WEBVTT

- $00:00:02.600 \longrightarrow 00:00:05.190$ Hello, good afternoon all
- $00:00:05.190 \longrightarrow 00:00:08.250$ and welcome to our sixth and final session
- $00:00:08.250 \longrightarrow 00:00:11.460$ of the 2020 virtual CleanMed series.
- 00:00:11.460 --> 00:00:14.670 Our session today is clinical sustainability,
- $00:00:14.670 \longrightarrow 00:00:18.050$ environmental stewardship at the bedside.
- $00:00:18.050 \dashrightarrow 00:00:20.420$ And on behalf of Health Care Without Harm
- 00:00:20.420 --> 00:00:21.840 and Practice Greenhealth,
- $00:00:21.840 \longrightarrow 00:00:24.400$ we are very pleased to bring you this session
- $00:00:24.400 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.360$ in partnership with the Yale Center
- 00:00:26.360 --> 00:00:28.470 for Climate Change and Health.
- 00:00:28.470 --> 00:00:29.800 My name is Shanda Damaris,
- $00:00:29.800 \longrightarrow 00:00:32.240$ and I'm a Member Engagement Manager
- 00:00:32.240 --> 00:00:33.640 with Practice Greenhealth,
- $00:00:33.640 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.530$ as well as a cardiovascular nurse by background.
- $00{:}00{:}36.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}39.310$ And it is my pleasure today to be moderating this session
- $00:00:39.310 \longrightarrow 00:00:41.600$ for many, many folks across the country.
- $00:00:41.600 \longrightarrow 00:00:43.040$ So welcome.
- $00{:}00{:}43.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}46.180$ I also want to recognize my colleague, Dr. Amy Collins
- $00:00:46.180 \longrightarrow 00:00:48.780$ for her efforts in co-developing this session.
- 00:00:48.780 --> 00:00:50.180 So thank you for joining us.
- $00:00:53.100 \longrightarrow 00:00:55.360$ We would like to thank Kaiser Permanente
- $00:00:55.360 \longrightarrow 00:00:58.060$ for supporting our virtual series this year.
- $00:00:58.060 \longrightarrow 00:01:00.090$ And while of course, we're looking forward
- $00:01:00.090 \longrightarrow 00:01:03.250$ to future years when we can connect in-person,
- $00:01:03.250 \longrightarrow 00:01:06.277$ we do recognize the challenges that our communities,
- $00:01:06.277 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.630$ and of course our health professional audience
- $00:01:08.630 \longrightarrow 00:01:11.030$ in particular, is facing these days.
- $00:01:11.030 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.560$ And so that's why we are excited to let you know

- $00:01:13.560 \longrightarrow 00:01:15.700$ that CleanMed 2021,
- $00:01:15.700 \longrightarrow 00:01:20.370$ will be an even larger all-digital experience.
- $00:01:20.370 \longrightarrow 00:01:23.030$ So we'll share more details in the coming months.
- $00{:}01{:}23.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}25.520$ And we certainly look forward to your participation
- 00:01:25.520 --> 00:01:29.793 in a safe, exciting, and virtual CleanMed 2021.
- 00:01:32.367 --> 00:01:35.040 So a quick look at our agenda today.
- 00:01:35.040 --> 00:01:38.120 Just of note, the session will be recorded
- $00:01:38.120 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.620$ and it will be made available to attendees afterwards;
- 00:01:42.620 --> 00:01:46.350 in addition, all audience members are on mute.
- $00:01:46.350 \longrightarrow 00:01:48.330$ And so if you have questions
- $00:01:48.330 \longrightarrow 00:01:50.730$ or discussion you'd like to have during the session,
- $00{:}01{:}50.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}54.220$ please do feel encouraged to do that in the chat box.
- $00{:}01{:}54.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}57.663$ Myself and Dr. Amy Collins will be monitoring that together.
- $00:01:59.680 \longrightarrow 00:02:03.960$ So it is my pleasure to introduce our colleagues
- $00:02:03.960 \longrightarrow 00:02:06.330$ that will be on the line to say with us.
- 00:02:06.330 --> 00:02:08.930 First off will be Dr. Jodi Sherman;
- 00:02:08.930 --> 00:02:12.740 and Dr. Sherman is a Practicing Anesthesiologist
- $00:02:12.740 \longrightarrow 00:02:15.170$ and Medical Director of Sustainability
- 00:02:15.170 --> 00:02:17.750 at The Center for Sustainable Health Care,
- 00:02:17.750 --> 00:02:20.590 at Yale-New Haven Health System.
- 00:02:20.590 --> 00:02:22.980 She also holds among many other roles,
- $00:02:22.980 \longrightarrow 00:02:24.770$ the associate professor title
- 00:02:24.770 --> 00:02:27.833 at Yale School of Medicine and Public Health.
- 00:02:29.980 --> 00:02:33.090 Dr. Jonathan Slutzman will also be joining us today.
- $00:02:33.090 \longrightarrow 00:02:34.220$ And Dr. Slutzman
- $00:02:34.220 \longrightarrow 00:02:37.480$ is a Practicing Emergency Medicine Physician
- $00:02:37.480 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.130$ at Massachusetts General Hospital,

 $00:02:40.130 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.930$ and an instructor at Harvard Medical School.

 $00:02:42.930 \longrightarrow 00:02:45.060$ Dr. Slutzman has a diverse background

 $00:02:45.060 \longrightarrow 00:02:47.490$ in health care environmental research

 $00:02:47.490 \longrightarrow 00:02:49.273$ and environmental engineering.

 $00:02:51.200 \longrightarrow 00:02:55.890$ And joining us virtually today by prerecorded session,

 $00:02:55.890 \longrightarrow 00:02:58.950$ Dr. Cassandra Thiel, is an Assistant Professor

 $00:02:58.950 \dashrightarrow 00:03:03.050$ at NYU Wagner Graduate School of Public Service.

 $00:03:03.050 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.860$ And she teaches in the department of population health

 $00{:}03{:}05.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}10.680$ and ophthalmology at NYU Grossman School of Medicine.

00:03:10.680 --> 00:03:12.820 So with that, I'm honored to hand this over

00:03:12.820 --> 00:03:15.023 to Dr. Jodi Sherman, who will kick us off.

00:03:26.890 --> 00:03:28.760 - Well thank you for inviting me

 $00:03:28.760 \longrightarrow 00:03:31.070$ to participate in the session.

 $00:03:31.070 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.120$ I am a practicing anesthesiologist

 $00:03:33.120 \longrightarrow 00:03:35.000$ and have been doing a lot of work

00:03:35.000 --> 00:03:36.850 in environmental health sector footprinting

 $00:03:36.850 \longrightarrow 00:03:38.150$ for the past decade.

 $00{:}03{:}38.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}39.620$ And we thought it'd be useful

 $00:03:39.620 \longrightarrow 00:03:41.860$ for me to start the presentation

 $00:03:41.860 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.630$ with a higher level view of emissions and drivers

 $00:03:46.630 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.040$ in health care sustainability.

 $00{:}03{:}49.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}50.600$ For disclosures, the Yale Program

00:03:50.600 --> 00:03:52.170 on Health care Environmental Sustainability,

 $00:03:52.170 \longrightarrow 00:03:53.020$ does receive funds

 $00{:}03{:}53.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}56.437$ from the Association for Medical Device Reprocessors.

 $00:03:57.870 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.160$ So why is sustainability in health care?

00:04:00.160 --> 00:04:02.490 Well, pollution is a leading cause of morbidity

 $00:04:02.490 \longrightarrow 00:04:06.100$ and mortality globally, responsible for 9 million

00:04:06.100 --> 00:04:09.260 or 16% of premature deaths annually.

 $00:04:09.260 \longrightarrow 00:04:11.610$ health care itself is a leading emitter

 $00:04:11.610 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.290$ of environmental emissions.

00:04:13.290 --> 00:04:14.650 And reducing health care pollution

00:04:14.650 --> 00:04:16.470 can improve the quadruple bottom line,

 $00{:}04{:}16.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}20.510$ meaning better care for the most people at the least cost.

 $00:04:20.510 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.920$ and to greatest staff satisfaction.

00:04:22.920 --> 00:04:24.810 And engaging health professionals,

 $00{:}04{:}24.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}28.830$ which are respected leaders in communities and globally

 $00:04:28.830 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.640$ around the issue of health care pollution prevention,

 $00:04:31.640 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.340$ can be key for societal transformation

 $00:04:34.340 \longrightarrow 00:04:35.780$ by affecting public policy

 $00{:}04{:}35.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}38.530$ and by touching all the patients that we interact with.

00:04:40.010 --> 00:04:41.210 So it's important to recognize

 $00:04:41.210 \longrightarrow 00:04:44.110$ that globally the health sector footprint is quite large.

 $00:04:44.110 \longrightarrow 00:04:48.850 \ 4.6\%$ of global greenhouse gas emissions

 $00:04:48.850 \longrightarrow 00:04:50.490$ come from health care.

00:04:50.490 --> 00:04:54.077 That's an enormous quantity of emissions

 $00:04:54.077 \longrightarrow 00:04:55.510$ and a big responsibility,

 $00:04:55.510 \longrightarrow 00:04:58.640$ and when our commitment is to first do no harm.

 $00:04:58.640 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.140$ The U S health sector is an outlier.

 $00:05:00.140 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.570$ while only 4% of the global population,

 $00:05:03.570 \longrightarrow 00:05:05.470$ we are responsible for about 1/4

 $00:05:05.470 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.440$ of global health care greenhouse gas emissions.

 $00:05:09.440 \longrightarrow 00:05:11.320$ On the left, this is from the Lancet Commission

 $00{:}05{:}11.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}14.940$ on Climate Change and Health count down angle report. $00:05:14.940 \longrightarrow 00:05:19.550$ We see that per capita health care greenhouse gas emissions,

 $00{:}05{:}19.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}24.350$ as a function of per capita GDP, the U S is an outlier.

 $00:05:24.350 \longrightarrow 00:05:25.290$ The bubble width

 $00:05:25.290 \longrightarrow 00:05:30.290$ represents a fraction of GDP spent on health care.

 $00:05:30.310 \longrightarrow 00:05:32.240$ So we spend more than twice as much in the U S

 $00:05:32.240 \longrightarrow 00:05:35.070$ on health care, but we do not have the best health outcomes

 $00:05:35.070 \longrightarrow 00:05:36.650$ for that investment.

 $00{:}05{:}36.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}40.280$ And if we look on the right, these are trends over time.

 $00:05:40.280 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.540$ This direction in health care is going globally,

 $00:05:42.540 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.060$ is not sustainable.

 $00:05:44.060 \longrightarrow 00:05:46.490$ We see one outlier here and that's Greece

 $00:05:46.490 \longrightarrow 00:05:50.140$ and this has to do with economic instability,

 $00:05:50.140 \longrightarrow 00:05:53.580$ and in part related to the Syrian refugee crisis

 $00{:}05{:}53.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}58.350$ which has very much challenged their health care system.

 $00:05:58.350 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.420$ And this is just to bring up an important point

 $00{:}06{:}01.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}04.110$ that we can reduce emissions by providing less care;

 $00:06:04.110 \longrightarrow 00:06:06.603$ that's not what we're at all suggesting.

 $00:06:07.940 \longrightarrow 00:06:09.930$ We need to improve access

00:06:09.930 --> 00:06:12.820 to basic and good quality care globally,

 $00:06:12.820 \longrightarrow 00:06:14.683$ and it has to be done sustainably.

 $00:06:15.690 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.800$ So delving deeper into the U S,

00:06:17.800 --> 00:06:20.780 the U S health care sector emits 9-10%

 $00:06:20.780 \longrightarrow 00:06:23.040$ of total national greenhouse gas emissions

 $00:06:23.040 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.653$ and similar fractions of criteria air pollution.

 $00:06:26.575 \longrightarrow 00:06:30.920$ So understanding what that means for public health,

 $00:06:30.920 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.820$ the public health damages from the U S health sector,

 $00:06:33.820 \longrightarrow 00:06:37.680$ around 614 disability adjusted life years lost annually.

 $00:06:37.680 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.450$ That's especially due to air pollution

 $00:06:39.450 \longrightarrow 00:06:40.940$ and also greenhouse gas emissions,

 $00:06:40.940 \longrightarrow 00:06:43.410$ but that's from total environmental emissions

00:06:43.410 --> 00:06:46.230 using life cycle assessment modeling.

 $00{:}06{:}46.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}50.170$ This amount of damages in the same order of magnitude,

 $00:06:50.170 \longrightarrow 00:06:52.600$ as the 44,000- 88,000 deaths

 $00:06:52.600 \longrightarrow 00:06:55.738$ due to medical errors first identified

 $00:06:55.738 \longrightarrow 00:06:59.150$ or quantified by the Institute of Medicine

 $00:06:59.150 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.250$ and their famous to err is human report

 $00:07:01.250 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.260$ that came out in 1999.

 $00:07:03.260 \longrightarrow 00:07:07.000$ This put patient safety on the map for health care.

 $00:07:07.000 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.650$ This completely transformed the lens

 $00:07:09.650 \longrightarrow 00:07:11.710$ through which we provide health care.

 $00:07:11.710 \longrightarrow 00:07:14.720$ It is all done through the lens of patient safety.

00:07:14.720 --> 00:07:16.670 On average, 10 years of life are lost

 $00:07:16.670 \dashrightarrow 00:07:18.470$ for those medical error premature deaths.

 $00:07:18.470 \dashrightarrow 00:07:21.250$ So that's why we're in the same order of magnitude.

 $00{:}07{:}21.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}25.290$ To this point, we've been ignoring the public health impacts

 $00:07:25.290 \longrightarrow 00:07:27.030$ of health care pollution.

 $00:07:27.030 \longrightarrow 00:07:29.030$ What we're saying is that pollution prevention

 $00:07:29.030 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.810$ is a new patient safety movement.

 $00:07:30.810 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.870$ This is just as important as protecting our patients

 $00:07:33.870 \longrightarrow 00:07:35.270$ from the care that we give,

 $00:07:35.270 \longrightarrow 00:07:37.623$ we also must protect public health.

 $00:07:39.240 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.803$ Delving in further the relative emissions

 $00:07:41.803 \longrightarrow 00:07:44.690$ that we're within health care those emissions come from;

 $00:07:44.690 \longrightarrow 00:07:46.140$ a lot of it comes from travel;

00:07:46.140 --> 00:07:48.330 both staff, patients, visitors.

 $00:07:48.330 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.890$ A lot of it comes from the energy

 $00:07:49.890 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.740$ that is required to run facilities.

 $00{:}07{:}54.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}56.330$ This is from the National Health Sector.

00:07:56.330 --> 00:07:58.170 If you're not, national health service,

00:07:58.170 --> 00:08:00.330 if you're not aware of the sustainable development unit

 $00:08:00.330 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.410$ out of England, do you are heavily encouraged

 $00:08:03.410 \longrightarrow 00:08:06.150$ to look at their reports.

 $00{:}08{:}06.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}07.611$ Importantly here a takeaway

 $00:08:07.611 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.530$ is that 2/3 of the health sector emissions

00:08:09.530 --> 00:08:11.090 are coming from procurement;

 $00:08:11.090 \longrightarrow 00:08:13.630$ and heavily coming from pharmaceuticals

 $00:08:13.630 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.580$ and other chemicals as whether,

 $00:08:15.580 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.920$ as well as consumable medical equipment.

 $00:08:17.920 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.210$ Numerous studies have shown

 $00{:}08{:}19.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}23.480$ more than 60% of health care's greenhouse gas emissions

 $00:08:23.480 \longrightarrow 00:08:25.550$ are coming from the supply chain;

00:08:25.550 --> 00:08:28.310 especially energy and upstream manufacturing.

 $00:08:28.310 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.720$ And so health care administrators and clinicians,

 $00:08:30.720 \longrightarrow 00:08:33.540$ we control which devices and which drugs

 $00:08:33.540 \longrightarrow 00:08:35.210$ and how many that we use.

 $00{:}08{:}35.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}37.040$ Whereas manufacturers and regulators

 $00:08:37.040 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.507$ really influence embedded emissions

 $00:08:39.507 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.500$ and what goes to marketplace.

 $00:08:41.500 \longrightarrow 00:08:46.500$ So we have different ways to leverage our voice.

 $00:08:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.470$ And specifically in health care, we have a problem,

 $00:08:50.470 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.430$ particularly in the U S;

- 00:08:52.430 --> 00:08:54.890 so this concept of a candy store culture,
- $00:08:54.890 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.830$ where all the resources with rare exception
- 00:08:57.830 --> 00:09:00.580 of things like expensive implant devices,
- $00:09:00.580 \longrightarrow 00:09:01.670$ everything seems free.
- $00:09:01.670 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.830$ So there's very little accountability to which
- $00:09:03.830 \longrightarrow 00:09:04.920$ and how much that we use.
- $00:09:04.920 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.420$ So this is a big part of the problem
- $00:09:06.420 \longrightarrow 00:09:08.343$ that we face in the United States.
- $00:09:09.290 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.310$ Another issue is infection control.
- $00:09:12.310 \longrightarrow 00:09:14.130$ Preventing infection is fundamental
- $00:09:14.130 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.810$ to everything that we do in health care.
- 00:09:15.810 --> 00:09:18.948 It is part of that safety, that patient safety lens
- $00:09:18.948 \longrightarrow 00:09:22.990$ that we view all our patient care through.
- $00:09:22.990 \longrightarrow 00:09:25.010$ It is fundamental to what we do.
- 00:09:25.010 --> 00:09:27.660 It is all our jobs to prevent infection.
- $00:09:27.660 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.670$ It costs our health system a lot.
- $00:09:30.670 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.230$ And when we have an additional care
- $00:09:33.230 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.100$ that is required to take care of patients
- 00:09:35.100 --> 00:09:37.040 who have health care acquired infections,
- $00:09:37.040 \longrightarrow 00:09:38.410$ that also increases costs
- $00:09:38.410 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.790$ as well as the pollution footprint.
- 00:09:40.790 --> 00:09:42.000 And of course it's the right thing
- $00:09:42.000 \longrightarrow 00:09:43.880$ to do to prevent infections.
- $00{:}09{:}43.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}46.260$ But the problem is that our efforts to prevent infections
- $00:09:46.260 \longrightarrow 00:09:47.530$ are driving this trend
- 00:09:47.530 --> 00:09:51.480 toward excessive single use disposable device uptake
- $00:09:51.480 \longrightarrow 00:09:53.033$ as well as drug waste.
- $00{:}09{:}53.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}56.970$ And so this is an important area that we need to address.
- 00:09:56.970 --> 00:09:58.800 Focusing on one type of infections,

- $00:09:58.800 \longrightarrow 00:10:01.270$ this is surgical site infections.
- 00:10:01.270 --> 00:10:02.620 Taking a historical view,
- 00:10:02.620 --> 00:10:04.970 if you were to go back a couple 100 years
- $00:10:04.970 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.120$ and you had a major surgery,
- $00:10:07.120 \longrightarrow 00:10:10.960$ you had about a 95% chance of getting an infection
- $00:10:10.960 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.720$ and maybe a 40% chance of survival.
- 00:10:13.720 --> 00:10:15.760 If we track the trends over time,
- $00:10:15.760 \longrightarrow 00:10:18.310$ we see the greatest change happening
- $00:10:18.310 \longrightarrow 00:10:21.870$ between 1860s, 1880, 1900.
- $00{:}10{:}21.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}24.970$ This happened along with some of Weiss and pastor
- $00{:}10{:}24.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}28.420$ and (in distinct) and Lewin Hook with germ theory,
- $00:10:28.420 \longrightarrow 00:10:30.830$ the microscope to actually prove the germs existed
- $00:10:30.830 \dashrightarrow 00:10:33.670$ and then creating a septic and antiseptic practices.
- $00:10:33.670 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.710$ So this was the greatest contribution
- $00{:}10{:}35.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}39.120$ to preventing infection and improving survivability
- $00:10:39.120 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.520$ in this case, after surgery.
- 00:10:42.520 --> 00:10:45.200 And then you see a slowing of the curve
- $00{:}10{:}45.200 \rightarrow 00{:}10{:}48.310$ and another bump happening between 1930 and 1940.
- $00:10:48.310 \longrightarrow 00:10:50.340$ This was the introduction of antibiotics
- $00:10:50.340 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.280$ into our surgical protocols.
- $00:10:53.280 \longrightarrow 00:10:55.480$ And so that was the other great detriment.
- $00:10:55.480 \longrightarrow 00:10:57.470$ And then over time, you're seeing improvements
- $00:10:57.470 \longrightarrow 00:11:00.160$ in policies and procedures around our protocols
- $00:11:00.160 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.160$ for antibiosis and aseptic techniques.
- $00:11:05.240 \longrightarrow 00:11:08.470$ And so we are gradually approaching zero here.
- $00{:}11{:}08.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}10.250$ So we have less than a 5% chance
- 00:11:10.250 --> 00:11:12.030 of getting a surgical site infection,
- $00:11:12.030 \longrightarrow 00:11:15.190$ and a greater than 95% survival rate.

- 00:11:15.190 --> 00:11:17.840 So if we were to continue to look at this curve,
- $00:11:17.840 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.970$ we're asking tonically approaching zero.
- $00:11:19.970 \longrightarrow 00:11:21.550$ This is the infection rate,
- $00:11:21.550 \longrightarrow 00:11:23.720$ but what we're doing is we're trying to get to zero.
- $00:11:23.720 \longrightarrow 00:11:25.810$ And the question is whether or not that's realistic,
- $00:11:25.810 \longrightarrow 00:11:26.830$ because at the same time
- $00{:}11{:}26.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}29.530$ we're throwing more and more disposables at the problem,
- 00:11:29.530 --> 00:11:31.250 more and more cleaning chemicals;
- $00{:}11{:}31.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}34.330$ at the same time we're throwing more and more resource
- $00:11:34.330 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.800$ trying to get to zero,
- 00:11:35.800 --> 00:11:39.200 we're also increasing this hidden to date;
- $00:11:39.200 \longrightarrow 00:11:42.870$ hidden indirect disease burden from health care pollution.
- $00:11:42.870 \longrightarrow 00:11:45.190$ So we can't ignore that anymore.
- $00:11:45.190 \longrightarrow 00:11:48.835$ So ideally we find this nexus here,
- $00{:}11{:}48.835 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}52.250$ it's very hard to get there, but that's the aspiration.
- $00:11:52.250 \longrightarrow 00:11:53.530$ And we really have to question
- $00:11:53.530 \longrightarrow 00:11:56.710$ whether or not getting to zero is the right goal.
- $00:11:56.710 \longrightarrow 00:11:59.640$ And so causes of infection are multifactorial.
- $00:11:59.640 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.700$ The most important thing
- 00:12:00.700 --> 00:12:03.870 is aseptic and antiseptic practices;
- 00:12:03.870 --> 00:12:05.800 most notably hand washing.
- $00:12:05.800 \longrightarrow 00:12:07.930$ Patient health status is also important.
- $00{:}12{:}07.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}10.720$ So patients who have diabetes and immunocompromised
- $00:12:10.720 \longrightarrow 00:12:12.020$ are a greater risk.
- $00{:}12{:}12.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}15.510$ Exposure site, the type of the organism, its virulence,
- $00{:}12{:}15.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}19.190$ how much of that organism is introduced into the patient,

- $00:12:19.190 \longrightarrow 00:12:22.220$ and then preventive antibiotics and so forth.
- $00{:}12{:}22.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}25.020$ So the bottom line is that all these things contribute
- $00:12:25.020 \longrightarrow 00:12:27.580$ to health care acquired infections.
- $00:12:27.580 \longrightarrow 00:12:29.690$ And the most important thing we need to do
- $00:12:29.690 \longrightarrow 00:12:30.770$ is wash our hands.
- $00:12:30.770 \longrightarrow 00:12:34.290$ We don't do enough of it, even here in the United States.
- 00:12:34.290 --> 00:12:35.750 The World Health Organization
- $00:12:35.750 \longrightarrow 00:12:38.810$ has a big initiative around this,
- $00:12:38.810 \longrightarrow 00:12:40.450$ but we're not gonna cure the problem
- $00:12:40.450 \longrightarrow 00:12:41.790$ in sufficient hand washing.
- 00:12:41.790 --> 00:12:43.680 And we're not gonna cure diabetes
- $00:12:43.680 \longrightarrow 00:12:46.960$ by throwing more and more disposable devices at the problem.
- $00:12:46.960 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.530$ So we really need to look more deeply into these practices.
- 00:12:51.530 --> 00:12:53.030 And as we've learned with COVID,
- $00:12:53.030 \longrightarrow 00:12:56.450$ we've become so dependent on single use disposable;
- 00:12:56.450 --> 00:12:57.850 not only devices for patients,
- $00:12:57.850 \longrightarrow 00:12:59.970$ but our personal protective equipment or PPE.
- $00{:}12{:}59.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}03.493$ So here you're seeing reusable and disposable face masks,
- $00:13:05.030 \longrightarrow 00:13:08.150$ impermeable gowns, or semipermeable gowns.
- 00:13:08.150 --> 00:13:09.980 And in this case, video laryngoscopes
- $00{:}13{:}09.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}13.210$ or a type of device we use to put in breathing tubes.
- $00:13:13.210 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.630$ We're so dependent on single use disposables;
- $00{:}13{:}15.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}18.600$ and with COVID, the supply chain has been interrupted.
- $00{:}13{:}18.600 \to 00{:}13{:}22.140$ So decreasing the amount of supplies we can actually obtain.

- $00{:}13{:}22.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}25.180$ At the same time, we've seen massive surges in demand.
- 00:13:25.180 --> 00:13:27.620 And so we've had no choice but to,
- $00{:}13{:}27.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}30.250$ and the question is why we weren't using more reusables
- $00:13:30.250 \longrightarrow 00:13:33.760$ to begin with, which by and large
- $00:13:33.760 \longrightarrow 00:13:35.660$ have lower environmental footprints
- $00:13:35.660 \longrightarrow 00:13:38.560$ and sometimes even are even cost beneficial.
- $00:13:38.560 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.850$ But we were caught with our pants down
- 00:13:39.850 --> 00:13:41.140 with the COVID pandemic;
- $00:13:41.140 \longrightarrow 00:13:43.453$ to the point where we've had to reuse,
- $00:13:44.550 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.410$ extend the life of reused reusable devices,
- $00:13:47.410 \longrightarrow 00:13:49.410$ and sometimes not so safely.
- $00:13:49.410 \longrightarrow 00:13:51.553$ There is a third party procedure
- 00:13:55.600 --> 00:13:57.200 called medical device reprocessing,
- 00:13:57.200 --> 00:13:59.954 which is an entire market that can clean
- $00:13:59.954 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.750$ and return reusable devices,
- $00:14:02.750 \longrightarrow 00:14:05.320$ sorry, single use disposable devices for safe reuse.
- 00:14:05.320 --> 00:14:07.920 And in fact, we've had to figure out
- 00:14:07.920 --> 00:14:09.180 under the Emergency Use Act,
- $00:14:09.180 \longrightarrow 00:14:11.450$ how to safely extend and reuse these devices.
- $00:14:11.450 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.670$ And we've done so safely
- $00:14:13.670 \longrightarrow 00:14:15.980$ to the point where it begs the question,
- $00:14:15.980 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.590$ what's the difference between a reusable
- $00:14:17.590 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.520$ and disposable devices, if we can reuse disposables,
- $00:14:21.520 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.380$ not always, but in sometimes safely?
- 00:14:24.380 --> 00:14:26.290 So what is a disposable device?
- $00:14:26.290 \longrightarrow 00:14:29.460$ Well, this is a actually a label that comes from industry.
- $00{:}14{:}29.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}33.420$ So single use disposable does not mean it can't be reused.
- $00:14:33.420 \longrightarrow 00:14:35.190$ It means that whoever cleans it

- $00:14:35.190 \longrightarrow 00:14:38.350$ assumes the risk of its functionality.
- $00:14:38.350 \longrightarrow 00:14:40.220$ Hospitals tend to not want that risk.
- 00:14:40.220 --> 00:14:43.480 So they've externalized that procedure,
- 00:14:43.480 --> 00:14:47.840 but only 2-3% of approved devices are currently reprocessed.
- $00{:}14{:}47.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}52.760$ So we have to rethink and come up with better solutions
- 00:14:52.760 --> 00:14:57.760 to bolster the resiliency of our supply chain,
- $00{:}14{:}58.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}02.790$ which also improves environmental mission.
- $00{:}15{:}02.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}05.850$ So we need to move from a linear health care economy,
- 00:15:05.850 --> 00:15:07.940 which is essentially, take-make waste
- $00:15:07.940 \longrightarrow 00:15:11.280$ where we extract materials, make them, use them,
- $00:15:11.280 \longrightarrow 00:15:13.100$ and then eventually throw them away.
- $00{:}15{:}13.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}16.950$ Principles of the circular economy are things like recycling
- $00{:}15{:}16.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}19.600$ which is probably the last thing that we wanna do.
- $00:15:19.600 \longrightarrow 00:15:22.110$ We wanna keep things in use and reuse them,
- $00:15:22.110 \longrightarrow 00:15:25.130$ repurpose them for alternative uses when we can't,
- 00:15:25.130 --> 00:15:28.090 refurbish them, and most importantly,
- $00:15:28.090 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.650$ we need to reduce the things that we use,
- $00:15:30.650 \longrightarrow 00:15:31.860$ and we need to redesign them
- $00:15:31.860 \longrightarrow 00:15:33.020$ so that they are easier to clean.
- $00:15:33.020 \longrightarrow 00:15:35.420$ So these are principles of the circular economy.
- $00{:}15{:}37.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}40.530$ And so the intergovernmental panel on climate change
- $00:15:40.530 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.310$ came out with a special report in 2018,
- 00:15:45.310 --> 00:15:47.990 basically saying that two degrees centigrade,
- $00{:}15{:}47.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}51.890$ which is the aspiration of the Paris Accord is not enough.
- $00:15:51.890 \longrightarrow 00:15:53.740$ We really need to limit our emissions

 $00{:}15{:}53.740$ --> $00{:}15{:}58.740$ to get to 1.5 degrees max average temperature increase.

 $00{:}15{:}59.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}03.080$ We've already seen one degree centigrade warming.

 $00:16:03.080 \longrightarrow 00:16:05.440$ This is the curve for business as usual.

 $00:16:05.440 \longrightarrow 00:16:08.250$ These are with the current policies and pledges,

00:16:08.250 --> 00:16:10.910 so even our current policies aren't enough

 $00:16:10.910 \dashrightarrow 00:16:15.070$ to get us to the Commitment, to the Paris Climate Accord,

 $00:16:15.070 \longrightarrow 00:16:16.270$ and really we need

 $00:16:16.270 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.650$ to get to one and half degrees centigrade pathway.

 $00:16:20.650 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.830$ And the reason is to reduce the,

00:16:22.830 --> 00:16:24.760 it's not that we can stop climate change,

 $00{:}16{:}24.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}28.300$ but it's to reduce the worst harms that are predicted

00:16:28.300 --> 00:16:30.040 to occur, are already occurring,

 $00:16:30.040 \longrightarrow 00:16:32.380$ but especially predicted by the year 2100.

 $00:16:32.380 \longrightarrow 00:16:34.683$ We are likely to reach 1.5 degrees centigrade

 $00:16:34.683 \longrightarrow 00:16:37.750$ between 2030 and 2052.

 $00:16:37.750 \longrightarrow 00:16:39.530$ And really what it's going to take

 $00{:}16{:}39.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}42.450$ to get us to limit to one and a half degrees centigrade

00:16:42.450 --> 00:16:44.170 average temperature rise,

 $00:16:44.170 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.930$ is to cut our emissions by 45% by 2030,

 $00:16:47.930 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.040$ and get to net zero by 2050.

 $00:16:50.040 \longrightarrow 00:16:52.300$ And those of us who are committing the,

 $00:16:52.300 \longrightarrow 00:16:54.760$ contributing the most, especially in the U S,

 $00{:}16{:}54.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}58.180$ but not exclusively, we have to get there much faster.

 $00:16:58.180 \longrightarrow 00:16:59.610$ This is on average.

00:16:59.610 --> 00:17:02.540 This is possible within the laws of physics and chemistry,

 $00:17:02.540 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.233$ but really what it's going to take is political will.

- $00{:}17{:}06.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}08.040$ If you're not aware, you should know
- $00:17:08.040 \longrightarrow 00:17:09.120$ that the national health service
- $00:17:09.120 \longrightarrow 00:17:10.740$ has committed to get to net zero.
- $00:17:10.740 \longrightarrow 00:17:11.860$ They have a legal mandate,
- $00{:}17{:}11.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}15.160$ but they have actually made a public announcement.
- 00:17:15.160 --> 00:17:18.963 They're the largest health care organization in the world.
- 00:17:18.963 --> 00:17:21.950 They're the largest employer in Europe,
- $00{:}17{:}21.950 \rightarrow 00{:}17{:}25.630$ and after the U S military and the Chinese military,
- $00:17:25.630 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.910$ the third largest employer in the world.
- $00:17:27.910 \longrightarrow 00:17:29.970$ So in order to get to net zero,
- $00:17:29.970 \longrightarrow 00:17:31.450$ we have to measure our missions.
- 00:17:31.450 --> 00:17:32.800 We have to know where they're coming from,
- $00:17:32.800 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.150$ and we need to have a plan of action
- $00:17:35.150 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.070$ to address where these are coming from.
- $00:17:38.070 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.070$ So improving the electricity source.
- $00:17:43.530 \longrightarrow 00:17:45.090$ I mentioned that most of the emissions
- 00:17:45.090 --> 00:17:46.540 coming from our supply chain
- 00:17:46.540 --> 00:17:48.330 are in the manufacturing process.
- $00:17:48.330 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.990$ So obviously decarbonizing our electricity grid,
- $00:17:50.990 \longrightarrow 00:17:52.310$ getting off fossil fuels.
- $00:17:52.310 \dashrightarrow 00:17:54.550$ It's one of the most important things we need to do
- $00{:}17{:}54.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}58.860$ And I invite you to read their reports which is 86 pages,
- $00:17:58.860 \longrightarrow 00:18:01.830$ and cannot be done justice in this talk.
- $00:18:01.830 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.410$ So, but where do we go from here?
- $00:18:03.410 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.010$ So importantly, we have to quantify the pollutants
- $00{:}18{:}06.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}08.140$ from all our clinical activities.
- $00:18:08.140 \longrightarrow 00:18:09.830$ We need to include environmental emissions

- $00:18:09.830 \longrightarrow 00:18:11.230$ in the total cost of ownership
- 00:18:11.230 --> 00:18:13.830 as part of our overall decision-making.
- $00:18:13.830 \longrightarrow 00:18:16.980$ Public health needs to be elevated
- $00:18:16.980 \longrightarrow 00:18:19.520$ to the level of importance of patient safety.
- $00:18:19.520 \longrightarrow 00:18:20.980$ And it has to be right up there
- $00:18:20.980 \longrightarrow 00:18:23.350$ with what we mean by quality and value and care.
- $00:18:23.350 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.260$ And this needs to be leveraged through accountability;
- $00:18:26.260 \longrightarrow 00:18:29.300$ for example, through mandated pay for performance.
- $00:18:29.300 \longrightarrow 00:18:34.300$ So the value equation typically used by health care managers
- $00:18:34.490 \longrightarrow 00:18:36.440$ includes taken from the triple aim,
- $00:18:36.440 \longrightarrow 00:18:39.390$ that the outcomes for patients and populations
- $00:18:39.390 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.610$ need to be maximized.
- 00:18:40.610 --> 00:18:42.720 Financial costs need to be minimized.
- $00:18:42.720 \longrightarrow 00:18:44.200$ when needs to be factored in there
- 00:18:44.200 --> 00:18:47.550 are environmental missions in the social costs of care.
- 00:18:47.550 --> 00:18:49.410 We haven't even talked about social costs,
- $00:18:49.410 \longrightarrow 00:18:51.900$ things like not harming the communities
- $00:18:51.900 \longrightarrow 00:18:54.570$ that have the manufacturing plants
- $00:18:54.570 \longrightarrow 00:18:58.290$ and make our devices paying livable wages.
- $00:18:58.290 \longrightarrow 00:19:00.060$ So these also need to,
- 00:19:00.060 --> 00:19:02.170 so unlivable wages need to be minimized,
- $00:19:02.170 \longrightarrow 00:19:04.100$ or the social impacts need to be minimized.
- $00{:}19{:}04.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}05.910$ So earlier I mentioned the quadruple care.
- $00:19:05.910 \longrightarrow 00:19:07.380$ I don't have a picture for that.
- $00:19:07.380 \longrightarrow 00:19:10.160$ So famously there's the triple aim
- $00:19:10.160 \dashrightarrow 00:19:13.680$ but the quadruple, the fourth leg of that has to do
- $00:19:13.680 \dashrightarrow 00:19:18.010$ with staff satisfaction, that staff care about these issues.

- 00:19:18.010 --> 00:19:19.440 And so a summary of take home points,
- 00:19:19.440 --> 00:19:21.430 not all of which I've been able to touch upon,
- 00:19:21.430 --> 00:19:23.920 but that clinicians were driving health care pollution.
- $00:19:23.920 \longrightarrow 00:19:27.610$ We are the ones who decide how much to use, which to use,
- $00:19:27.610 \longrightarrow 00:19:30.800$ it is well-known we over diagnose, we over-treat.
- $00:19:30.800 \longrightarrow 00:19:33.050$ We fail to prevent disease.
- $00:19:33.050 \dashrightarrow 00:19:37.400$ We fail to end, we failed to treat patients at end of life
- $00:19:37.400 \longrightarrow 00:19:38.720$ in ways that they want,
- $00:19:38.720 \longrightarrow 00:19:43.020$ and in ways that are inexpensive and minimize pollution.
- $00:19:43.020 \longrightarrow 00:19:45.290$ So that's a big area that we need to address.
- 00:19:45.290 --> 00:19:47.180 There's this problem of candy store culture
- 00:19:47.180 --> 00:19:49.220 and lack of accountability.
- $00{:}19{:}49.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}52.600$ And there's excess in our infection control practices.
- $00:19:52.600 \longrightarrow 00:19:54.560$ We need to engage one another,
- $00:19:54.560 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.490$ that this is about public health.
- $00:19:56.490 \longrightarrow 00:19:58.000$ This is about patient safety.
- $00:19:58.000 \longrightarrow 00:19:59.403$ They are one in the same.
- $00{:}20{:}00.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}02.270$ Not all clinicians can get involved
- $00:20:02.270 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.570$ and care about things like making their cafeteria
- $00:20:05.570 \longrightarrow 00:20:09.580$ more nutritious and more locally sustainable.
- $00:20:09.580 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.510$ Not every clinician can get involved
- $00{:}20{:}11.510 --> 00{:}20{:}14.630$ with trying to make their facilities more energy efficient,
- $00{:}20{:}14.630 --> 00{:}20{:}18.840$ but every one of us cares deeply and will get involved
- $00:20:18.840 \longrightarrow 00:20:20:330$ in how we take care of our patients.
- $00:20:20.330 \longrightarrow 00:20:21.960$ So we need to engage one another
- $00:20:21.960 \longrightarrow 00:20:23.720$ and how we take care of our patients.

- 00:20:23.720 --> 00:20:24.760 Our choices matter,
- 00:20:24.760 --> 00:20:27.230 while I have not been able to address in this talk,
- $00:20:27.230 \longrightarrow 00:20:29.830$ you will be hearing from the next two speakers
- $00:20:29.830 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.520$ about using metrics to be able to discern
- $00:20:34.520 \longrightarrow 00:20:36.050$ what's environmentally preferable
- $00:20:36.050 \longrightarrow 00:20:38.870$ in terms of drugs, devices in clinical care pathways;
- $00:20:38.870 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.810$ and how we put that all together.
- $00:20:40.810 \longrightarrow 00:20:42.940$ This process requires data.
- $00:20:42.940 \longrightarrow 00:20:46.040$ It requires more industry transparency.
- $00:20:46.040 \longrightarrow 00:20:48.423$ So the value-based payment model,
- 00:20:49.840 --> 00:20:52.020 particularly in the United States,
- $00:20:52.020 \longrightarrow 00:20:54.890$ needs to factor in resource conservation
- $00:20:54.890 \longrightarrow 00:20:57.080$ as how we hold one another accountable.
- $00:20:57.080 \longrightarrow 00:20:59.070$ That resource conservation
- $00:20:59.070 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.760$ is part of what we mean by quality care.
- 00:21:01.760 --> 00:21:03.570 This could not have been highlighted
- $00:21:03.570 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.110$ more than with the COVID pandemic.
- $00{:}21{:}06.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}09.290$ We have a moral responsibility to conserve resources
- $00:21:09.290 \longrightarrow 00:21:11.200$ and we can be held accountable to it
- 00:21:11.200 --> 00:21:12.710 through our payment models.
- $00{:}21{:}12.710 \longrightarrow 00{:}21{:}14.760$ We need to track our resource utilization
- $00:21:14.760 \longrightarrow 00:21:17.740$ and our emissions at the health care organization level,
- $00:21:17.740 \longrightarrow 00:21:19.940$ at the practice and practitioner level.
- $00:21:19.940 \longrightarrow 00:21:21.840$ This can be done.
- $00{:}21{:}21.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}23.850$ We need to add environmental performance metrics
- $00:21:23.850 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.493$ to the merit-based incentive payment system.
- $00{:}21{:}25.493 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}28.030$ This is through (in distinct) and Medicare and Medicaid.
- $00:21:28.030 \longrightarrow 00:21:30.300$ This is how we're gonna drive change.

- $00:21:30.300 \longrightarrow 00:21:31.830$ We need to address public policy
- 00:21:31.830 --> 00:21:35.230 and regulatory drivers of waste and disposability.
- $00:21:35.230 \longrightarrow 00:21:36.840$ Many of us feel very powerless
- $00:21:36.840 \longrightarrow 00:21:39.200$ based on our institutional practices
- $00:21:39.200 \longrightarrow 00:21:41.720$ or departments of public health or regulations.
- $00:21:41.720 \longrightarrow 00:21:43.090$ We can challenge them.
- $00:21:43.090 \longrightarrow 00:21:45.710$ We have the ability to do that.
- 00:21:45.710 --> 00:21:47.530 It's hard, but we can't throw up our hands.
- $00:21:47.530 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.800$ We have to get involved.
- $00{:}21{:}48.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}51.930$ And then certainly haven't talked about prevention.
- $00{:}21{:}51.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}55.190$ Self-care for us as physicians, but also for our patients;
- 00:21:55.190 --> 00:21:56.780 whole foods, plant-based diet,
- $00{:}21{:}56.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}00.030$ exercise, active transport, social, spiritual connections,
- $00:22:00.030 \longrightarrow 00:22:02.520$ green spaces this is all part of what has to happen
- $00:22:02.520 \longrightarrow 00:22:05.707$ in the transformation of care to prevent diseases.
- $00:22:05.707 \longrightarrow 00:22:07.990$ And certainly we need to address
- $00:22:07.990 \longrightarrow 00:22:09.470$ the social determinants of health.
- 00:22:09.470 --> 00:22:14.340 If we can't lift our population out of poverty
- $00:22:14.340 \longrightarrow 00:22:18.820$ to address basic economic needs
- 00:22:18.820 --> 00:22:21.210 and give basic access to health care,
- $00:22:21.210 \longrightarrow 00:22:23.230$ we're never gonna solve this problem.
- 00:22:23.230 --> 00:22:24.900 So we've got a lot of work to do today,
- $00:22:24.900 \longrightarrow 00:22:26.070$ but I'm certainly optimistic.
- $00{:}22{:}26.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}27.953$ And I thank you very much for your time.
- $00:22:33.350 \longrightarrow 00:22:35.620$ Terrific, thank you so much Dr. Sherman.
- $00:22:35.620 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.617$ We sincerely appreciate it.
- 00:22:37.617 --> 00:22:41.140 All right, I am happy to hand over the helm
- 00:22:41.140 --> 00:22:44.033 to Dr. Jonathan Slutzman, who will be up next.
- $00:22:51.900 \longrightarrow 00:22:52.820$ Thank you Shanda.

- 00:22:52.820 --> 00:22:54.550 And thank you Jodi.
- $00:22:54.550 \longrightarrow 00:22:57.763$ It's always a pleasure to follow you as best I can.
- $00:22:58.600 \longrightarrow 00:23:00.700$ So my task here today
- $00:23:00.700 \longrightarrow 00:23:05.700$ is to give you the super fast brief overview
- $00:23:06.050 \longrightarrow 00:23:08.890$ of health care sustainability science.
- $00:23:08.890 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.010$ For those of you who are fans
- 00:23:10.010 --> 00:23:11.540 of the reduced Shakespeare Company,
- 00:23:11.540 --> 00:23:15.120 this is health care sustainability science, abridged.
- 00:23:15.120 --> 00:23:16.770 Of course, if you have any questions,
- $00:23:16.770 \longrightarrow 00:23:21.130$ please ask, and we'll try to answer them afterwards.
- $00:23:21.130 \longrightarrow 00:23:24.580$ As a disclosure, I have received travel funding from 3M,
- $00{:}23{:}24.580 \to 00{:}23{:}28.740$ but won't be discussing any specific items in this talk.
- 00:23:28.740 --> 00:23:30.730 So what is sustainability science?
- $00:23:30.730 \longrightarrow 00:23:32.510$ It's a research field.
- $00:23:32.510 \longrightarrow 00:23:34.740$ It's one where we look specifically
- $00{:}23{:}34.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}38.470$ at the interactions between the natural environment
- $00:23:38.470 \longrightarrow 00:23:40.310$ and social systems,
- $00{:}23{:}40.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}45.310$ and how those impact the challenge of sustainability,
- $00{:}23{:}45.670 --> 00{:}23{:}50.010$ defined as meeting the needs of the present generation
- $00:23:50.010 \longrightarrow 00:23:53.120$ while preserving the abilities of future generations
- $00:23:53.120 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.393$ to meet their own needs.
- $00{:}23{:}55.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}58.910$ There are a number of tools within sustainability science.
- 00:23:58.910 --> 00:24:00.530 The one that I'm gonna highlight the most,
- 00:24:00.530 --> 00:24:04.350 and you heard Jodi mention it a little bit already,
- $00:24:04.350 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.790$ is life cycle assessment;

 $00{:}24{:}06.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}11.520$ which is a very powerful research tool that can be used

00:24:11.520 --> 00:24:14.660 to quantify the environmental impact,

 $00{:}24{:}14.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}18.580$ both upstream and downstream of a product or a process

00:24:18.580 --> 00:24:19.690 from cradle to grave;

 $00:24:19.690 \longrightarrow 00:24:23.920$ from raw material acquisition, through transportation,

00:24:23.920 --> 00:24:28.400 manufacturing, more transportation, use, reuse,

 $00:24:28.400 \longrightarrow 00:24:31.360$ reprocessing, and ultimately disposal.

 $00:24:31.360 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.340$ The idea being that if you want to compare different options

 $00{:}24{:}34.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}38.020$ whether it's single use disposables to durable equipment,

 $00:24:38.020 \longrightarrow 00:24:41.940$ or different surgical procedures

00:24:41.940 --> 00:24:44.890 that achieve the same clinical outcomes,

 $00:24:44.890 \longrightarrow 00:24:47.380$ then you can do it in a holistic way,

 $00:24:47.380 \longrightarrow 00:24:51.010$ in a whole body perspective;

 $00{:}24{:}51.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}53.670$ the same way that we should be making our decisions

 $00:24:53.670 \longrightarrow 00:24:55.670$ as we care for our patients.

 $00:24:55.670 \longrightarrow 00:24:59.380$ So this is the super-duper five-second version

 $00{:}24{:}59.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}01.940$ of how to do a life cycle assessment.

00:25:01.940 --> 00:25:02.773 I promise you,

00:25:02.773 --> 00:25:04.830 it will not qualify you to do it after this talk,

 $00:25:04.830 \longrightarrow 00:25:06.840$ but at least it'll give you a sense

 $00{:}25{:}06.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}10.860$ for what we'll be talking about in a few of the studies

 $00:25:10.860 \longrightarrow 00:25:12.530$ that I'll be reviewing shortly.

 $00:25:12.530 \longrightarrow 00:25:15.630$ There are four stages to a life cycle assessment.

 $00:25:15.630 \longrightarrow 00:25:17.550$ The first is the goal and scope definition.

00:25:17.550 --> 00:25:20.800 Meaning I'm going to sit down and decide,

 $00:25:20.800 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.960$ what am I including in my system or out of my system.

 $00:25:24.960 \longrightarrow 00:25:27.640$ And what are the purposes for the study at hand?

00:25:27.640 --> 00:25:29.710 There's a very, very different way of doing it.

 $00:25:29.710 \longrightarrow 00:25:32.180$ If you're an end-user

00:25:32.180 --> 00:25:34.990 talking about purchasing one particular product

 $00{:}25{:}34.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}38.700$ versus another product, versus a manufacturer perhaps,

 $00:25:38.700 \longrightarrow 00:25:42.460$ who's deciding in the production process

 $00:25:42.460 \longrightarrow 00:25:44.350$ which ways to do things.

 $00:25:44.350 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.090$ The next is the inventory analysis.

 $00:25:46.090 \longrightarrow 00:25:50.830$ That's where you would add up all of the emissions

 $00{:}25{:}50.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}53.530$ coming out of a product or a process,

 $00:25:53.530 \longrightarrow 00:25:57.530$ or the material inputs going into a product or a process,

 $00:25:57.530 \longrightarrow 00:25:59.270$ which leads to the impact assessment

 $00:25:59.270 \longrightarrow 00:26:02.810$ where we translate those material flows

 $00:26:02.810 \longrightarrow 00:26:07.810$ into some sort of normalized impact

00:26:08.290 --> 00:26:12.740 on different environmental qualities.

 $00:26:12.740 \longrightarrow 00:26:14.900$ And there are different categories of impacts

 $00:26:14.900 \longrightarrow 00:26:16.130$ that you might wanna include.

 $00:26:16.130 \longrightarrow 00:26:17.770$ Some that you might have heard of

00:26:17.770 --> 00:26:20.230 would be climate change potential,

 $00:26:20.230 \longrightarrow 00:26:24.360$ or ozone depletion potential or human health impacts.

 $00:26:24.360 \longrightarrow 00:26:26.790$ And then throughout the whole process

00:26:26.790 --> 00:26:28.790 comes interpretation analysis.

00:26:28.790 --> 00:26:30.850 It's a somewhat iterative approach

00:26:30.850 --> 00:26:33.080 that as you're doing it you're continuing

 $00:26:33.080 \longrightarrow 00:26:34.340$ to see what you're getting

 $00:26:34.340 \longrightarrow 00:26:36.453$ and how you can improve the process.

 $00:26:37.660 \longrightarrow 00:26:39.160$ So with that behind us,

00:26:39.160 --> 00:26:43.610 I'm going to give a really, really tiny taste

 $00:26:44.680 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.680$ of the spectrum of sustainability science in health care.

 $00:26:51.050 \longrightarrow 00:26:55.180$ Each of the four studies that I'll be discussing

 $00:26:55.180 \longrightarrow 00:26:58.351$ are published in peer reviewed publications.

 $00:26:58.351 \longrightarrow 00:27:00.290$ And I believe that all of them

 $00:27:00.290 \longrightarrow 00:27:03.880$ are even in the last handful of years.

00:27:03.880 --> 00:27:06.240 We're gonna start at the highest level here

 $00:27:06.240 \longrightarrow 00:27:08.330$ where Jodi Sherman and Matt Eckelman.

 $00:27:08.330 \longrightarrow 00:27:11.820$ You heard from Dr. Sherman just a couple of minutes ago,

 $00{:}27{:}11.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}15.580$ did this study with Matt Eckelman at Northeastern University

 $00:27:15.580 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.530$ trying to quantify what are the environmental impacts

 $00:27:18.530 \longrightarrow 00:27:20.870$ of the entire U S health care system.

 $00:27:20.870 \longrightarrow 00:27:23.330$ And if you've ever quoted the number

 $00{:}27{:}23.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}27.030$ that about 10% of U S greenhouse gas emissions

 $00:27:27.030 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.170$ come from health care,

 $00:27:28.170 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.870$ this is the source for that data point.

 $00{:}27{:}30.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}34.980$ And what Sherman and Eckelman did, was what we call

 $00{:}27{:}34.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}39.610$ an environmental economic input-output life cycle assessment

 $00:27:39.610 \longrightarrow 00:27:42.890$ where they took data,

00:27:42.890 --> 00:27:47.060 economic data on spending patterns essentially,

 $00:27:47.060 \longrightarrow 00:27:52.060$ for U S health care, and used translation tables,

 $00{:}27{:}52.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}55.030$ their economic input-output tables

 $00:27:55.030 \dashrightarrow 00:28:00.030$ that try to connect a dollar spent in one particular field,

 $00:28:00.100 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.810$ where does that then go?

 $00{:}28{:}01.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}05.000$ And what are the emissions potentially associated with that?

 $00{:}28{:}05.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}09.550$ For example, if you spend \$10 on ground transportation

00:28:09.550 --> 00:28:13.540 or you spend \$100 on pharmaceuticals,

00:28:13.540 --> 00:28:18.540 or \$1000 on durable medical equipment,

 $00:28:18.610 \longrightarrow 00:28:20.720$ what are the emissions associated with that?

00:28:20.720 --> 00:28:24.420 And those kinds of data are great

 $00:28:24.420 \longrightarrow 00:28:29.160$ for looking at very large scale systems.

 $00:28:29.160 \longrightarrow 00:28:32.070$ You can imagine that what I just described before

 $00:28:32.070 \longrightarrow 00:28:33.450$ of doing a life cycle assessment,

00:28:33.450 --> 00:28:35.940 adding up all of the inventory components

 $00{:}28{:}35.940 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}\:} 00{:}28{:}38.840$ for your product or your process, can be quite tedious

 $00:28:38.840 \longrightarrow 00:28:41.960$ even for a simple small scale item

 $00{:}28{:}41.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}45.380$ like the pad of paper that's sitting on your desk right now

 $00:28:45.380 \longrightarrow 00:28:46.900$ for you to take notes.

 $00:28:46.900 \longrightarrow 00:28:48.890$ There are a lot of steps that go into that.

 $00:28:48.890 \longrightarrow 00:28:50.720$ So imagine trying to do that

00:28:50.720 --> 00:28:52.360 for a health care system as a whole,

 $00:28:52.360 \longrightarrow 00:28:56.000$ it is prohibitively complex.

 $00{:}28{:}56.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}59.340$ So that's where economic input-output comes along.

 $00:28:59.340 \longrightarrow 00:29:02.460$ And you get these really interesting results

 $00:29:02.460 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.500$ where you can look at over time,

 $00{:}29{:}05.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}08.040$ in this case, the greenhouse gas emissions associated

 $00:29:08.040 \dashrightarrow 00:29:11.260$ with the U S health care system as a whole.

00:29:11.260 --> 00:29:14.560 And what you can see is that, for the 11 years,

00:29:14.560 --> 00:29:17.653 that Sherman and Eckelman studied,

 $00{:}29{:}18.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}23.540$ both the proportion of total U S greenhouse gas emissions

 $00:29:23.540 \longrightarrow 00:29:25.190$ from health care has increased

 $00:29:25.190 \longrightarrow 00:29:26.840$ as well as the absolute number.

 $00:29:26.840 \longrightarrow 00:29:30.770$ So a number of industries actually decreased over that time,

00:29:30.770 --> 00:29:32.480 but health care continued to grow,

 $00:29:32.480 \longrightarrow 00:29:35.810$ and it shows the extent of the challenges

 $00:29:35.810 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.210$ that we in health care face.

 $00:29:38.170 \longrightarrow 00:29:41.380$ So if you look beyond greenhouse gas emissions

 $00:29:41.380 \longrightarrow 00:29:46.380$ and see that there are other output categories

00:29:46.880 --> 00:29:49.420 or environmental impact categories;

 $00:29:49.420 \longrightarrow 00:29:50.960$ you can get these kinds of results

00:29:50.960 --> 00:29:54.910 where you have an absolute number in some normalized unit.

 $00:29:54.910 \longrightarrow 00:29:57.400$ For example, if we look at the,

00:29:57.400 --> 00:30:02.400 let's say ODP here is ozone depletion potential,

00:30:03.560 --> 00:30:07.410 it's measured in kilograms of CFC 11 equivalence,

 $00:30:07.410 \longrightarrow 00:30:10.170$ and you can see what the health care total is

 $00:30:10.170 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.730$ versus the national total.

 $00:30:11.730 \longrightarrow 00:30:14.690$ And then the fraction that health care represents

 $00:30:14.690 \dashrightarrow 00:30:18.160$ including the global warming potential up at the top,

 $00:30:18.160 \longrightarrow 00:30:21.023$ which is that 9.8, nearly 10% number.

 $00:30:22.400 \dashrightarrow 00:30:25.550$ So let's move down from what this might have been,

 $00:30:25.550 \longrightarrow 00:30:27.430$ let's say the 50,000 foot study,

 $00:30:27.430 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.200$ and go down to about 10,000 feet.

 $00{:}30{:}30{:}30{:}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}33{:}880$ And here we have a study by McNeil Lily-White and Brown

 $00:30:33.880 \longrightarrow 00:30:37.650$ of carbon footprinting of operating theaters.

00:30:37.650 --> 00:30:42.650 This study was done by some Britains and some Canadians.

 $00:30:44.300 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.720$ So they call it an operating theater,

 $00:30:46.720 \longrightarrow 00:30:49.410$ where I come from they're operating rooms,

 $00:30:49.410 \dashrightarrow 00:30:52.760$ but this was done looking at three different hospitals

- $00:30:52.760 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.600$ on three different continents.
- 00:30:54.600 --> 00:30:56.220 Vancouver General Hospital,
- 00:30:56.220 --> 00:30:58.370 the University of Minnesota Medical Center,
- $00:30:58.370 \longrightarrow 00:31:01.640$ and the John Radcliffe Hospital
- $00:31:01.640 \longrightarrow 00:31:04.360$ in the U K National Health Service.
- $00:31:04.360 \longrightarrow 00:31:08.087$ And what they did was looked at the scope one, scope two,
- $00:31:08.087 \longrightarrow 00:31:09.960$ and scope three emissions
- $00:31:09.960 \dashrightarrow 00:31:14.040$ from the operating room complex at each of these hospitals.
- $00:31:14.040 \longrightarrow 00:31:17.312$ It turns out that they're not terribly different in size,
- $00:31:17.312 \longrightarrow 00:31:21.700$ so we can compare the numbers closely enough
- $00:31:21.700 \longrightarrow 00:31:23.020$ for our purposes.
- 00:31:23.020 --> 00:31:26.460 And in scope one, they had direct emissions
- $00:31:26.460 \longrightarrow 00:31:31.460$ of an esthetic gases, scope two were purchased energy,
- $00{:}31{:}31.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}35.500$ or they actually moved their onsite energy generation
- $00:31:35.500 \longrightarrow 00:31:38.500$ for heating into the scope tWo number of it.
- 00:31:38.500 --> 00:31:40.360 It made sense for their purposes,
- $00{:}31{:}40.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}42.120$ and it doesn't change the total.
- $00{:}31{:}42.120 \to 00{:}31{:}44.520$ Although many people would consider that in scope one.
- $00:31:44.520 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.640$ And then scope three,
- 00:31:45.640 --> 00:31:50.423 they considered the supply chain for the operating rooms.
- 00:31:51.397 --> 00:31:54.050 And what they did was this hybrid
- 00:31:54.050 --> 00:31:56.060 greenhouse gas footprinting study,
- $00:31:56.060 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.060$ where they apply readily accessible
- $00:32:02.597 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.690$ and accepted greenhouse gas emission factors
- $00{:}32{:}06.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}11.690$ for their anesthetic gases and their energy generation

- $00:32:14.270 \longrightarrow 00:32:19.270$ based on grid and fossil fuel burning emissions.
- 00:32:19.670 --> 00:32:22.010 And then for the scope three emissions,
- 00:32:22.010 --> 00:32:24.310 which are the hardest to quantify,
- $00:32:24.310 \longrightarrow 00:32:26.560$ they basically did waste audits,
- $00:32:26.560 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.410$ and extrapolated to a year of waste generation
- $00:32:29.410 \longrightarrow 00:32:30.510$ from the (indistinct),
- $00:32:31.700 \longrightarrow 00:32:34.310$ separated into the predominant material
- $00:32:34.310 \longrightarrow 00:32:38.320$ which not surprisingly was mostly a variety of plastics,
- $00:32:38.320 \longrightarrow 00:32:40.540$ and then apply the factors for those.
- $00{:}32{:}40.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}44.890$ And what you see is that they're pretty large differences
- $00:32:44.890 \longrightarrow 00:32:48.050$ in the greenhouse gas emissions footprints
- $00:32:48.050 \longrightarrow 00:32:51.350$ from these three different sets of operating rooms
- $00:32:51.350 \dashrightarrow 00:32:55.090$ with the number that jumps out, the biggest to me,
- $00:32:55.090 \longrightarrow 00:32:57.750$ is the huge difference in scope one emissions
- $00:32:57.750 \dashrightarrow 00:33:00.820$ between these three hospitals with Vancouver General
- $00:33:00.820 \longrightarrow 00:33:04.770$ and the University of Minnesota, being fairly comparable;
- $00{:}33{:}04.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}07.220$ but the John Radcliffe Hospital being immensely lower.
- 00:33:07.220 --> 00:33:11.460 And that is, if you look in the top left table,
- $00:33:11.460 \longrightarrow 00:33:15.640$ predominantly driven by zero deaths fluorine use
- 00:33:15.640 --> 00:33:17.360 at John Radcliffe Hospital,
- $00:33:17.360 \longrightarrow 00:33:18.960$ it's just not available on formulary.
- $00{:}33{:}18.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}21.010$ And Dr. Sherman can wax poetic
- $00:33:21.010 \longrightarrow 00:33:23.863$ about the benefits of doing that at your own hospital.
- $00:33:24.920 \longrightarrow 00:33:28.130$ This kind of a method is really useful,
- $00:33:28.130 \longrightarrow 00:33:31.230$ for again, a larger scale study,
- 00:33:31.230 --> 00:33:34.230 but you can quibble a bit about that,

- $00:33:34.230 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.740$ that scope three emissions number,
- $00:33:35.740 \longrightarrow 00:33:38.653$ which as I said, is really challenging to quantify.
- $00:33:39.630 \longrightarrow 00:33:42.040$ So let's move down from the 10,000 foot level
- $00:33:42.040 \longrightarrow 00:33:45.180$ to more the 1000 foot level.
- 00:33:45.180 --> 00:33:48.170 And look at a process life cycle assessment
- $00{:}33{:}48.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}52.440$ where some body would look at the individual components
- $00:33:52.440 \longrightarrow 00:33:55.530$ of a product or a process, and add that up,
- $00:33:55.530 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.890$ and get the emissions associated with that.
- $00:33:57.890 \dashrightarrow 00:34:01.070$ Here we have another study by Dr. Sherman and Eckleman
- $00:34:01.070 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.430$ with Lewis Radley, assisting in the middle there.
- $00:34:04.430 \longrightarrow 00:34:06.060$ This is a life cycle assessment
- $00:34:06.060 \longrightarrow 00:34:11.060$ and a life cycle costing assessment of laryngoscopes.
- 00:34:12.270 --> 00:34:14.550 It's possible that at many of your facilities,
- $00:34:14.550 \longrightarrow 00:34:15.720$ you've seen a transition
- $00:34:15.720 \dashrightarrow 00:34:20.380$ from reusable, durable laryngoscope, handles and blades,
- $00:34:20.380 \longrightarrow 00:34:23.730$ to some combination of disposable blades
- $00:34:23.730 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.670$ and potentially disposable handles as well.
- 00:34:26.670 --> 00:34:27.970 And as Dr. Sherman said,
- $00:34:27.970 \longrightarrow 00:34:31.700$ this is based on the potential for infection control
- $00:34:31.700 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.950$ with variable benefits.
- $00:34:33.950 \longrightarrow 00:34:35.280$ But let's answer the question
- $00:34:35.280 \longrightarrow 00:34:36.860$ of what are the environmental impacts?
- $00:34:36.860 \longrightarrow 00:34:39.650$ So the first figure that you see,
- $00:34:39.650 \longrightarrow 00:34:44.650$ is that the scope of boundary
- $00:34:44.930 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.680$ of what was included in the study
- $00:34:47.680 \longrightarrow 00:34:50.460$ and the different phases of the life cycle assessment
- $00:34:50.460 \longrightarrow 00:34:52.150$ that we talked about initially,
- $00:34:52.150 \longrightarrow 00:34:53.820$ and then the bottom of the lab boxes

```
00:34:53.820 \longrightarrow 00:34:56.500 is the costs that were included.
```

 $00:34:56.500 \longrightarrow 00:34:58.420$ So here we have some results.

00:34:58.420 --> 00:35:01.220 Again, similar to that large scale,

 $00:35:01.220 \longrightarrow 00:35:06.030$ 50,000 foot total health care system study,

 $00:35:06.030 \longrightarrow 00:35:08.120$ you have the same impact categories.

00:35:08.120 --> 00:35:10.680 You're just looking at a different set of options,

 $00:35:10.680 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.170$ and this is comparative rather than temporal.

 $00:35:14.170 \longrightarrow 00:35:16.670$ So we're not looking at the same system over time.

 $00:35:16.670 \longrightarrow 00:35:18.920$ We're looking at different options within a system.

 $00{:}35{:}18.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}22.750$ And these results are scaled so that the lowest impact

 $00:35:22.750 \longrightarrow 00:35:25.810$ is one, and the others are multiples of that.

00:35:25.810 --> 00:35:30.810 So you can see that in almost all categories,

 $00:35:30.820 \longrightarrow 00:35:35.820$ the multi-use blades, and multi-use handles

 $00:35:36.310 \longrightarrow 00:35:38.280$ under high level disinfection,

 $00:35:38.280 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.980$ have the least environmental impacts

 $00:35:39.980 \longrightarrow 00:35:43.123$ with single use disposable devices,

 $00:35:43.123 \longrightarrow 00:35:45.930$ in some cases hundreds of times

 $00:35:45.930 \longrightarrow 00:35:48.030$ more impactful on the environment.

 $00:35:48.030 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.100$ And you can make really pretty charts

 $00:35:50.100 \longrightarrow 00:35:52.080$ that show you just visually strikingly

 $00:35:52.080 \longrightarrow 00:35:53.910$ how different these are;

00:35:53.910 --> 00:35:57.120 but what's most striking about this study, I think,

 $00:35:57.120 \longrightarrow 00:35:59.460$ is the life cycle costing piece.

 $00{:}35{:}59.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}02.730$ And this chart right here, you're seeing the emissions.

 $00:36:02.730 \longrightarrow 00:36:04.910$ So these are greenhouse gas emissions.

 $00:36:04.910 \longrightarrow 00:36:06.900$ And then you can go to the next chart

 $00:36:06.900 \longrightarrow 00:36:11.700$ which is the same options in the same order,

 $00:36:11.700 \longrightarrow 00:36:13.460$ but here we're looking at the costs.

00:36:13.460 --> 00:36:15.900 And it's worth noting that the ones

 $00:36:15.900 \longrightarrow 00:36:19.060$ that are the most environmentally impactful,

00:36:19.060 --> 00:36:23.320 also happen to be the ones that are the most expensive.

 $00:36:23.320 \longrightarrow 00:36:25.320$ So this is not necessarily a case

 $00:36:25.320 \longrightarrow 00:36:26.410$ where we're gonna save money

 $00:36:26.410 \longrightarrow 00:36:28.470$ by using single use disposables,

 $00:36:28.470 \longrightarrow 00:36:31.870$ by not spending money on reprocessing.

 $00:36:31.870 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.940$ This is a case where doing the right thing environmentally

 $00:36:34.940 \dashrightarrow 00:36:38.653$ will often help your financial bottom line as well.

 $00:36:39.650 \longrightarrow 00:36:42.300$ So we've gone from the 50,000 foot level

00:36:42.300 --> 00:36:46.560 to may be the 10,000 foot level to the 1000 foot level.

 $00:36:46.560 \longrightarrow 00:36:48.988$ And now we're gonna go to ground level,

 $00:36:48.988 \longrightarrow 00:36:51.290$ and do some dumpster diving.

 $00:36:51.290 \dashrightarrow 00:36:55.690$ This is from an emergency department waste audit.

 $00:36:55.690 \longrightarrow 00:36:57.890$ This is the most recently published of the studies

 $00:36:57.890 \longrightarrow 00:36:59.590$ that we're reviewing today.

 $00:36:59.590 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.250$ And this is one of mine,

 $00:37:01.250 \dashrightarrow 00:37:05.010$ done with Sarah Sue at Brown and Cassie Thiel here,

00:37:05.010 --> 00:37:07.110 you're gonna hear from in just a minute or so,

 $00{:}37{:}07.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}10.720$ Mike Mellow at Brown, and then I was leading this study.

 $00:37:10.720 \longrightarrow 00:37:14.000$ We did perhaps one of the simplest

 $00:37:14.000 \longrightarrow 00:37:17.160$ kinds of health care sustainability studies there is,

00:37:17.160 --> 00:37:22.030 which was taking all of our trash and dividing it,

00:37:22.030 --> 00:37:26.080 and measuring it, quantifying it and reporting it.

 $00:37:26.080 \longrightarrow 00:37:27.480$ And this was the first time

 $00:37:27.480 \dashrightarrow 00:37:29.790$ that a North American Emergency Department

 $00:37:29.790 \longrightarrow 00:37:32.530$ really did a dedicated waste audit.

 $00:37:32.530 \longrightarrow 00:37:36.150$ These numbers represent 100%

 $00{:}37{:}36.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}40.100$ of the waste generated from our emergency department

 $00:37:40.100 \longrightarrow 00:37:43.610$ in 24 hours, with the exception of pharmaceutical waste;

 $00:37:43.610 \longrightarrow 00:37:45.680$ which is complicated, why we didn't do that

 $00:37:45.680 \longrightarrow 00:37:49.520$ but it's actually a really small number for our facility.

 $00:37:49.520 \longrightarrow 00:37:52.280$ And the take home message is,

 $00:37:52.280 \longrightarrow 00:37:53.680$ that over the course of one day,

 $00:37:53.680 \longrightarrow 00:37:58.680$ we generated about 1400 pounds of waste.

 $00:37:59.010 \longrightarrow 00:38:01.060$ The vast majority of which was plastic.

00:38:01.060 --> 00:38:04.250 And if we extrapolate that over a year,

 $00:38:04.250 \longrightarrow 00:38:09.250$ we're talking about somewhere around 225 tons of waste,

 $00:38:11.010 \longrightarrow 00:38:13.343$ just from one emergency department.

00:38:14.829 --> 00:38:19.550 The disposing of that waste for one day, just the disposal,

00:38:19.550 --> 00:38:22.980 not the upstream impacts, but just the disposal,

 $00:38:22.980 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.700$ is equivalent to driving your average car 7,700 miles;

 $00:38:27.700 \longrightarrow 00:38:28.950$ which for some people

00:38:28.950 --> 00:38:32.470 is actually more than a year of driving;

 $00:38:32.470 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.273$ is just disposing of one day of our waste.

 $00:38:36.387 \longrightarrow 00:38:38.150$ So it can be quite impactful.

00:38:38.150 --> 00:38:40.980 And then as you saw from the McNeil Study,

 $00:38:40.980 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.540$ these waste audit numbers can then be an input

 $00:38:43.540 \longrightarrow 00:38:45.880$ for additional footprinting studies.

 $00:38:45.880 \longrightarrow 00:38:47.280$ So our key takeaways:

00:38:47.280 --> 00:38:49.510 sustainability science can identify many things

 $00:38:49.510 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.880$ that we can do that can have marginal environmental benefits

 $00:38:52.880 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.720$ and an aggregate can be quite significant.

 $00:38:54.720 \longrightarrow 00:38:56.110$ And some of the things we identify

 $00:38:56.110 \longrightarrow 00:38:58.630$ can be pretty big on their own.

 $00:38:58.630 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.970$ However, these larger scale economy-wide shifts.

00:39:01.970 --> 00:39:05.370 like Dr. Sherman mentioned, energy source changes in U K,

 $00:39:05.370 \longrightarrow 00:39:07.020$ can have a much larger impact.

 $00:39:07.020 \longrightarrow 00:39:08.590$ And that I want you to take away

 $00:39:08.590 \dashrightarrow 00:39:11.900$ that life cycle assessment is an extremely powerful tool

00:39:11.900 --> 00:39:16.130 for making these evidence-based clinical procurement

00:39:16.130 --> 00:39:17.910 and other decisions when it comes to

 $00:39:17.910 \longrightarrow 00:39:20.340$ what is best for us environmentally.

00:39:20.340 --> 00:39:21.173 And with that,

 $00{:}39{:}21.173 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}24.053$ I will say thank you and turn it back over to Shanda.

 $00:39:26.990 \longrightarrow 00:39:29.310$ - Excellent, thank you so much Dr. Slutzman.

 $00:39:29.310 \longrightarrow 00:39:31.920$ This has been terrific.

 $00:39:31.920 \longrightarrow 00:39:34.100$ All right, so now I am eager

 $00:39:34.100 \dashrightarrow 00:39:39.100$ to get Dr. Cassandra Thiel session up and rolling here.

 $00{:}39{:}41.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}44.080$ And so she is not able to join us today unfortunately,

 $00:39:44.080 \longrightarrow 00:39:46.693$ but we will hear her Zoomed in.

00:39:50.270 --> 00:39:51.103 - [Cassandra] All right.

00:39:52.170 --> 00:39:53.850 Well, thank you very much for having me.

 $00:39:53.850 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.100$ I'm sorry I can't be there in person,

 $00:39:55.100 \longrightarrow 00:39:58.290$ but I'm glad to be able to share some of the work

 $00:39:58.290 \longrightarrow 00:40:00.610$ that myself and colleagues have done in ophthalmology

 $00:40:00.610 \longrightarrow 00:40:03.333$ to work on sustainability in clinical care pathways.

 $00:40:05.460 \longrightarrow 00:40:07.850$ Let me (faintly speaking) slides.

00:40:07.850 --> 00:40:09.800 So why are we looking at ophthalmology?

00:40:10.680 --> 00:40:12.280 It's a really interesting specialty.

 $00:40:12.280 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.530$ One, they perform a lot of surgeries

 $00{:}40{:}14.530$ --> $00{:}40{:}18.430$ and surgeries are resource intensive and quite wasteful.

00:40:18.430 --> 00:40:20.270 This is just one of my favorite studies,

 $00:40:20.270 \longrightarrow 00:40:22.480$ is from a Neurosurgical Department out of California,

 $00:40:22.480 \longrightarrow 00:40:25.120$ but they monitored How many of their supplies

 $00:40:25.120 \longrightarrow 00:40:26.610$ they were throwing out without being used.

 $00{:}40{:}26.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}29.000$ And found it was about 13% of their total supply costs,

 $00:40:29.000 \longrightarrow 00:40:30.810$ were completely unused.

 $00:40:30.810 \longrightarrow 00:40:33.440$ If they could somehow not waste those materials,

 $00{:}40{:}33.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}36.490$ they would save about \$3 million a year in their department.

00:40:36.490 --> 00:40:38.540 And this is very common across all surgeries,

 $00:40:38.540 \longrightarrow 00:40:39.820$ even within ophthalmology.

 $00:40:39.820 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.270$ So it's a good area to focus on.

 $00:40:42.270 \longrightarrow 00:40:43.620$ Another reason we're looking at ophthalmology

 $00:40:43.620 \longrightarrow 00:40:45.750$ is because it's a large specialty.

 $00:40:45.750 \longrightarrow 00:40:47.200$ So they performed cataract surgeries

 $00:40:47.200 \longrightarrow 00:40:48.860$ kind of their bread and butter.

00:40:48.860 --> 00:40:50.980 And basically everyone needs cataract surgeries,

 $00:40:50.980 \longrightarrow 00:40:52.220$ if you live long enough.

 $00{:}40{:}52.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}54.550$ It's one of the most performed procedures worldwide.

 $00:40:54.550 \longrightarrow 00:40:55.383$ And in the U S,

 $00:40:55.383 \longrightarrow 00:40:57.610$ we spend a lot of money on cataract surgeries.

 $00:40:57.610 \longrightarrow 00:41:00.320$ About 1/2 of that spend is coming from Medicare,

 $00:41:00.320 \longrightarrow 00:41:02.440$ and cataract surgeries alone account for 12%

 $00:41:02.440 \longrightarrow 00:41:03.660$ of Medicare's budget.

00:41:03.660 --> 00:41:07.163 So this is a really big reach within a specialty,

- 00:41:08.040 --> 00:41:09.810 and beyond that it's actually growing, right?
- $00:41:09.810 \longrightarrow 00:41:13.000$ So we have more people, they're getting older,
- $00{:}41{:}13.000 \rightarrow 00{:}41{:}15.540$ and we're also trying to expand capacity into regions
- 00:41:15.540 --> 00:41:16.980 where they previously didn't really
- $00:41:16.980 \longrightarrow 00:41:19.763$ have a lot of ophthalmologists or access to eyecare.
- $00{:}41{:}21.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}24.210$ So this has a lot of potential for change.
- 00:41:24.210 --> 00:41:26.250 And that was one of the exciting reasons
- $00:41:26.250 \longrightarrow 00:41:28.150$ to look at ophthalmology specifically.
- $00:41:29.070 \longrightarrow 00:41:31.680$ So what do we know about what's going on ophthalmology?
- $00:41:31.680 \longrightarrow 00:41:33.870$ Well, there was a study that was published 2013
- 00:41:33.870 --> 00:41:34.800 out of the U K,
- $00:41:34.800 \longrightarrow 00:41:37.610$ it was on carbon footprint of cataract surgery.
- $00:41:37.610 \longrightarrow 00:41:39.300$ The most common form of cataract surgery
- $00:41:39.300 \longrightarrow 00:41:41.170$ in developed countries
- $00:41:41.170 \longrightarrow 00:41:43.720$ is called phacoemulsification or phaco.
- $00:41:43.720 \longrightarrow 00:41:45.890$ And so they looked at phacoemulsification
- 00:41:45.890 --> 00:41:48.090 and found that it emits about 180 kilos
- $00:41:48.090 \longrightarrow 00:41:49.500$ of carbon dioxide equivalence.
- $00{:}41{:}49.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}51.900$ So these are the greenhouse gas emissions.
- $00{:}41{:}51.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}54.020$ That's a good one to a British person living for a week.
- 00:41:54.020 --> 00:41:55.050 And this is first surgery
- $00{:}41{:}55.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}58.600$ that lasts anywhere from 30 minutes to an hour typically.
- $00:41:58.600 \longrightarrow 00:41:59.690$ Over 1/2 of those emissions
- 00:41:59.690 --> 00:42:01.840 were coming from procurement of supplies,
- 00:42:01.840 --> 00:42:02.820 which is not surprising
- $00:42:02.820 \longrightarrow 00:42:06.120$ for those of us who study life cycle assessments
- $00:42:06.120 \longrightarrow 00:42:08.650$ or carbon footprints of surgical procedures.
- $00:42:08.650 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.950$ A lot of the footprint comes from the supplies.

- 00:42:11.950 --> 00:42:13.580 And of course in the U K, similar to the U S,
- $00:42:13.580 \longrightarrow 00:42:16.160$ a lot of the supplies are single use and disposable.
- $00:42:16.160 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.603$ So this led to some interesting thoughts.
- 00:42:20.910 --> 00:42:22.280 My first thought was,
- 00:42:22.280 --> 00:42:24.130 okay, so we have these developing countries
- $00:42:24.130 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.350$ where everything, or sorry,
- $00:42:25.350 \longrightarrow 00:42:26.550$ developed countries where everything
- $00:42:26.550 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.020$ is kind of on a single use disposable end of the spectrum,
- $00:42:30.020 \longrightarrow 00:42:31.550$ but there's gotta be other places in the world
- $00:42:31.550 \longrightarrow 00:42:32.597$ where that's not the case.
- $00:42:32.597 \longrightarrow 00:42:34.670$ But these surgeries are conducted everywhere.
- $00:42:34.670 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.840$ Not everyone can afford
- $00:42:36.840 \longrightarrow 00:42:39.480$ to use supplies in the same way that we do.
- $00:42:39.480 \longrightarrow 00:42:42.840$ And so this took me to a health care system
- 00:42:42.840 --> 00:42:45.800 called Aravind Eye Care, it's in Southern India.
- $00:42:45.800 \longrightarrow 00:42:46.670$ They're very notable.
- $00:42:46.670 \longrightarrow 00:42:47.890$ There's actually a Ted talk on them
- 00:42:47.890 --> 00:42:50.253 if you wanna learn more about what they do,
- $00{:}42{:}51.230$ --> $00{:}42{:}55.210$ they really developed out of financial efficiency models.
- 00:42:55.210 --> 00:42:58.350 So their founder initially thought,
- $00:42:58.350 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.070$ if McDonald's can make hamburgers so cheap
- $00:43:00.070 \longrightarrow 00:43:01.370$ for everyone around the world,
- $00:43:01.370 \longrightarrow 00:43:03.820$ why can't we make cataract care,
- $00:43:03.820 \longrightarrow 00:43:06.540$ just as cheap for everyone around the world?
- $00{:}43{:}06.540 \to 00{:}43{:}08.750$ So their mission is really geared at providing eye care
- $00:43:08.750 \longrightarrow 00:43:10.870$ for people who can barely afford it.
- $00:43:10.870 \longrightarrow 00:43:14.590$ And so they've designed a surgical center here
- $00{:}43{:}14.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}18.570$ that is very efficient, but is looking at reducing costs

 $00:43:18.570 \longrightarrow 00:43:21.010$ to the point where they can be a profitable health systems.

 $00:43:21.010 \longrightarrow 00:43:23.460$ They don't rely on donations, they're consistent.

 $00:43:24.560 \longrightarrow 00:43:27.320$ But where people can pay either the market rate

 $00:43:27.320 \longrightarrow 00:43:31.190$ or anything below that down to zero.

 $00:43:31.190 \longrightarrow 00:43:33.770$ So I think it's about 2/3 of their surgeries

 $00:43:33.770 \longrightarrow 00:43:37.050$ or 1/2 of their surgeries are free or reduced rate.

00:43:37.050 --> 00:43:39.100 And with the people who pay the full rate,

 $00:43:39.100 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.370$ they're actually a profitable model.

00:43:41.370 --> 00:43:44.030 And so it was really based out of finances,

 $00:43:44.030 \longrightarrow 00:43:45.280$ how they develop their efficiency.

 $00{:}43{:}45.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}48.380$ But I went there to look at, of course, the resource use;

 $00:43:48.380 \longrightarrow 00:43:51.140$ because that does tie into that financial efficiency.

 $00:43:51.140 \longrightarrow 00:43:53.030$ So here you can see their operating room,

 $00:43:53.030 \longrightarrow 00:43:55.230$ a little different from in the U S,

 $00{:}43{:}55.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}57.570$ we have four beds and two surgeons.

 $00:43:57.570 \longrightarrow 00:44:00.040$ So one surgeon operates on two beds.

00:44:00.040 --> 00:44:01.390 Typically they're operating on one bed

 $00:44:01.390 \longrightarrow 00:44:02.810$ while the other one's being prepped.

 $00{:}44{:}02.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}05.290$ They'll flip all the equipment over, operate on that one,

 $00:44:05.290 \longrightarrow 00:44:08.600$ while the first one is being kinda cleaned up

 $00:44:08.600 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.660$ and the next patient is brought in

 $00:44:09.660 \longrightarrow 00:44:12.490$ and they just go back and forth between the beds.

00:44:12.490 --> 00:44:15.180 So this really reduces their overhead.

 $00:44:15.180 \longrightarrow 00:44:16.013$ And you can also see

 $00:44:16.013 \longrightarrow 00:44:18.920$ that they have a lot of reusable supplies here.

00:44:18.920 --> 00:44:19.900 This is prior to COVID,

 $00:44:19.900 \longrightarrow 00:44:23.050$ things have changed a little bit during the pandemic;

 $00:44:23.050 \longrightarrow 00:44:24.870$ but essentially they have all reusable masks,

- 00:44:24.870 --> 00:44:28.720 gowns, head coverings, drapes,
- $00:44:28.720 \longrightarrow 00:44:31.470$ all of that stuff is reusable.
- $00:44:31.470 \longrightarrow 00:44:33.510$ So they've really cut down on the resource efficiency
- $00:44:33.510 \longrightarrow 00:44:35.170$ or resource use.
- 00:44:35.170 --> 00:44:37.787 And you may be wondering now, well,
- $00:44:37.787 \longrightarrow 00:44:38.970$ that's all well and good,
- 00:44:38.970 --> 00:44:41.890 but what about infection control practices?
- $00:44:41.890 \longrightarrow 00:44:44.510$ And that's where Aravind was particularly interesting
- $00:44:44.510 \longrightarrow 00:44:47.730$ to look at because they have really good metrics
- 00:44:47.730 --> 00:44:50.970 for their complication rates, rates of success,
- $00{:}44{:}50.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}54.450$ post-surgery, and they're actually better than the U S
- $00:44:54.450 \longrightarrow 00:44:56.080$ in quite a few metrics.
- $00:44:56.080 \longrightarrow 00:44:58.060$ So that last one there, the rates of endophthalmitis
- 00:44:58.060 --> 00:45:01.410 that's an eye infection that is not very common,
- $00:45:01.410 \longrightarrow 00:45:03.020$ but it's one of the worst outcomes
- $00:45:03.020 \longrightarrow 00:45:04.670$ you can get in a cataract surgery.
- $00:45:04.670 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.930$ And you can see the rates for that
- $00:45:05.930 \longrightarrow 00:45:07.273$ are much lower than the U S.
- $00:45:07.273 \longrightarrow 00:45:09.580$ So this is a really interesting place to look,
- $00:45:09.580 \longrightarrow 00:45:12.550$ because they're clearly doing their surgeries well,
- $00:45:12.550 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.670$ but in a very different way
- $00:45:13.670 \longrightarrow 00:45:15.370$ from how we do things in the U S.
- $00:45:16.410 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.610$ So while I was there and monitored their waste generation,
- $00:45:18.610 \longrightarrow 00:45:21.137$ this is just one visual for how different things are.
- 00:45:21.137 --> 00:45:25.300 And we have one phaco in the U S on the left,
- $00:45:25.300 \longrightarrow 00:45:26.830$ it's the garbage produced there;
- $00:45:26.830 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.450$ and 93 phacos are ovens on the right.
- $00:45:30.450 \longrightarrow 00:45:33.060$ So a huge difference in the amount of materials

- $00:45:33.060 \longrightarrow 00:45:35.283$ that we're using in each of these surgeries.
- $00:45:36.480 \longrightarrow 00:45:38.250$ This is look at the carbon footprint.
- $00:45:38.250 \longrightarrow 00:45:41.770$ So this is comparing Aravind to that U K based study.
- 00:45:41.770 --> 00:45:43.220 And what you'll notice is that,
- 00:45:43.220 --> 00:45:45.410 of course, the U K has a much higher footprint
- $00:45:45.410 \longrightarrow 00:45:49.230$ than Aravind does for the same procedure.
- 00:45:49.230 --> 00:45:51.660 So it's like driving car 500 kilometers in the U K,
- 00:45:51.660 --> 00:45:53.283 versus 25 kilometers in Aravind.
- 00:45:54.820 --> 00:45:57.190 And it's just really interesting to note this, right?
- $00:45:57.190 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.720$ We have the data now to show the resource use
- $00:45:59.720 \longrightarrow 00:46:02.220$ and these are just some ways to visualize it.
- 00:46:02.220 --> 00:46:04.850 So Aravind has some really interesting takeaways
- $00:46:04.850 \longrightarrow 00:46:06.170$ that we could potentially bring back
- $00:46:06.170 \longrightarrow 00:46:09.030$ to more developed countries.
- $00:46:09.030 \longrightarrow 00:46:11.000$ The first one is really about their physical layout.
- $00:46:11.000 \longrightarrow 00:46:12.870$ So they paid very close attention
- 00:46:12.870 --> 00:46:14.750 to setting up their operating rooms,
- 00:46:14.750 --> 00:46:18.840 in a way that would optimize for the surgeries themselves.
- $00{:}46{:}18.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}20.890$ So it's set up a lot like an assembly line.
- $00{:}46{:}20.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}24.050$ It may be uncomfortable for a lot of patients in America,
- $00:46:24.050 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.020$ at least to go through this;
- $00:46:25.020 \longrightarrow 00:46:26.680$ in India, didn't seem to be a problem at all
- $00{:}46{:}26.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}29.980$ but the patients are always the ones who are waiting.
- 00:46:29.980 --> 00:46:32.890 It's never the surgeons or the surgical teams,
- $00:46:32.890 \longrightarrow 00:46:34.920$ because they're the high value item.
- $00:46:34.920 \longrightarrow 00:46:37.710$ So patients are kind of ushered through the system.
- 00:46:37.710 --> 00:46:40.210 They're given their preoperative drugs.

- $00:46:40.210 \longrightarrow 00:46:42.180$ They go through anesthesia
- $00:46:42.180 \longrightarrow 00:46:43.850$ prior to going to the operating room.
- $00:46:43.850 \longrightarrow 00:46:46.327$ They are led into the operating room and let out.
- $00:46:46.327 \longrightarrow 00:46:48.190$ But the surgeons always have
- $00:46:48.190 \longrightarrow 00:46:50.350$ someone available to operate on.
- 00:46:50.350 --> 00:46:52.130 And it's part of that is the physical layout,
- $00{:}46{:}52.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}55.080$ the flow of the patients through that system.
- $00:46:55.080 \longrightarrow 00:46:57.140$ They also engage in what's called task shifting.
- $00:46:57.140 \longrightarrow 00:46:59.020$ So this is basically,
- 00:46:59.020 --> 00:47:01.510 they've trained a lot of young women actually,
- $00{:}47{:}01.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}03.390$ there's a different story on that end of the spectrum.
- 00:47:03.390 --> 00:47:05.190 But young women from the community
- 00:47:05.190 --> 00:47:07.970 are trained up basically as nurses,
- 00:47:07.970 --> 00:47:11.095 they call them mid-level ophthalmic professionals;
- $00:47:11.095 \longrightarrow 00:47:13.970$ and they handle a lot of these other tasks
- $00{:}47{:}13.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}17.253$ so that the surgeon can focus just on cataract surgeries.
- $00:47:18.100 \longrightarrow 00:47:20.900$ So the woman in the center here is their scrub nurse,
- 00:47:20.900 --> 00:47:23.600 the two in green, in the darker green,
- $00:47:23.600 \longrightarrow 00:47:25.100$ they're the ones bringing the patients in and out.
- 00:47:25.100 --> 00:47:28.130 They do the preoperative work and the post-operative work.
- $00:47:28.130 \longrightarrow 00:47:29.660$ Because you don't necessarily need a surgeon
- $00:47:29.660 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.320$ to do those things.
- $00:47:31.320 \longrightarrow 00:47:32.400$ So this allows the surgeon
- $00:47:32.400 \longrightarrow 00:47:35.823$ to just do cut to close cases all day in.
- $00:47:37.310 \longrightarrow 00:47:38.640$ Standardization is another thing
- $00:47:38.640 \longrightarrow 00:47:41.520$ that Aravind has gotten very good at.
- $00:47:41.520 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.353$ They have standardized
- $00:47:42.353 \longrightarrow 00:47:44.640$ of course, the pathway steps for the patients.

```
00:47:44.640 --> 00:47:46.040 So every patient's doing the same thing
```

 $00:47:46.040 \longrightarrow 00:47:47.640$ all the way through the surgery.

 $00:47:48.640 \longrightarrow 00:47:50.080$ They standardized the instrumentation.

00:47:50.080 --> 00:47:51.300 I think this is really important,

 $00:47:51.300 \longrightarrow 00:47:53.450$ because in the U S we see a lot of variability

 $00:47:53.450 \longrightarrow 00:47:57.090$ in what materials are used during the surgery,

 $00:47:57.090 \longrightarrow 00:48:00.270$ even if we have custom packs or standardized kits.

 $00:48:00.270 \longrightarrow 00:48:02.620$ So every surgeon might use a different proportion

 $00:48:02.620 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.140$ of those things.

 $00:48:04.140 \longrightarrow 00:48:05.510$ And even for reusable items

 $00:48:05.510 \longrightarrow 00:48:07.350$ that can lead to a lot of wasted effort,

 $00:48:07.350 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.940$ because we have to clean the whole kit,

 $00:48:08.940 \longrightarrow 00:48:10.910$ even if it's not used.

 $00{:}48{:}10.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}13.350$ So Aravind has standardized those instruments phase

 $00{:}48{:}13.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}15.960$ and pretty much every surgeon uses almost everything

 $00:48:15.960 \longrightarrow 00:48:17.750$ that's in there every time;

00:48:17.750 --> 00:48:19.830 which leads to this third part of standardization,

 $00:48:19.830 \longrightarrow 00:48:21.720$ which is the surgical approach.

 $00:48:21.720 \longrightarrow 00:48:23.210$ So there's very little variation

00:48:23.210 --> 00:48:25.950 between surgeons on how they operate,

00:48:25.950 --> 00:48:27.410 which means it could be a little bit boring

00:48:27.410 --> 00:48:28.810 for the surgeons themselves, right?

 $00{:}48{:}28.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}32.090$ They're able to do the surgery in about five to 10 minutes

 $00:48:32.090 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.040$ instead of the half hour to an hour, it takes here.

 $00:48:35.040 \longrightarrow 00:48:37.840$ So you can imagine if you're operating on 40 people a day,

 $00:48:37.840 \longrightarrow 00:48:39.140$ doing the same procedure over and over,

 $00:48:39.140 \longrightarrow 00:48:40.280$ it could get a little bit boring.

 $00:48:40.280 \longrightarrow 00:48:41.730$ But the benefit of that

```
00:48:41.730 \longrightarrow 00:48:44.270 is that everyone on surgical team
```

00:48:44.270 --> 00:48:45.960 knows exactly what's happening.

00:48:45.960 --> 00:48:47.930 And with that standardization,

 $00{:}48{:}47.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}51.400$ I think that actually improves your outcomes as well.

00:48:51.400 --> 00:48:52.680 Another thing they focus on of course

 $00:48:52.680 \longrightarrow 00:48:54.550$ is reducing their waste.

 $00:48:54.550 \longrightarrow 00:48:57.270$ Waste is just money thrown out the door.

00:48:57.270 --> 00:48:59.740 And to do this, they maximize reuse,

 $00:48:59.740 \longrightarrow 00:49:01.490$ and that includes their drugs.

 $00:49:01.490 \longrightarrow 00:49:02.880$ Their drugs are all multi-dose.

 $00:49:02.880 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.940$ So they're not throwing out partial bottles.

00:49:04.940 --> 00:49:07.310 They're using them on multiple patients,

 $00:49:07.310 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.743$ as long as they're safe.

 $00:49:09.850 \longrightarrow 00:49:12.410$ And they're able to basically reduce

00:49:12.410 --> 00:49:14.230 how much garbage they're producing,

 $00:49:14.230 \longrightarrow 00:49:16.070$ and also minimize how much material

00:49:16.070 --> 00:49:18.620 they're bringing into each surgery.

00:49:18.620 --> 00:49:20.640 Finally, and this is the most important,

 $00:49:20.640 \longrightarrow 00:49:22.782$ they're maintaining their safety.

 $00:49:22.782 \longrightarrow 00:49:23.640$ So they can't maintain,

00:49:23.640 --> 00:49:26.007 they can't actually achieve their mission, right?

00:49:26.007 --> 00:49:28.550 Of a high value eyecare for low costs,

 $00:49:28.550 \longrightarrow 00:49:31.960$ if their surgeries are not doing anything good

 $00:49:31.960 \longrightarrow 00:49:33.250$ for their patients.

 $00{:}49{:}33.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}35.010$ If the patients are leaving worse than they came in,

 $00:49:35.010 \longrightarrow 00:49:36.890$ and then there's no point in doing this at all.

00:49:36.890 --> 00:49:38.840 And that's probably the ultimate waste, right?

 $00:49:38.840 \longrightarrow 00:49:40.300$ Is surgeries that don't go well.

00:49:40.300 --> 00:49:44.480 So they're really careful about maintaining safety,

 $00:49:44.480 \longrightarrow 00:49:45.550$ about making sure that everything

 $00{:}49{:}45.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}49.150$ that needs to be sterilized between cases is sterilized.

 $00:49:49.150 \longrightarrow 00:49:52.003$ and that's really key to their model for its success.

 $00:49:53.590 \longrightarrow 00:49:55.740$ So to go back into the U S,

 $00:49:55.740 \longrightarrow 00:49:58.920$ we see a lot of variability in our cases.

 $00:49:58.920 \longrightarrow 00:50:01.030$ So this is just to look at surgical supply costs

00:50:01.030 --> 00:50:04.140 for phacoemuls ification of five different U S facilities.

00:50:04.140 --> 00:50:07.260 And you can see a wide range in cost of supplies,

 $00:50:07.260 \longrightarrow 00:50:09.410$ whether it's kind of the purple stuff on the bottom,

 $00:50:09.410 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.480$ which are the single use supplies,

00:50:11.480 --> 00:50:14.210 or if it's drugs or the IOLs, inocula lens

 $00:50:14.210 \longrightarrow 00:50:17.810$ that they're replacing the cataract with.

 $00{:}50{:}17.810 --> 00{:}50{:}21.363$ Here's our ovens costs, so much, much smaller of course.

 $00:\!50:\!22.260 --> 00:\!50:\!24.310$ We wanted to focus a little bit more on the drugs here

 $00.50:24.310 \longrightarrow 00.50:27.660$ in the U S because it was a contentious point

 $00:50:27.660 \longrightarrow 00:50:29.260$ for a lot of the surgeons we were talking to,

 $00:50:29.260 \longrightarrow 00:50:30.340$ may find they were throwing away

 $00:50:30.340 \longrightarrow 00:50:33.040$ so much of it unnecessarily.

 $00:50:33.040 \longrightarrow 00:50:36.960$ So we went in to four different medical centers

 $00:50:36.960 \longrightarrow 00:50:37.980$ in the Northeastern U S,

 $00{:}50{:}37.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}40.430$ and just measured how much of these drugs were thrown out

 $00{:}50{:}40.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}42.650$ after every cataract case.

00:50:42.650 --> 00:50:43.750 And here are our findings, right?

 $00:50:43.750 \longrightarrow 00:50:45.110$ So the eyedrops in particular,

 $00:50:45.110 \longrightarrow 00:50:47.720$ were heavily wasted between patients.

 $00{:}50{:}47.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}49.810$ So these are, they'll put a couple drops on a patient's eye

 $00:50:49.810 \longrightarrow 00:50:51.640$ and then they have to throw out the whole bottle.

- $00:50:51.640 \longrightarrow 00:50:53.870$ Even if the bottle is labeled as multi-dose,
- $00:50:53.870 \longrightarrow 00:50:55.970$ as is the case with dilating drops,
- $00:50:55.970 \longrightarrow 00:50:58.190$ even if the bottle is something that the patients
- 00:50:58.190 --> 00:51:00.260 would be using after their surgery,
- $00:51:00.260 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.520$ as this case of antibiotics.
- $00:51:02.520 \longrightarrow 00:51:03.943$ And you can see for eyedrops,
- $00:51:03.943 \longrightarrow 00:51:06.690$ that almost 80% of the drugs are thrown out
- $00:51:06.690 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.843$ at two of our sites.
- 00:51:09.150 --> 00:51:10.117 This has financial cost, right?
- $00:51:10.117 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.930$ You pay for those drugs at those two sites
- 00:51:12.930 --> 00:51:15.940 that threw out the most, that's \$190,000 worth of drugs
- $00:51:15.940 \longrightarrow 00:51:18.500$ to run out each year from cataract surgeries.
- $00{:}51{:}18.500 \rightarrow 00{:}51{:}21.030$ That would pay for an additional 53 cataract surgeries
- $00:51:21.030 \dashrightarrow 00:51:24.620$ at each location, if we somehow didn't throw them out.
- 00:51:24.620 --> 00:51:26.020 On the environmental side, of course,
- 00:51:26.020 --> 00:51:29.480 we're manufacturing and delivering these drugs,
- $00:51:29.480 \longrightarrow 00:51:31.310$ and that has a carbon footprint.
- $00:51:31.310 \longrightarrow 00:51:33.040$ So the two sites that wasted the most
- $00{:}51{:}33.040$ --> $00{:}51{:}37.750$ are throwing out about 105,000 metric tons of CO2 unused.
- $00{:}51{:}37.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}40.930$ We've already admitted those and we're not even using them.
- $00{:}51{:}40.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}43.350$ That's like driving a car between Alaska and Florida,
- $00:51:43.350 \longrightarrow 00:51:45.290 51,000$ times a year.
- $00:51:45.290 \longrightarrow 00:51:46.920$ And these are just like a single site.
- 00:51:46.920 --> 00:51:48.040 That's throwing away these drugs
- $00:51:48.040 \longrightarrow 00:51:49.730$ in their cataract surgeries.
- 00:51:49.730 --> 00:51:51.780 So there's a lot of waste happening here.
- 00:51:52.750 --> 00:51:54.780 This led us to conduct a national survey, right?

 $00{:}51{:}54.780 --> 00{:}51{:}58.230$ We're wondering if what we're observing in our surgeons

00:51:58.230 --> 00:51:59.180 is universally true,

 $00:51:59.180 \longrightarrow 00:52:00.520$ where they're frustrated with the amount of waste.

 $00:52:00.520 \longrightarrow 00:52:02.740$ So we surveyed

 $00:52:02.740 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.210$ members of the top four ophthalmological societies,

 $00:52:06.210 \longrightarrow 00:52:07.921$ and had about 5%

00:52:07.921 --> 00:52:12.190 of the U S ophthalmological population respond.

00:52:12.190 --> 00:52:13.220 And the major conclusion,

 $00:52:13.220 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.450$ is yes, they're concerned about climate change.

00:52:15.450 --> 00:52:17.050 Yes, they're concerned about how much trash

 $00:52:17.050 \longrightarrow 00:52:19.320$ is generated in the operating rooms.

 $00{:}52{:}19.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}21.850$ We asked them very specific questions about what drugs

 $00:52:21.850 \longrightarrow 00:52:25.520$ or supplies they would consider reusing or multiusing.

 $00:52:25.520 \longrightarrow 00:52:27.277$ And there was actually a surprising number

 $00:52:27.277 \longrightarrow 00:52:29.230$ who were comfortable with that,

 $00:52:29.230 \longrightarrow 00:52:32.330$ that they would prefer reusable over disposable.

 $00{:}52{:}32.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}35.480$ But they felt that there was too many regulatory barriers

00:52:35.480 --> 00:52:38.630 to doing so, is a liability issue more than anything else.

00:52:38.630 --> 00:52:40.560 So they wanted more discretion to reuse,

 $00:52:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:52:42.220$ and they also wanted manufacturers

 $00:52:42.220 \longrightarrow 00:52:45.310$ to do more to consider the carbon footprint.

 $00:52:45.310 \dashrightarrow 00:52:47.260$ So these are some really interesting takeaways

 $00:52:47.260 \longrightarrow 00:52:50.330$ that led for two of the ophthalmological sites

 $00:52:50.330 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.600$ to join the medical society consortium

 $00:52:52.600 \longrightarrow 00:52:53.860$ on climate and health.

 $00:52:53.860 \longrightarrow 00:52:56.040$ So they're engaging a little bit more

 $00:52:56.040 \longrightarrow 00:52:58.240$ on this political side.

 $00:52:58.240 \longrightarrow 00:53:00.130$ So overall, what I love for you to take away

 $00{:}53{:}00.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}01.600$ from this particular presentation

 $00:53:01.600 \longrightarrow 00:53:04.210$ is that low resource settings may be a great place

 $00:53:04.210 \longrightarrow 00:53:06.060$ to look for more efficient resource use.

 $00:53:06.060 \longrightarrow 00:53:08.050$ And the surgeries are conducted all over the world.

 $00:53:08.050 \longrightarrow 00:53:10.670$ There are sites globally that are doing this very well,

 $00:53:10.670 \longrightarrow 00:53:13.610$ but with a very different resource use profile.

 $00:53:13.610 \longrightarrow 00:53:15.920$ Not every place can afford to throw away supplies

 $00:53:15.920 \longrightarrow 00:53:17.380$ like we do here in the U S.

00:53:17.380 --> 00:53:19.400 And so if you're looking for ways to change that,

 $00:53:19.400 \longrightarrow 00:53:21.923$ there are great examples already out there.

 $00:53:23.660 \longrightarrow 00:53:25.720$ And I think another of this

 $00:53:25.720 \longrightarrow 00:53:29.080$ is that we're all individually passionate about this,

 $00{:}53{:}29.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}32.660$ but at some point we have to build this up to a larger level

 $00:53:32.660 \longrightarrow 00:53:34.170$ and engaging with your professional societies

 $00:53:34.170 \longrightarrow 00:53:37.020$ is a great way to leverage those collective voices.

00:53:37.020 --> 00:53:38.360 It helps to gather the data of course,

00:53:38.360 --> 00:53:42.150 to have carbon footprinting data, perhaps even surveys

 $00:53:42.150 \longrightarrow 00:53:44.640$ to show how widespread this interest is.

 $00:53:44.640 \longrightarrow 00:53:46.170$ But engaging those professionals societies

00:53:46.170 --> 00:53:51.000 is a really great way to try to create political change

 $00:53:51.000 \longrightarrow 00:53:52.620$ much more quickly.

00:53:52.620 --> 00:53:53.860 And finally, I like to say this,

 $00:53:53.860 \longrightarrow 00:53:57.600$ 'cause a lot of physicians are a little anti-industry

 $00:53:57.600 \longrightarrow 00:53:58.560$ and I can understand why.

 $00:53:58.560 \longrightarrow 00:54:01.650$ But industry is part of this puzzle as well.

 $00.54:01.650 \longrightarrow 00.54:03.440$ So the people who manufacture these devices

 $00:54:03.440 \longrightarrow 00:54:05.030$ also set the instructions for use

- $00:54:05.030 \longrightarrow 00:54:06.660$ and influence regulation on them.
- $00:54:06.660 \longrightarrow 00:54:07.940$ And you're not gonna change the system
- $00:54:07.940 \longrightarrow 00:54:10.190$ without engaging industry as well.
- $00:54:10.190 \longrightarrow 00:54:11.820$ So these are some of the major things
- 00:54:11.820 --> 00:54:15.350 that I think could really help any specialty
- $00:54:15.350 \longrightarrow 00:54:17.340$ who's looking to change their carbon footprint
- $00:54:17.340 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.300$ and make health care more clinically sustainable.
- $00:54:20.300 \longrightarrow 00:54:23.740$ So I have a few funding support shown here,
- $00:54:23.740 \longrightarrow 00:54:24.890$ that I'd like to thank,
- $00{:}54{:}25.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}28.390$ and of course, lots of research partners.
- $00:54:28.390 \longrightarrow 00:54:29.280$ So I will leave it at that.
- 00:54:29.280 --> 00:54:32.650 If you do have any questions, please feel free to email me.
- $00{:}54{:}32.650 \rightarrow 00{:}54{:}34.900$ I may be on maternity leave for the next few months,
- $00:54:34.900 \longrightarrow 00:54:36.750$ but I will try to get back to you.
- $00:54:36.750 \longrightarrow 00:54:37.583$ Thank you.
- 00:54:43.900 --> 00:54:46.540 Fantastic, and apologies again
- $00{:}54{:}46.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}50.790$ for not having Dr. Cassandra Thiel in person with us,
- $00:54:50.790 \longrightarrow 00:54:52.240$ but we are very grateful
- $00:54:52.240 \longrightarrow 00:54:55.190$ that she was able to do that ahead of time.
- 00:54:55.190 --> 00:54:58.790 All right, so as we close out the session here,
- 00.54.58.790 -> 00.55.03.790 we really only have a short moment to do a Q&A.
- 00:55:06.470 --> 00:55:09.960 And so I want to open up the question
- $00:55:09.960 \longrightarrow 00:55:11.990$ for maybe a 60 second answer
- 00:55:11.990 --> 00:55:14.683 for each of our panelists on the line.
- $00:55:15.610 \longrightarrow 00:55:17.250$ How have you been able
- $00:55:17.250 \longrightarrow 00:55:21.070$ to incorporate environmental sustainability
- 00:55:21.070 --> 00:55:25.660 into your relationships with patients or colleagues,
- $00:55:25.660 \longrightarrow 00:55:28.920$ to really spread this as part of the culture
- $00:55:28.920 \longrightarrow 00:55:30.100$ within your health system,

- $00:55:30.100 \longrightarrow 00:55:32.730$ or roles with other organizations?
- $00:55:32.730 \longrightarrow 00:55:35.140$ So that culture and that relationship component.
- $00:55:35.140 \longrightarrow 00:55:36.743$ Maybe 60 seconds each.
- $00:55:39.030 \longrightarrow 00:55:41.450$ I'm happy to go first.
- $00:55:41.450 \longrightarrow 00:55:42.700$ As an anesthesiologist,
- $00:55:42.700 \longrightarrow 00:55:46.180$ it's less a conversation I have with my patients.
- $00:55:46.180 \longrightarrow 00:55:48.750$ It's just not something that comes up.
- $00:55:48.750 \longrightarrow 00:55:50.940$ But I have it every single day with my colleagues.
- $00:55:50.940 \longrightarrow 00:55:53.470$ And basically my observation
- $00{:}55{:}53.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}55.340$ is driven every single research question
- $00:55:55.340 \longrightarrow 00:55:56.340$ that I've addressed.
- $00:55:58.685 \longrightarrow 00:56:01.420$ Just as an example, the question about reusable
- $00:56:01.420 \longrightarrow 00:56:03.600$ versus disposable laryngoscopes that came about
- $00:56:03.600 \longrightarrow 00:56:05.130$ because there was a sweeping trend
- $00:56:05.130 \longrightarrow 00:56:07.010$ toward disposable laryngoscopes
- $00:56:07.010 \longrightarrow 00:56:09.150$ that was (indistinct) evidence-based.
- 00:56:09.150 --> 00:56:12.510 It came from a loophole in the regulations,
- $00{:}56{:}12.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}16.500$ and how it was interpreted by the joint commission.
- $00:56:16.500 \longrightarrow 00:56:18.530$ And so after doing,
- $00:56:18.530 \longrightarrow 00:56:23.280$ not only LCA looking at the emissions and costs,
- $00:56:23.280 \longrightarrow 00:56:25.740$ we also, I also had to do a careful review
- $00:56:25.740 \longrightarrow 00:56:27.120$ in the infection control literature,
- $00{:}56{:}27.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}30.330$ and there was nothing to substantiate the transition.
- $00:56:30.330 \longrightarrow 00:56:31.730$ So that has been an ongoing battle.
- $00:56:31.730 \longrightarrow 00:56:34.720$ And that is just one device out of thousands.
- 00:56:34.720 --> 00:56:36.150 But as a conversation I have every day,
- $00:56:36.150 \longrightarrow 00:56:38.650$ I work in a teaching institution every day.
- $00{:}56{:}38.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}43.040$ My residents are drilled on both resource conservation
- $00:56:43.040 \longrightarrow 00:56:45.210$ and environmental preferable practices,

```
00:56:45.210 --> 00:56:47.570 where we have data in my specialty
```

 $00:56:47.570 \longrightarrow 00:56:49.610$ because of my research collaborations.

 $00:56:49.610 \longrightarrow 00:56:50.780$ We have a lot of information,

 $00:56:50.780 \longrightarrow 00:56:52.780$ but that's not true of many specialties.

 $00:56:55.120 \longrightarrow 00:56:56.890$ - Thank you Dr. Sherman

 $00:56:56.890 \longrightarrow 00:56:57.723$ - I would add

 $00:56:57.723 \longrightarrow 00:57:00.850$ that it's challenging in the emergency department

 $00:57:00.850 \longrightarrow 00:57:03.620$ to have long conversations about topics

 $00:57:03.620 \longrightarrow 00:57:07.370$ that are not directly germane to the care at hand,

 $00:57:07.370 \longrightarrow 00:57:10.720$ but with my patients, certainly patients

 $00:57:10.720 \longrightarrow 00:57:13.520$ who come in with asthma exacerbations,

00:57:13.520 --> 00:57:17.920 or respiratory illnesses, or heat exposure,

 $00:57:17.920 \longrightarrow 00:57:19.890$ or plenty of other conditions,

00:57:19.890 --> 00:57:21.920 I'll frequently mentioned that;

00:57:21.920 --> 00:57:24.170 if you're wondering why this is happening,

 $00{:}57{:}24.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}27.170$ all ergens are a lot worse now than they used to be.

 $00:57:27.170 \longrightarrow 00:57:31.280$ And heat exposure is an important factor.

00:57:31.280 --> 00:57:33.200 And then certainly with my colleagues,

 $00{:}57{:}33.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}36.170$ both on the clinical side and the administrative side,

 $00:57:36.170 \longrightarrow 00:57:39.890$ I have conversations at least daily

 $00.57:39.890 \longrightarrow 00.57:43.590$ about the environmental impact that we have

 $00:57:43.590 \longrightarrow 00:57:45.340$ and how it's harming our patients.

 $00:57:45.340 \longrightarrow 00:57:48.423$ So it's a big factor in our clinical care.

 $00{:}57{:}50.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}53.173$ - Thank you so much Dr. Slutzman.

00:57:54.020 --> 00:57:57.480 So as we wrap up here together everyone,

 $00:57:57.480 \longrightarrow 00:57:59.220$ I just wanna share gratitude again

00:57:59.220 --> 00:58:01.120 for my colleague Dr. Amy Collins,

00:58:01.120 --> 00:58:03.140 in the preparation for this session;

00:58:03.140 --> 00:58:05.120 of course, our presenters today;

00:58:05.120 --> 00:58:07.850 Dr. Jodi Sherman, Dr. Jonathan Slutzman

 $00:58:07.850 \longrightarrow 00:58:09.640$ and Dr. Cassandra Thiel.

00:58:09.640 --> 00:58:11.430 And if you're interested in learning more,

 $00:58:11.430 \longrightarrow 00:58:13.920$ check out these websites and resources,

 $00:58:13.920 \longrightarrow 00:58:15.770$ especially the Physician Network

 $00:58:15.770 \longrightarrow 00:58:17.703$ and the Nurses Climate Challenge.

00:58:18.838 --> 00:58:20.420 And as a reminder,

 $00:58:20.420 \longrightarrow 00:58:23.210$ this session will be posted on the website linked below.

 $00:58:23.210 \longrightarrow 00:58:25.950$ And if you have further questions after this session,

 $00:58:25.950 \longrightarrow 00:58:28.190$ feel free to reach out to either myself

 $00:58:28.190 \longrightarrow 00:58:29.973$ or Dr. Amy Collins.

00:58:30.810 --> 00:58:32.350 Thank you again for joining us

 $00:58:32.350 \longrightarrow 00:58:34.927$ all during this challenging time in health care,

 $00:58:34.927 \longrightarrow 00:58:38.260$ and we are so grateful to have so many allies in this work.

 $00:58:38.260 \longrightarrow 00:58:42.330$ Stay safe, stay healthy, and thank you all.

 $00:58:42.330 \longrightarrow 00:58:43.163$ Bye now.