

**OPTN/UNOS Kidney-Pancreas Workgroup
Meeting Minutes
March 19, 2019
Conference Call**

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

Introduction

The KP Sub-Committee met via teleconference on 03/19/2019 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Public Comment Feedback
2. Circle Size Research
3. Initial Variation Proposals

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

1. Public Comment Feedback

Data summary:

Based on regional feedback, the majority favored a hybrid framework, the 150 or 500 NM circle, and a separate distribution framework.

Some of the trends from public comment included:

- Support for hybrid model over fixed distance circles
- No clear preference on which proximity point combination is preferred
- 300NM circle is less preferred
- Support for pancreas/KP having different allocation from kidney than having the same allocation

Summary of discussion:

The Pancreas chair said that it would be helpful after the new modeling results to ask separate questions in order to differentiate between feedback preferences for kidney vs. pancreas. The Kidney chair agreed. The Kidney Vice-Chair brought up that a large concern from public feedback was the decreased transplant count number. One member suggested the one potential solution to some of the modeling weaknesses is to model with the assumption that every organ is accepted by the first offer.

2. Circle Size Research

A UNOS staff member explained the permutation process that goes into the modeling and asked for the workgroup preferences.

Data Summary:

Regardless of proximity points, a patient cannot move from one classification to another – proximity points simply “reshuffle” candidates against each other, in terms of identified characteristics as well as geography within their classification

The higher the proximity points, the more we may value geography over other factors (such as CPRA, waiting time, and HLA mismatches – KAS currently gives points for these

characteristics). The more proximity points awarded, the less broadly organs will be distributed within a circle.

Discussion Summary:

One Pancreas Workgroup member supported running 6 permutations to see all the options. The Pancreas Vice-Chair spoke up in favor of seeing all permutations involving a Pancreas circle at 500 NM due to the different ways that pancreas programs procure.

UNOS staff explained that those nine runs may take up a lot of bandwidth for SRTR modeling and adding points would increase the amount of models. The workgroup decided to discuss the topic more in depth at their next call.

The Pancreas Chair explained that the pancreas members felt that valuing geography strongly made the most sense outside of the circle due to the fact that it is less necessary to prioritize distance inside the local circle where cold ischemic time is not as much of an issue and instead do steep points outside the circle where ischemic time begins to be a limiting factor.

3. Initial Variation Proposals

Workgroup members discussed some of the different aspects of modeling.

Framework: Hybrid

The Pancreas Chair spoke that the pancreas subcommittee members were most interested in the hybrid framework. One member of the workgroup spoke up in concern about a 500 NM circle as they felt that the switch between driving and flying was closer to 250 NM and a 500 NM circle would force a lot more flying.

A UNOS staff member sought to clarify that hybrid frameworks include those variations with a single fixed circle and no points inside and outside of that circle. Because this kind of framework could technically be considered a fixed distance model, UNOS staff wanted to ensure that these kinds of variations were still considered “hybrid”.

The workgroup members voted unanimously in favor of hybrid framework.

Circle Sizes:

- 150 NM
- 250 NM
- 500 NM

While the pancreas group is interested in all three circle sizes, their first option is 500 NM, followed by 250 NM. The pancreas members felt that because 500 NM still falls under 8 hours – it does not unreasonably drive up cold ischemic time. 250 NM is also a potential option.

A workgroup member felt concern about a 500 NM circle and was more interested in a 250 NM circle, as they felt that the latter would be most similar to current allocation. The Kidney Vice-Chair also agrees and feels that modeling all 3 circle size options in order to gather lots of data and better understand the travel component. How big does the circle have to be to see a better distribution?

A pancreas workgroup member noted that 150 NM was a popular option among the regions and felt that after asking for feedback the workgroup was obligated to listen to the regional feedback. The Kidney Chair agreed and felt that concern was one additional reason to choose 150 NM circle.

One workgroup member asked if it was possible to model all three options. The Kidney Chair responded that at the moment it was unclear but it would be best to select the committee’s best

judgement and then pair down if necessary. One workgroup member felt that the previous model of 500 NM circle with steep points gave a good picture of that particular option and it was not necessary to model it again. The Pancreas Chair disagreed as he felt that there were multiple different options and point variations that could greatly change the modeling results. The other workgroup member felt it would be difficult to justify using more proximity points as they were equal to an entire year of wait time. The Pancreas Vice-Chair disagreed, as she felt that there was sufficient justification to heavily award proximity points so as to prioritize patients closer to the program.

The Kidney Chair noted that there would be time to discuss the specifics of proximity points on the next call.

A UNOS staff member asked how the workgroup could justify, with their professional clinical experience and opinion, a 150 NM circle if the modeling came back favorable, considering that other organs with shorter cold ischemic time have created allocation policies with larger circles. The Kidney Chair felt a discussion on that topic was the objective of public comment and that it was unnecessary for the workgroup to discuss further. Additionally, the Vice Chair expressed that this was just a vote to model the 150 NM circle and not select it for the new allocation.

Upcoming Meetings

- March 22, 2019
- March 29, 2019