



COP - R C O R P

Communities of Practice for Rural Communities Opioid Response Program

Local Sustainability Plan

Fairfield County, Ohio

Fairfield County Opiate Task Force

Fairfield County Alcohol, Drug Addiction and Mental Health Board

2020

This page is intentionally blank.

Acknowledgements

HRSA CoP-RCORP is funded by the HRSA Rural Communities Opioid Response Program-Implementation: HRSA-19-082, CFDA: 93.912 grants GA1RH33529 and GA1RH33529.

The Fairfield County Opiate Task Force acknowledges the time and efforts that consortium members and other stakeholders contributed to the development of this local sustainability plan.

As the convening leads for the CoP-RCORP master consortium, Ohio University's Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs (OU-VS) and the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE) braid their funding through a shared services approach and work collaboratively with project directors and staff from the local CoP-RCORP backbone organizations to provide leadership, training, capacity building, technical assistance and evaluation services, and management oversight for project activities. This local sustainability plan represents the shared work of the Fairfield County Opiate Task Force (local consortium), the Fairfield County Alcohol, Drug Addiction and Mental Health Board (backbone organization), and the CoP-RCORP Training, Technical Assistance, and Evaluation Team (OU-VS and PIRE).

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Measuring Sustainability	3
Local Sustainability Plan	4
Conclusion.....	7
References	8
APPENDIX A.....	1
APPENDIX B.....	2

Fairfield County Opiate Task Force
CoP-RCORP
Fairfield County, OH
Sustainability Plan
February 2021

Grantee Organization	Ohio University Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs	
Grant Number	GA1RH33529	
Address	Building 21, The Ridges, Room 204, 1 Ohio University, Athens OH 45701-2979	
Service Area	Fairfield County	
Project Director	Name:	Holly Raffle
	Title:	Professor
	Phone number:	740.597.1710
	Email address:	raffle@ohio.edu
Local Project Lead	Name:	Toni Ashton
	Title:	Prevention Coordinator
	Phone number:	740-654-0829
	Email address:	740-654-0829
Contributing Consortium Members and Stakeholders	Rhonda Myers, Executive Director, Fairfield County ADAMH Board	
	Marcy Fields, Fairfield County ADAMH Board	
	David Suman, Fairfield County ADAMH Board	
	Patricia Waits, Fairfield County ADAMH Board	
	Toni Ashton, Fairfield County ADAMH Board	
	Jeffery Scott Duff, Director, Project FORT (Fairfield Opiate Response Team)	
	Trisha Farrar, Executive Director, The Recovery Center	
	Phil Pack, CEO, New Horizons Mental Health Services	
	Nicole Yandell, COP-RCORP Training, Technical Assistance, & Evaluation Team	
	Casey Shepherd, COP-RCORP Training, Technical Assistance, & Evaluation Team	
	Laura Milazzo, COP-RCORP Training, Technical Assistance, & Evaluation Team	

Introduction

RCORP Initiative

The Rural Communities Opioid Response Program (RCORP) is a multi-year initiative supported by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), an operating division of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, to address barriers to access in rural communities related to substance use disorder (SUD), including opioid use disorder (OUD). RCORP funds multi-sector consortia to enhance their ability to implement and sustain SUD/OUD prevention, treatment, and recovery services in underserved rural areas. The overall goal of the RCORP initiative is to reduce the morbidity and mortality associated with opioid overdoses in high-risk rural communities by strengthening the organizational and infrastructural capacity of multi-sector consortiums to address prevention, treatment, and recovery. To support funded RCORP consortia, HRSA also funded a national technical assistance provider, JBS International.

CoP-RCORP Consortium

In 2018, with support from the state of Ohio (viz. Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services and Ohio Department of Health), Ohio University's Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs (OU-VS) and the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE) applied and received two \$200,000 RCORP planning grants. In turn, OU-VS funded community organizations in Ashtabula and Fairfield counties and PIRE funded those in Sandusky and Washington counties. Through a shared services agreement, OU-VS and PIRE braided their funding together and created fiscal efficiencies to fund a fifth in Seneca County. In addition, the efficiencies allowed a project website to be created to organize, share, and archive innovative project strategies.

As system conveners (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner, 2015) of the Communities of Practice for Rural Communities Opioid Response Program (CoP-RCORP), faculty and staff from OU-VS and PIRE brought together representatives from three county behavioral health authorities in Ashtabula, Fairfield, and Seneca counties and two county health departments in Sandusky and Washington counties during the planning phase. Each of the five community-based organizations acted as backbone fiscal support for a local consortium and oversaw the project activities being carried out in their community. The CoP-RCORP master consortium utilized a community of practice (Wenger & McDermott, 2002) approach where representatives from the local consortia collaboratively engaged in peer learning and grant activities facilitated by OU-VS and PIRE.


At the end of the planning grant, OU-VS and PIRE each led efforts with respective community representatives and submitted separate proposals for RCORP-Implementation funding. HRSA awarded OU-VS and PIRE each \$1 million over three-years. In August 2019, OU-

VS and PIRE entered into another shared services agreement and braided funding to continue growing the community of practice model being utilized with the master consortium. The implementation funding includes 15 required core activities, which span the continuum of care and include prevention, treatment, and recovery to reduce the morbidity and mortality associated with opioid overdoses in high-risk rural communities. Sustaining those local efforts is a critical overarching goal.

Process-wise, the CoP holds monthly master consortium meetings to learn from one another. At the conclusion of Year 1, the Washington County Behavioral Health Board and the CoP-RCORP Master Consortium separated. Currently, the master consortium includes representatives from the following four communities: Ashtabula, Fairfield, Sandusky, and Seneca counties.

As the convening lead for the master consortium, OU-VS and PIRE work with members of the master consortium to advance the core activities at the local level. The master consortium also draws on state-based resources to inform policies, programs, and practices. See the figure below for an organizational graphic. More information about the organizational structure and initiative may be found on the project website:

communitiesofpractice-rcorp.com.



Measuring Sustainability

Under the CoP-RCORP initiative, OU-VS and PIRE approached sustainability as a process with a two-fold purpose. First, we wanted to make sure we fulfilled the RCORP grant requirements. Moreover, we wanted to ensure local consortia had the information they needed to continue supporting their local infrastructure in addressing ongoing opiate use disorder (OUD) issues. This locally driven type of process follows a format that has successfully been used in other Ohio initiatives, which involves assessing what needs to be sustained first, followed by a set of reflection questions about how to shore up the issues identified.

In particular, OU-VS and PIRE wanted each local consortium to think about how they could continue to build and sustain their local capacity to plan and address OUD on an ongoing basis. We utilized this approach in part based on our developmental evaluation and capacity building experience over the years which has illustrated the importance of: (a) clarifying what to continue or sustain (Mancini & Marek, 2002; Weiss, Coffman, & Bohan-Baker, 2002), (b) understanding the public value, authorizing environment, and operational capacity needed for sustainability (Moore, 1995), and (c) viewing sustainability as a process rather than an outcome (Schell, et al., 2013).

Near the end of implementation year 1, HRSA and JBS International asked all phase 1 grantees to complete a set of sustainability assessments and develop a plan based on those findings. That process occurred at the master consortium level. In addition, OU-VS and PIRE asked each community organization to complete a local sustainability assessment process. The balance of this report describes that local process, the findings, and plan for next steps.

Washington University Program Sustainability Assessment Tool

Each of the four project directors conducted an online assessment utilizing the Program Sustainability Assessment Tool (PSAT) from Washington University in St. Louis. The PSAT includes 40-items arranged into eight domains: Environmental Support, Funding Stability, Partnerships, Organizational Capacity, Program Evaluation, Program Adaptation, Communications, and Strategic Planning. Using a scale from 1 to 7, project directors rated the extent to which each process or structure exists in their consortium, with a 1 meaning no extent and 7 meaning full extent. See Luke, Calhoun, Robichaux, Elliott, and Moreland-Russell (2014) for more information about the tool.

Community organizations were offered two options for completing the sustainability assessment tool. In the first option, a core local planning team met as a group to discuss and

rate each question. Upon reaching consensus, the group entered a score for each question and received a summary report with the results. Alternatively, each identified member of the core local planning group answered all the questions independently. The project director then received a report that averaged the responses. The Fairfield County Opiate Task Force chose the option of average score.

Local Sustainability Plan

Fairfield County Opiate Task Force

The Fairfield County Opiate Task Force serves as the local consortium for the RCORP-Planning grant, while the Fairfield County Alcohol, Drug Addiction and Mental Health Board operates as the backbone organization. To develop and strengthen the local consortium, the following individuals engaged in a sustainability assessment and reflection process (Core Sustainability Planning Team):

- Toni Ashton, David Suman, Patricia Waits, Marcy Fields

Sustainability Plan

Reflection questions and assessment results. After completing the online PSAT assessment tool, communities received a summary of their assessment results that reported the average score for each domain (see Appendix A for a copy of the Summary Assessment Results). Next, each community reviewed the summary results and reflected on several questions developed by OU-VS and PIRE based on the guidance from JBS International (see Appendix A for a copy of the Reflection Questions). Table 1 below shows the overall sustainability assessment results and prioritized domain and score for that domain.

Table 1. Sustainability Assessment Results for Fairfield County Alcohol, Drug Addiction and Mental Health Board, October 2020

County	Assessment Approach	Overall Sustainability Assessment Score	Overall Assessment Range	Prioritized Domain(s)	Assessment Score(s) for Prioritized Domain(s)
Fairfield County	Average Score	4.9	4.3 - 5.7	Communications & Environmental Support	4.6 & 5.3

Assessment summary. To begin reviewing the assessment results, the Fairfield County Sustainability Planning Team conducted a SWOT analysis by categorizing the various domains as

strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, or threats. They also discussed why they categorized a domain as a strength, weakness, opportunity, or threat (see Table 2).

Table 2. SWOT Analysis on the Sustainability Assessment Domains

Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>Organizational Capacity Strong leadership who has experience in leading other coalitions.</p> <p>Environmental Support Strong support from member’s organizations and the ADAMH board. However not so much from local leaders and community members.</p>	<p>Funding Stability The Opiate Task Force has a lack of flexible and long-term funding. The funding that the OTF receives is prescriptive in nature.</p>
Opportunities	Threats
<p>Communication Talk about possibly including ADAMH’s PR person (Latina Duffy) in the coalition so she can help with reaching out to people via social media and advertising. Increase in advertising about education events to help fight stigma, and increased involvement in smaller communities outside of Lancaster and Pickerington.</p>	<p>Program Adaptation The Opiate Task Force has adapted to online meetings and less/smaller events because of COVID but is still a challenge and threat to the coalition.</p> <p>Environmental Support The program has little to no public support in smaller communities outside of Lancaster and Pickerington. Even inside of Lancaster and Pickerington there is still backlash from some community members.</p> <p>Communications Educating the public on OUD and the purpose of the Opiate Task Force. Increasing overall visibility and try to address stigma.</p>

Problem statement. The Fairfield County Sustainability Planning Team identified one domain area that represents a key weakness or threat for the sustainability of the local consortium to address OUD. The weakness or threat domain to address is communication/ environmental support (stigma).

Selecting this area was prioritized because of the lack of education about Opiate Use Disorder, many community members grasp onto ideas that they hear in the media and this is how negative thoughts are formed by a group of people that can lead to stigmatizing behavior. We would like to increase community (environmental) support by using communications. The Opiate Task Force has had issues holding events due to fear of community backlash by organizations or local political leaders.

Population of focus. The organizations, agencies, community leaders, and staff/personnel who need to be present to work on this problem include Opiate Task Force members and the organizations that they represent.

Goals and objectives. The goal this group will work toward addressing and at least one key objective follow. Table 3 lists the specific activities for the goal and objectives.

Goal Statement: Changing community attitude towards a subject is difficult. However, through education opportunities and increased awareness, our goal is to start addressing the issue of stigma against SUD, MAT Services, and Narcan within local communities.

Key Objective(s): Increasing knowledge/communication and decreasing stigma.

Table 3. Specific Activities for Goals and Objectives

Activity	Start Date	End Date	Responsible Party	Resources
Discussion of increasing knowledge of SUD and decreasing stigma at the Opiate Task Force Meeting	12/12/2020	Ongoing	OTF Committee Co-Chairs	Stigma Resources shared by Ohio University and PIRE Tools. Templates, materials, TTAE expertise
Ask members of the Opiate Task Force to share PowerPoints or “elevator speech’s” to use when educating mayors and community members on stigma.	1/12/2021	Ongoing	All OTF Sub-Committee Members	
Peer Support Involvement in the Opiate Task Force to assist in reducing stigma	11/12/2020	Ongoing	Recovery Support Sub-Committee Chair	Obtain a list of peer supporters in Fairfield County
Contact Mayors in the targeted zip code areas to a meeting to discuss the Opiate Task Force, educate them on SUD and stigma	4/12/2021	Ongoing	OTF Committee Co-Chairs	
With Mayors assistance schedule community townhall meetings to share information with community members about SUD and stigma	5/12/2021	Ongoing		Meeting space in each of the villages, Narcan to distribute, Deterra bags to distribute, printed materials to distribute

Evaluate the community townhall meetings by reviewing evaluation that include questions regarding knowledge and stigma	5/12/2021 After each townhall meeting	Ongoing		Opiate Task Force members
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	---------	--	---------------------------

Long-term outcomes and indicators. Below are the long-term change outcomes and indicators to define how change will be demonstrated.

Long-term Outcome: We hope to decrease stigma in communities throughout Fairfield County and increase community involvement within the coalition and events that we hold.

Long-term Indicator: There will be a stigma survey administered by the RCORP Stigma Workgroup. We hope to use the results of that survey as a baseline of community stigma. After our efforts we would like to re-administer the survey to see if community attitude has changed.
Other indicators include, increase of community activity with the coalition and events as well as more community support on social media.

Conclusion

Affordability and Accessibility of OUD Prevention, Treatment, & Recovery

The Fairfield County Opiate Task Force will use the following outcome statement: “The Fairfield County Opiate Task Force keeps the focus on affordability and accessibility of OUD prevention, treatment, and recovery services to individuals” on each monthly meeting agenda, as a reminder that this is what we are trying to accomplish with the implementation grant.

Prioritization of Evaluation

The Fairfield County Opiate Task Force is aware of that the entire future of treating mental health and substance abuse disorders is dependent on metrics. For data, we will refer to the surveys and community involvement in events and/or education opportunities. Everything we are doing is to show how we are making an impact on the community climate.

References

- Luke, D. A., Calhoun, A., Robichaux, C. B., Elliott, M. B., and Moreland-Russell, S. (2014). The program sustainability assessment tool: A new instrument for public health programs. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 11.
- Mancini, J. A., & Marek, L. I. (2004). Sustaining community-based programs for families: Conceptualization and measurement. *Family Relations*, 53, 339-347. doi: 10.1111/j.0197-6664.2004.00040.x
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schell, S. F., Luke, D. A., Schoole, M. W., Elliott, M. B., Herbers, S. H., Mueller, N. B., & Bunger, A. C. (2013). Public health program capacity for sustainability: A new framework. *Implementation Science*, 8(15).
- Weiss, H., Coffman, J., & Bohan-Baker, M. (2002). *Evaluation's role in supporting initiative sustainability*. Retrieved from Harvard Kennedy School of Government website: <http://www.hks.harvard.edu/urbanpoverty/Urban%20Seminars/December2002/Weiss.pdf>
- Wenger E, McDermott R, Snyder W. (2002). *Cultivating Communities of Practice: A Guide to Managing Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Wenger-Trayner, B, Wenger-Trayner E. (2015). System conveners in complex landscapes. In: Wenger-Trayner E, Fenton-O'Creevy, F, Hutchinson, S, Kubiak C, Wenger-Trayer B, eds. *Learning in Landscapes of Practice: Boundaries, Identity, and Knowledgeability in Practice-Based Learning*. New York, NY: Routledge; 132-147.

APPENDIX A

Local Consortium Sustainability Assessment Report

Many factors can affect sustainability, such as financial and political climates, organizational characteristics, and elements of evaluation and communication. The **Program Sustainability Assessment Tool (PSAT)** allows stakeholders to rate their programs on the extent to which they have processes and structures in place that will increase the likelihood of sustainability. Assessment results can then be used to identify next steps in building program capacity for sustainability in order to position efforts for long term success.

Interpreting the Results

The table presents the average rating for each sustainability domain based on the responses provided by 4 participants. The remainder of the document presents the average ratings for indicators within each domain. There is no minimum rating that guarantees the sustainability of a program. However, lower ratings do indicate opportunities for improvement that a program may want to focus on when developing a plan for sustainability.

Next Steps

- These results can be used to guide sustainability planning for your program.
- Areas with lower ratings indicate that there is room for improvement.
- Address domains that are most modifiable, quicker to change, and have data available to support the needed changes.
- Develop strategies to tackle the domains that may be more difficult to modify.
- Make plans to assess your program’s sustainability on an ongoing basis to monitor program changes as you strive for an ongoing impact.

Here is your sustainability score: **4.9**


Domain	Domain Score
Environmental Support	5.3
Funding Stability	4.5
Partnerships	5.1
Organizational Capacity	5.7
Program Evaluation	4.8
Program Adaptation	5.2
Communications	4.6
Strategic Planning	4.3

1 = program has this to no extent





7 = program has to the full extent

NA = not able to answer

Average Sustainability Capacity By Domain



For more information about the Program Sustainability Assessment Tool and sustainability planning, visit <https://sustaintool.org/>

	Environmental Support	Rating		Funding Stability	Rating
1. Champions exist who strongly support the program.	5.8		1. The program exists in a supportive state economic climate.	4.3	
2. The program has strong champions with the ability to garner resources.	5.5		2. The program implements policies to help ensure sustained funding.	5.0	
3. The program has leadership support from within the larger organization.	6.5		3. The program is funded through a variety of sources.	4.5	
4. The program has leadership support from outside of the organization.	5.0		4. The program has a combination of stable and flexible funding.	4.5	
5. The program has strong public support.	3.8		5. The program has sustained funding.	4.0	
	Partnerships	Rating		Organizational Capacity	Rating
1. Diverse community organizations are invested in the success of the program.	5.5		1. The program is well integrated into the operations of the organization.	5.5	
2. Community leaders are involved with the program.	5.5		2. Organizational systems are in place to support the various program needs.	5.5	
3. Community members are passionately committed to the program.	4.8		3. Leadership effectively articulates the vision of the program to external partners.	5.8	
4. The program communicates with community leaders.	5.0		4. Leadership efficiently manages staff and other resources.	6.3	
5. The community is engaged in the development of program goals.	4.8		5. The program has adequate staff to complete the program's goals.	5.3	
	Program Evaluation	Rating		Program Adaptation	Rating
1. The program has the capacity for quality program evaluation.	5.3		1. The program periodically reviews the evidence base.	4.8	
2. The program reports short term and intermediate outcomes.	5.0		2. The program adapts strategies as needed.	5.0	
3. Evaluation results inform program planning and implementation.	4.5		3. The program adapts to new science.	5.3	
4. Program evaluation results are used to demonstrate successes to funders and other key stakeholders.	4.5		4. The program proactively adapts to changes in the environment.	5.3	
5. The program provides strong evidence to the public that the program works.	4.5		5. The program makes decisions about which components are ineffective and should not continue.	5.5	
	Communications	Rating		Strategic Planning	Rating
1. The program has communication strategies to secure and maintain public support.	4.5		1. The program plans for future resource needs.	4.3	
2. Program staff communicate the need for the program to the public.	4.0		2. The program has a long-term financial plan.	3.7	
3. The program is marketed in a way that generates interest.	4.5		3. The program has a sustainability plan.	4.3	
4. The program increases community awareness of the issue.	5.5		4. The program's goals are understood by all stakeholders.	4.3	
5. The program demonstrates its value to the public.	4.3		5. The program clearly outlines roles and responsibilities for all stakeholders.	5.0	

Results based on responses to the Program Sustainability Assessment Tool, ©2012, Washington University in St Louis.

For more information about the Program Sustainability Assessment Tool and sustainability planning, visit <https://sustaintool.org/>

APPENDIX B

CoP RCORP Sustainability Reflection Questionnaire



HRSA’s Communities of Practice: Rural Communities Opioids Response Program Reflection Questions for Developing a Sustainability Plan

Name of Person (s) Completing Form:			
Date:		County Name:	

Step 1 – Decide How to Complete these Reflection Questions

1. For communities using group consensus, you will want to reference your assessment report and the notes from your group consensus discussion. It is up to you to decide if you want to pull the core group back together to answer these questions.
2. For communities using average scores, you will need to pull together the 2-4 core planning members who completed the assessment and hold a group discussion with them to reflect on the findings from the Sustainability Assessment Report.

Step 2 – Begin by Reviewing Your Sustainability Assessment

1. Review the **Next Steps** section of the report (on page 1), which provides some helpful guidance for selecting domains that you may want to strengthen.
 - a. Note that the selection of domains that you want to focus on in your sustainability plan is not always governed solely by how low a domain’s score is.
 - b. The guidance also notes the importance of having data available to support the needed changes, and the importance of the domain being modifiable.
 - c. In addition to these considerations, you and your team will want to take into consideration local culture, history of prior efforts, and new trends that may be just emerging.

Step 3 – Reflect on Your Assessment and Document Your Plans

1. On page 2 of the Assessment report, look across the eight domains and complete a SWOT analysis.
 - a. What domains represent strengths and why?
 - b. What domains represent weaknesses and why?
 - c. What domains represent opportunities and why?
 - d. What domains represent threats and why?

Strengths – Capture these domain(s) and why they are strengths in this box. Type your response here	Weaknesses – Capture these domain(s) and why they are weaknesses in this box. Type your response here
Opportunities – Capture these domain(s) and why they are opportunities in this box. Type your response here	Threats – Capture these domain(s) and why they are threats in this box. Type your response here



2. Prioritize one key domain area that represents either a key weakness or key threat for your Local RCORP Consortium.
 - a. You will need to gather information about how you intend to shore up and address this weakness or threat. Guiding questions have been included below to help you capture that information.
 - b. Please type your responses where noted below. OU/PIRE will take your information and format it into a formatted Sustainability Plan document.
 - c. You only need to select one domain to address. It may be either a weakness or a threat from your SWOT analysis. You will then answer questions 3-9 below regarding that domain.
 - d. If you want to select an additional domain area to address, you will then need to answer questions 3-9 again for that domain.

3. Name the weakness or threat domain area that you have selected to address.

Weakness or Threat Domain to Address: **Type your response here**

4. How and why did you prioritize this weakness or threat domain?

Type your response here

5. Who needs to help address this weakness or threat domain? Include organizations, agencies, community leaders, staff/personnel, etc., as appropriate for the domain selected.

Type your response here

6. What is the goal you want this group of organizations, agencies, leaders, and/or staff to address related to the domain weakness or threat that you have prioritized? Please write a goal statement that you could provide to this group that would represent what they need to work toward addressing.

Type your response here

7. What is the change you are seeking?
 - a. Define the long-term change (outcome(s)) you want to see occur.

Type your response here



- b. How will you know that you have achieved that outcome? (List at least one indicator.)

Type here

8. List one or more objective for the group.

Objective: Type here

9. For the objective, identify a few key activities (e.g., convene the group, engage the issue, report back) and for each list a key person who will be responsible; other resources needed (staff, volunteers, space, money); and a planned start and end date.

Activity	Start Date	End Date	Responsible Party	Resources
Type here	Type here	Type here	Type here	Type here

10. HRSA is prioritizing the following outcome:

Maintain affordability and accessibility of OUD prevention, treatment, and recovery services provided to individuals.

Please write a one-two paragraph statement about how your Local RCORP Consortium will keep this outcome in mind throughout implementation process.

Type response here.

11. HRSA would like all Local RCORP Consortium to demonstrate that they are prioritizing evaluation.

Please write a one-two paragraph statement about how your Local RCORP Consortium is committed to developing quantifiable metrics that will be used to assess the impact of future activities.

Type response here.

Step 4 – Submit Your Reflection Report & Assessment Report to OU/PIRE

1. Save your Sustainability Reflection response document.
2. Send your completed Sustainability Reflection document to your TTAE.
3. Include a PDF copy of your online Assessment Report from Washington University.



4. OU/PIRE will transfer your information into a formatted Sustainability Plan and share it with you for final review and approval.