

**OPTN Organ Procurement Organization (OPO) Committee
Meeting Minutes
June 7, 2019
Teleconference**

**Jennifer Prinz, RN, BSN, MPH, CPTC, Chair
Diane Brockmeier, RN, BSN, MHA, Vice Chair**

Introduction

The Organ Procurement Organization (OPO) Committee met via teleconference on June 7, 2019 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Review of Expedited Placement (EP) Process
2. Review of revised Expedited Placement Liver Placement policy language
3. Vote on revised policy language

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

1. Review of Expedited Placement (EP) Process

The Committee Chair reviewed the Committee's Expedited Placement of Livers proposal with members.

Summary of discussion:

The Committee Chair began by providing an overview of the Committee's Expedited Placement (EP) of Livers proposal. There were four common themes from the public comment response as follows:

- "Initiating" expedited placement 2 hours prior to the operating room (OR)
- Impact on backup offer process
- New match vs. current match
- Outstanding questions – agreement to clarify language

There was a workgroup call on May 21, 2019. The workgroup supported the clarifications to the process. The workgroup also agreed that to ensure maximum efficiency, the expedited placement process should occur within the same match run.

The Committee Chair then reviewed the expedited placement process with members. OPOs would have the ability to view the expedited list prior to the OR. The goal is to maximize efficiency in the system and ensure patient safety on the transplant center side. Once an organ is turned down in the OR by the primary center, the OPO has the decision to continue down the match run or initiate expedited placement. The OPO must enter the following information to be able to send electronic EP orders:

- Date/time donor entered OR or, for DCD, withdrawal was initiated
- Date/time host OPO was notified of organ offer refusal
- Reason for organ offer refusal

Within the same match run, the OPO can send electronic EP liver offers. The "non-EP" candidates and previous refusals are screened off the EP list. The transplant hospitals have 30 minutes to review and provisionally accept the liver for their primary candidate. After the 30 minute cycle, the candidate who is at the highest place on the list would receive the organ offer.

A member asked if there was a program who already had a provisional yes, would there be an opportunity to have another provisional yes for the expedited placement list. UNOS staff confirmed that this was correct.

Another member asked that if a program timed out after the first 30 minute cycle, and a second set of offers were sent, would the OPO be able to go back to that program? The Committee Chair confirmed that the OPO would be able to respond after the second cycle times out. If a program accepted during the second cycle, that program would be given the organ. If the offer was not accepted during the second cycle, the OPO would be able to go back to the first cycle. The member then asked how many offers would be allowed. The Committee Chair clarified that this would be at the discretion of the OPO. The member continued by asking if the transplant programs would have to enter into expedited placement per patient and not the center. The Committee Chair confirmed that this was correct.

Another member asked what happens after the 30 minute time limit expires – do the cases just disappear or would the time limit need to be manually measured? The Committee Chair stated that it was understood that after the 30 minutes, the system would time out. UNOS staff confirmed that this was true and that the programming for this process was still being discussed with IT.

The Committee Chair asked if members needed to vote on the proposed process flow. UNOS staff stated that a vote would not be needed on the process flow. The process flow was shared to allow members to provide feedback. The process flow will be included in the public comment document and explain how each of the steps work so that the public will have an understanding of how the process would work.

A member asked if a provisional yes is an acceptance and if there was a reason why it would not say accepted. The Committee Chair asked for clarification that in working within the same match run, would the acceptance show in the same way as a provisional yes. UNOS staff confirmed that the acceptance would show as a provisional yes. Currently, the system is architected where only one acceptance is allowed on a match run. It was decided to stay as a provisional yes with the understanding that the process would be monitored to evaluate the provisional yes' that are being put in and not accepting offers.

The Committee Chair asked how this would be evaluated through the Membership and Professional Standards Committee (MPSC). UNOS staff stated that it was uncertain if the evaluation of this process would be evaluated internally or through MPSC.

There were no additional questions or comments.

2. Review of revised Expedited Placement Liver Placement policy language

UNOS staff reviewed the revised policy language for the expedited placement of livers proposal.

Summary of discussion:

UNOS staff reviewed the following revisions that were made to the Committee's proposal since public comment:

- Proposed language for OPTN Policy 1.2: Definitions for Organ acceptance, "For expedited offers, acceptance is pending until expiration of time to accept expedited offers" was removed. There were some grammatical errors that were revised in this section as well.
- No changes were made to proposed language for *OPTN Policy 5.3.D: Liver Acceptance Criteria* stating, "Acceptance criteria for expedited offers as outlined in *Policy 9.10.A: Expedited Placement Acceptance Criteria*".

- Proposed language for *OPTN Policy 5.4.C: Liver Offers* stating, “A previously accepted liver is refused and the host OPO initiates an expedited match run according to *Policy 9.10.B: Expedited Liver Offers*” was removed since the Committee has clarified to continue down the current match run and not re-execute the match run.
- No changes were made to proposed language for *OPTN Policy 5.6.B: Time Limit for Review and Acceptance of Organ Offers* stating, “This policy does not apply to expedited liver offers as outlined in *Policy 9.10.B: Expedited Liver Offers*”. The Committee previously reviewed the policy and it was determined that the policy did not apply with expedited liver offers.
- The proposed language for *OPTN Policy 9.10.A: Expedited Liver Placement Acceptance Criteria* remained unchanged as there was not too much feedback or controversy surrounding the acceptance criteria. The word “liver” was added to the policy’s title. There was discussion in the term macrosteatosis. The public comment document will make clear exactly how this process would work. Although transplant hospitals are required to enter the listed information, this would not be a requirement for OPOs as the information may not be available prior to the OR. If that information is available, it is encouraged for this to be entered as written in policy as it would be good information for the transplant hospital to have and possibly do additional screening.
- Most of the proposed language for *OPTN Policy 9.10.B: Expedited Liver Offers* was unchanged. From discussions internally and with leadership, it was decided that OPOs should be able to see who is participating in the expedited placement process so that OPOs can begin making calls prior to going into the OR. In the second section of the policy, language was revised to state that the criteria that must be met prior to expedited liver offers. This does not change the previously proposed process.
- New language was added stating, “Expedited liver offers will be made to potential transplant recipients on the match run who are eligible to receive expedited liver offers as described in *Policy 9.10.A: Expedited Liver Placement Acceptance Criteria*”.
- The proposed time limit of 20 minutes was changed to 30 minutes.
- The term “candidate” was changed to “potential transplant recipient” in the last paragraph. A candidate is not necessarily someone who is on the match run; a potential candidate is someone who is on the match run.
- The last sentence “The host OPO may send additional expedited liver offers until the liver is placed” was removed. There was discussion regarding the number of blasts that would be sent out. It was decided that this should not be prescriptive and telling OPOs what they should do in sending out offers. This would be explained further in the public comment document and through educational efforts rather than in policy.

There were no additional comments or questions.

The Committee Chair called for a vote by asking if there was any opposition to the revised policy language as written.

Vote: 9 Approve, 0 Abstain, 0 Oppose

UNOS staff reviewed next steps with Committee members. Currently UNOS staff is drafting the revised public comment document. Regional meeting prep calls will begin in July with additional 1:1 calls as needed. The fall public comment cycle will be from August 2nd – October 2nd with the proposal going to the Board in December.

There were no additional comments or questions.

The meeting was adjourned.

Upcoming Meeting

- TBD