

OPTN/UNOS Liver & Intestinal Organ Transplantation Committee
Meeting Minutes
May 24, 2017
Conference Call

Ryutaro Hirose, MD, Chair
Julie Heimbach, MD, Vice Chair

Introduction

The OPTN/UNOS Liver and Intestinal Organ Transplantation Committee (hereafter, the Committee) met via Citrix GoTo teleconference on 05/24/2017 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Liver Redistribution

The following is a summary of the Committee's discussions.

1. Liver Redistribution

The Committee met to finalize a data request.

Summary of discussion:

The Chair began the call by stating the intention for the call was to finalize a data request to the Scientific Registry of Transplant Recipients (SRTR). The Chair reviewed the recent discussion on a data request including developing an analysis plan to see the effect of the proposal:

- On rural/urban programs and/or populations
- On access to transplant (type of insurance, level of education, employment)
- With the committee's decisions in Chicago (prioritization of calculated MELD candidates and separate allocation classification for certain donors)
- With different sharing thresholds

It was stated that the next LSAM would prioritize the proposal that is going out for public comment, including a sharing threshold for calculated MELD candidates greater than or equal to 29. A committee member asked how best to identify the allocation classification that excludes candidates with a calculated MELD below 29. It was discussed that the "calculated MELD" requirement was not necessary if exception candidates were excluded from this specific classification. Another committee member stated that excluding exception candidates is not preferable because some exception candidates may have a calculated MELD greater than 29, thus reaching the sharing threshold to be included in the initial broader sharing classification. A committee member asked if the outputs of the modeling would show the number of organs transplanted outside the recovery Donor Service Area (DSA). A committee member replied that it was important to have DSA level data in the results.

The Committee discussed the additional effort by the SRTR, and the resulting effect on delivery of results to the Committee. A committee member stated that it was important to model different sharing thresholds in the upcoming data request. It was stated that every additional scenario (different sharing thresholds) would add additional time to the timeline.

The Committee discussed whether the data request should look at *circles* and *neighborhoods* or if the modeling should only examine one. The drawback of modeling both would be the additional complexity to the modeling and the effect on the timing of when the results would be shared. A committee member stated that the *neighborhoods* concept was not preferable to the circles concept and that it didn't warrant an additional request to model. The Committee

discussed the sharing thresholds modeled and it was agreed that 29 and 32 would be looked at. The Committee discussed whether they should additionally model a sharing threshold of 35. It was stated that 35, although not preferable in terms of increasing sharing, would be beneficial to look at in terms of its comparison with sharing thresholds of 29 and 32. SRTR staff commented that if they were only modeling the circles concept, that an additional sharing threshold would not add significant time to the data analysis. The Committee agreed that the request would also include a sharing threshold of 35.

Upcoming Meetings

- June 8th, 2017 Conference Call
- June 12th, 2017 Conference Call
- June 15th, 2017 Conference Call
- July 20th, 2017 Conference Call