

**OPTN/UNOS Ethics Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
December 20, 2018  
Conference Call**

**Elisa Gordon, PhD, MPH, Chair  
Keren Ladin, PhD, Vice Chair**

**Introduction**

The Ethics Committee (the Committee) met via teleconference on 12/20/2018 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Review multi-organ transplant (MOT) Paper

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

**1. Review MOT Paper**

The Committee reviewed the MOT paper for a final time before voting on official language to advance to public comment.

Summary of discussion:

The following section describes the issue related to modifying the MOT paper, the relevant page number, and the decision made by the Committee.

- Page 6: specify UNOS policy and table that are being referenced. The current reference to Policy 6.6.F.1: *Allocation of Heart-Lungs from Deceased Donors Over Age 18* – may have been modified as it does not currently contain a table.
  - A Committee member found the appropriate reference which was appropriately included in the MOT paper.
- Page 11: Section D on regional review boards exclusively applies to heart allocation– should it be kept even though the Committee does not go into detail about any other MOT combinations? Additionally, should the section explain why heart is singularly addressed and should it be re-named to reflect that?
  - Although current regional review boards may only be applicable for heart, the issues related to regional review boards demonstrate challenges that could arise in the future for other allocation systems. Therefore, the Committee considers it appropriate to include this section for discussion.
- Page 1: The Committee discussed whether information should be added about why MOTs are increasing.
  - The Committee agreed that this information is not particularly necessary for the discussion of MOTs. The main point is that MOTs are increasing and the potential for disparities could increase also.
- Page 2: are there concrete disparities that occur for “underserved groups in the current MOT allocation system”, such as black recipients awaiting isolated kidney transplantation?
  - Based on the advice of an OPTN/UNOS staff researcher, this statement was modified to acknowledge there could be “**potential** disparities”
- Page 4: Why are kidney criteria less strict? Should we say why? What does “marginal” mean in regards to quality of organs?

- The wording for SLK criteria can be addressed by adding it is based on potential “listing” disparities.
- Adding “marginal quality” helps clarify the meaning and should be clear for the community
- Page 5: How is “medical benefit” different from “years of life” or “quality of benefit”?
  - This is unclear to some members. Recommendation to modify for clarity – so done.
- Page 8: Section B Recommendation addresses transparency, but not how to balance equity and utility. Is it significant to note here that need-based systems do respect the “rule of rescue”?
  - Members felt no change was needed.
- Page 12: Review all instances of equity and “equality” to verify which one is most accurate.
  - Members discussed the use of “equal” and opted to replace an instance with the word “fair”.

Having completed the review of the MOT draft, the Committee unanimously supported sending the white paper out for public comment.

Next steps:

The white paper will go out for public comment in January 2019.

**Upcoming Meeting**

- January 17, 2019 (teleconference)