

**NAACCR Reg Ops  
Death Clearance Issues  
Workgroup**

Kathleen McKeen

NAACCR Annual Conference 2006

Regina, Saskatchewan

# Background

- Established in 2004 as a workgroup of the ROC
- Why? - Still unresolved issues regarding the Death Clearance process after Best Practices Document recommendations
- Major issue: Medical Doctor Only (MDO) case versus Death Clearance Only (DCO) case

# Background

- Death Clearance Issues Work Group Co-Chairs:
  - Robin Otto, Pennsylvania Cancer Registry
  - Susan Bolick-Aldrich, South Carolina Central Cancer Registry
- 21 member work group – including representatives from SEER, NPCR and Canada
- Monthly conference calls

# Objectives

- Provide recommendation regarding MDO cases
- Develop a Death Clearance Document that:
  - Incorporates all aspects of Death Clearance in one place – compiling all existing resources to the greatest extent possible
  - Identifies steps of the Death Clearance process that need to be performed consistently in order to provide comparable results among registries
  - Provides a source for definitions of terms associated with Death Clearance

# Objectives

- Gain consensus among SEER, NPCR, NAACCR, and Statistics Canada
- Identify minimal standards (not just recommendations) for conducting Death Clearance
- Offer additional useful guidelines

# Process and Progress

- Death Clearance Resources ✓
  - Developed resource list and gathered all resources for use in this process
    - 17 resources (US, Canada, and IARC/WHO) identified
  
- Definition of Death Clearance ✓
  - Death Clearance Match
  - Death Clearance Followback

# Process and Progress ✓

## ■ Scenerios ✓

- Detailed scenerios encountered during Death Clearance Followback provided by members
- Group provided responses for each – widely varied
- Showed lack of consistency among registries
- Indicated need for standardization for comparability
- Group reached consensus answers
- Will be included in the document
- Used this discussion to id requirements vs guidelines to gain greater consistency of results

# Process and Progress ✓

- Table of Contents for Document ✓
  - Contents
  - Format
  - Sections
    - Assigned to individual members to extract information from existing resources relative to topic
- Document (1/3 complete)
  - Requirements – have direct impact on number of DCO cases; must be done for consistent results among registries
  - Guidelines – do not have direct impact; helpful information but not required.



# Controversial Issues

- Process for consensus building:
  - Throughout the process, issues that may not be universally accepted by standard setting organizations may be identified
  - These will be presented to the Cancer Registration Steering Committee (CRSC) along the way
  - Consensus building steps will be taken: i.e. involvement of other NAACCR committees, NAACCR Town Meetings, consultation with other experts within standards setters
  - Incorporate results into document

# Next Steps

- Continue the monthly calls with document section development
- Update CRSC bimonthly
- Hopefully, the final document can be presented at the NAACCR 2007 Annual Conference in Detroit

# In Conclusion

The work is tedious. The timeframe seems endless.  
The concepts are complicated. The discussions are  
involved and get repeated over time.

But..

The topic is of extreme importance. The process is  
moving forward. Progress is being made.  
The workgroup is dedicated.

**It's NAACCR in Action!**