" and "collaborative request" are not well captured and therefore cannot be analysed
- Information about ODR status and known wishes needs refining and updating
- Access to reporting and the quality/depth of reporting needs improving





- Moving to a data led PDA tool Data items are requested and input by SN-ODs Analysis is undertaken by Statistics team - Moves away from subjective questions
- A review of causes of death options will be undertaken this calendar year
- Top down approach to establishing suitability for BSD testing
 - Neurological criteria met?
 - Were there continuing effects of sedative which would prevent neurological testing?
 - Was the patient's cardiovascular and respiratory status compatible with requirements to undertake neurological testing? If patient not stable, what attempts were made to stabilise patient for testing?
 - Did patient have a biochemical/endocrine abnormality recorded that would prevent neurological testing? If Yes, what biochemical/endocrine abnormality? If yes, were attempts made to correct the biochemical/endocrine abnormality





- New approach to establishing suitability as a DCD donor
 - Was life sustaining treatment withdrawn? If yes, what did the life sustaining treatment withdrawal involve? (Updated multiple choices)
 - What was the reason for the planned WLST ?
 - 1. Patient was deteriorating despite optimal &/or increasing support
 - 2. Patient was not expected to survive this episode of critical illness
 - 3. Patient was expected to have significant disability / neurological impairment if survived
 - 4. Patient had expressed a wish not to receive organ support
 - 5. Underlying disease associated with very short life expectancy
 - 6. Patient no longer required life sustaining treatments and death not expected to follow WLST
 - Were there any DCD/Infant donor exclusions?
 - Was the patient deemed unsuitable for organ donation following screening?
 - Was the patient declined by the organ donation team following donor assessment?





Patient Donation Decisions

- What was the patients last recorded NHS Organ Donor Register (ODR) status?
- What was the patient's last known decision regarding organ donation?
- What was method by which patient's last known decision was expressed?
- Which country did the patient die in? (Enabling question)
 - Will include automatic guidance on suitability for deeming consent.
- Future proofed for implementation of Opt-Out legislation throughout UK





- Donation Decision Conversation
 - Were the family asked to make or support an organ donation decision? moves away from "approach"
 - Detailed information on
 - the planning of the donation decision conversation
 - who was involved both staff (inc roles) and family
 - where it took place
 - initial family reactions
 - contribution of those in the room to the conversation
 - Whether it went according to plan
 - Outcome
 - Capture of previous discussions about organ donation





Reporting

- Planned improvement of reporting options
- Exploring the use of Power BI (Microsoft Office) to replace existing reports and add additional reporting options.
- Planned access to reports for all relevant stakeholders CL-ODs and Chairs
- Ability to explore the data in greater detail using online tools
- Greater detail available to statistics team for improved analysis of potential donor pool and donation activity

Leading to improved understanding of the next steps we can take to increase donation rates





- Design complete for development within the current Donor Path application
- Provides one interface for SN-ODs to complete referral, donation and potential donor activity
- Includes offline capability
- Decreases duplication, workload and use of paper

N/FS Blood and Transplant







SUPPORTIVE
ODT HUB

:41 Wed Jun 8		atl S	🖿 100% 🔳
	1234561 LR 13/11/1934	e 🌲	¢
Patient Information	Last sync: 22/09/2017 14:23		
Referral	CHI number		
Absolute Contraindic	Matabing referral found		
Neurological Death	Please double-check this match:	-	:
Donors after Circulat			
Patient Donation Dec	Patient O Date of Birth NHS number O Gender LIAM RICHARDSON 15/06/1964 450 557 7104 M		
Donation Decision C	CONGESTIVE HEART FAILURE		
Previous Donation C	Hospital S ABERDEEN ROYAL		
Outcome	Link PDA to this referral		
Case Review	Continue without linking a referral		
	18/12/1940 : 55 Years 1 Mon	th 5 Day	/S
	Age (if DOB not provided)		
	Age years Age months Age of	days	
			0



:41 Wed Jun 8 **...!| 🗢 100% 🥅** Ð Ó Ω Last sync: 22/09/2017 14:23 \sim Patient information **Previous Donation Conversation** Referral Absolute Contraindications Was donation mentioned or discussed prior to the Donation Decision Conversation? YES NO Neurological Death Testing Please input data for up to two pre-mention conversations. If there are more than Donors after Circulatory Death two pre-mention conversations, please select two which exemplify the conversation narrative. Please consider the conversations in chronological order. Patient Donation Decisions Conversations Donation Decision Conversation Conversation to discuss NDT or WLST **Previous Donation Conversation** Date/time of conversation Location of conversation Family's attitude 09/03/2018 15:46 ICU Neutral Outcome Case Review + Add Next >

NES

Blood and Transplant



SUPPORTIVE
ODT HUB

	Smith, T 21/11/1971	⊡ ▲ Ø
Patient Information	Last sync: 22/09/2017 14:23	
Referral	Neurological Death	Testing
Absolute Contraindications	Were the following criteria for neurological testing r	net:
Neurological Death Testing	No evidence of	In a coma with a Glasgow
Donors after Circulatory Death	effort	explained by sedation
Patient Donation Decisions	Fixed pupils	No evidence of cough reflex
Donation Decision Conversation		
Previous Donation Conversation	No evidence of gag reflex	
Outcome	Sodativos	
Case Review	Secializes	uld provent neurological testing?
	NO YES	ala prevent neurological testing?
	If yes, please record sedatives with time and date	of last administration





Acknowledgements.

Thank you to NODC members and all Organ Donation teams who contributed to the SWOT analyses and to the members of the PDA review group