

**OPTN/UNOS Kidney-Pancreas Workgroup
Meeting Minutes
February 6, 2019
Conference Call**

**Nicole Turgeon, MD, FACS, Chair, Kidney Transplantation Committee
Jon Odorico, MD, Chair, Pancreas Transplantation Committee**

Introduction

The Kidney-Pancreas Workgroup (the Workgroup) met via teleconference on 2/6/2019 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Kidney-Pancreas Workgroup Review
2. Regional Meeting Feedback
3. Looking Ahead
4. Open Discussion

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

1. Kidney-Pancreas Workgroup Review

UNOS staff gave the Workgroup a brief review of the kidney-pancreas concept paper and the modeling variations previously conducted by the Workgroup.

Summary of discussion:

UNOS Staff reviewed the different models detailed in the "Eliminate the Use of DSAs and Regions in Kidney and Pancreas Distribution" concept paper currently out for public comment.

A Workgroup member asked if one proximity point was equivalent to one year of waitlist time. UNOS staff explained the comparison is made because in the current Kidney Allocation System, one point is given per 365 days on the waitlist. The Workgroup member expressed the same comparison should not be made from a pancreas perspective as that waitlist is much shorter.

A Workgroup member asked why the group is not modeling a hybrid system which does not assign proximity points within the 500 NM circle and only assign points outside of the circle. The Chair expressed all ideas are potential options moving forward.

Another Workgroup member asked if there is anything in writing that details the value of a proximity point. UNOS staff explained within kidney policy, there are classification tables that say one day of waiting time is equivalent to 1/365 which is why one point is considered to be equivalent to one year of waiting time. Staff further explained the proximity points modeled are assigned solely based on the distance and no other criteria. The Workgroup continued to emphasize the value of proximity points are very different for kidneys and pancreata and should have different values for the different organ types. UNOS staff informed the Workgroup two separate organ models could be a consideration moving forward.

Next steps:

UNOS staff emphasized decisions that are made going forward must be grounded in the OPTN Final Rule.

2. Regional Meeting Feedback

UNOS staff gave the Workgroup an overview of the feedback received so far from two regional meetings and public comment. No comments have as of yet been received on the OPTN website.

Summary of discussion:

A Workgroup member cautioned against interpreting the regional votes too deeply as the presentations may be too high level for the regional members to vote thoughtfully.

3. Looking Ahead

The Workgroup will meet again on February 20 and twice in March. Within these four meetings the Workgroup will continue to work collaboratively with SRTR to develop a new modeling request to be submitted April 1. The proposal will be developed and submitted by July 9 in preparation for public comment opening on August 2.

4. Open Discussion

The Workgroup discussed how to consider noncontiguous territories such as Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. The Chair and UNOS staff explained the Ad Hoc Geography Committee did have conversations about noncontiguous states and geographically isolated hospitals but didn't come to consensus on how to consider them in new allocation models.

The Workgroup recognizes this issue and will continue to deliberate how to consider such territories and isolated hospitals in future frameworks.