s22



| | |
|---|---|
| **Background and Context**<br>– Aims and objectives of the original CDR<br>Findings of the Independent Review of the CDR | s22 outlined the original aim of the CDR which was to:<br>• *design, develop and implement a clinical quality registry for cardiac devices*<br><br>It is clear that a new approach is now required as the CDR has not been able to achieve wide support from the cardiac sector and is not a CQR.<br><br>An Independent Review of the Cardiac Devices Registry, undertaken by HealthConsult Pty Ltd (June-October 2017), clarified this.<br><br>Although the CDR demonstrated strengths in a number of areas, the key issues included:<br>• not meeting the requirements of the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care (Commission) *Framework for* |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *Australian Clinical Quality Registries;*<br>• low participation;<br>• inability to leverage the success of State based registries.<br>• CDR role – i.e. patient recall register or a CQR?<br>• Local governance and ethics approval processes.<br><br>The review provided options to address the identified issues with a Federated Model as the preferred approach. |

s22