# ODAP Project Review Panel (PRP) v0.51

#### Table of contents 1 Terms of Reference 1 Ways of working 2 2 2.22.5 2 2.7 3 Members $\mathbf{2}$

### 1 Terms of Reference

#### 1.1 Role and responsibility

To ensure compliance with the 5 safes, particularly **safe projects** - providing scientific review for applications for data use and approve/refer/reject data access requests for the Outbreak Data Analysis Platform.

The PRP will be provided with due diligence reports from the ODAP team, containing:

- confirmation of bona fide researcher status for the applicants
- $\bullet\,$  confirmation that requested data exists and is not under embargo
- assessment of fit with ODAP scope
- review of lay summary and public involvement
- a list of potential overlapping or duplicate projects already approved or proposed

The PRP will the provide an opinion regarding:

- Scientific quality of submitted projects
- Feasibility of proposed work
- Fit within ODAP scope and will provide benefit to patients or the public

The PRP will seek advice from the ODAP Data Access Governance Committee (DAGC), where appropriate, for potentially complex and challenging proposals and data access requests.



# 2 Ways of working

#### 2.1 Reporting

The ODAP secretariat will openly report the outcome of deliberations of the PRP on the ODAP website. For each onward sharing of the linked NHS Digital data, ODAP secretariate will report information about the dissemination on the NHS Digital release register. This will include the name of the organisation(s) accessing the data, the purpose (summary of the project) and details of the data released.

## 2.2 Meeting frequency

Subject to available resources, meetings are arranged monthly, with the possibility to increase the frequency to fortnightly or to carry out an online review of the applications if an application is particularly urgent or to meet the volume of applications.

### 2.3 Meeting content and quorum

Meetings consider applications, risks and issues arising of concern to the ODAP Project Review Panel and its responsibilities. All members are invited to attend and the meeting is quorate if five members are in attendance including one of the Chair or Deputy Chair.

## 2.4 Responsibilities of the Panel Chair

The Chair is responsible for arranging the meeting, setting an agenda, chairing the meeting and ensuring an accurate record of the decision-making is made. The Chair will be supported by the ODAP secretariat. All panel members have an opportunity to review and challenge the meeting record. The meeting records will be made public on the ODAP website: odap.ac.uk

#### 2.5 Conflicts of interest

Panel members who are involved in an application, or who have a direct personal or professional relationship with an applicant, will be expected to declare this to the panel and recuse themselves from discussion of the application.

#### 2.6 Amendment process

Amendments to approved applications may be considered by the Project Review Panel Chair and/or Deputy Chair out of meetings. Non-contentious simple amendments (such as the addition of a new researcher in a team, or the incremental addition of new relevant data items within a similar scope and sensitivity of the original application) may be approved by the Chair and/or Deputy without further consultation.

#### 2.7 Appeal process

Rejected applications are permitted to go through the appeal process once. Comments, questions and criticisms generated during the ODAP review process must be addressed fully by the applicants in order for the appeal to be considered.

#### 2.8 Terms of reference and review of processes

The outlined processes will be reviewed on a regular basis by the ODAP Steering Group and changed based on the practical implications proposed by the Project Review Panel.

# 3 Members

• Chair - ODAP scientific manager



- Support ODAP team
- 3 lay members
- Three scientific reviewers, drawn from the members from each of the various consortia contributing data to the ODAP will be sought on a rotational basis.
- EPCC representative
- $\bullet\,$  Study managers from each of the contributing academic studies