developers carries the risk of collaboration problems, but when managed successfully, adds value to the end product.

Implications for Guideline Developers/Users In order to avoid collaboration problems, the scope of the guideline was agreed on in an early stage. Interdisciplinary collaboration enhanced guideline quality.

**P055** DOES THE CANADIAN TASK FORCE ON PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE MEET THE INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE STANDARDS IN GUIDELINE DEVELOPMENT?

Gorber S, Jaramillo A, Pottie K, Singh H. Public Health Agency of Canada, Ottawa, Canada; Public Health Agency of Canada, Ottawa, Canada; University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada; University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada

Background There are a plethora of guideline development groups in operation, each with its own methods for summarising evidence and processes for developing recommendations, which can leave consumers with questions about which guidelines to follow. In 2011 the Institute of Medicine (IOM) released a set of standards for developing trustworthy systematic reviews and clinical practice guidelines (CPGs). These standards address the structure, process, reporting and final products associated with evidence-based CPGs. The Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care (CTFPHC) was recently re-established with a mandate to develop clinical practice guidelines for primary care practitioners based on a systematic assessment of scientific evidence.

Objectives To compare the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care’s methods with the standards outlined in the IOM. Methods The methods of the CTFPHC were compared to the IOM standards for both systematic reviews and CPGs and to the methods of other international guideline producers. Results The CTFPHC methods are consistent with those of the IOM and international guideline development groups. Some differences include how patient and consumer input is incorporated into guidelines, the review of documents, and the final recommendations statements, the degree to which documents are publicly available and the processes for dissemination and knowledge translation. Discussion New processes put in place to address the differences between CTFPHC methods and IOM standards will be explored.

Implications for Guideline Developers/Users Comparing the methods of guideline development groups to the IOM standards may provide users with a way to ascertain potential areas for enhancement of their CPG development process.

**P058** DEVELOPING A YOUTH HEALTH CARE GUIDELINE ON SEXUAL DEVELOPMENT WITH LIMITED EVIDENCE

Maris S, Deurloo J, Lanting C, Kamphuis M, van der Vlugt I, Rutgers WP. TNO Child Health, Leiden, The Netherlands; Rutgers WPF, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Background Children’s sexual development starts at an early age and is a very complex subject, comprising the physical but also the psychosocial development. Youth Health Care (YHC) professionals can prevent and detect problems in sexual development, and play a guiding role in stimulating sexual competency and positive sexual attitudes.

Objectives Our goal was to develop an evidence based national YHC guideline for sexual development.

Methods The content of the guideline is based on (inter)national guidelines, literature searches, consensus and experience. The guideline is now piloted for use in daily practice by YHC professionals. The way we handled the limited amount of evidence and the results of this pilot will be presented. We cooperated with an international centre of expertise on sexual and reproductive health and performed literature searches for a selected number of questions.

Results The guideline describes the (physical and psychosocial) sexual development of children from 0–19 years old, determinants of sexual health and groups at risk. Discussion In this presentation, we would like to discuss the issue of dealing with the limited amount of evidence and we will show how we handled this issue. Working together with an experienced centre was crucial. Coming to consensus in the working group and performing a pilot test in addition, is essential in gaining obtaining support for the recommendations of the guideline.

Implications for Guideline Developers/Users In YHC not much evidence of high quality is available. Exchange of experiences will help other guideline developers dealing with this as well.