OPTN Policy Oversight Committee
Provisional Yes Workgroup
Meeting Summary
June 10, 2020
Conference Call

Craig Van De Walker, Chair

Introduction

The Provisional Yes Workgroup (the Workgroup) met via Citrix GoToTraining teleconference on 06/10/2020 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. System Optimization Presentation and Discussion
2. Questionnaire Discussion
3. Next Steps

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

1. System Optimization Presentation and Discussion

UNOS staff presented past research from a 2016 System Optimization Workgroup, discussed potential descriptive data analyses, and overviewed conceptual framework.

Data summary:

Host Match Run table presented data from September 1, 2015 to August 31, 2016. The center level data included the following:

- Total number of offers (includes offers up to the final acceptor)
- The number of times a "Provisional Yes" was entered for an offer (include offers up to the final acceptor)
- The number of "Provisional Yes" responses that resulted in an accepted offer

Each center was counted once per match run. If a center had at least one "Provisional Yes" then they were counted as a center level provisional acceptance. If none of the center's candidates had a "Provisional Yes" then it was not counted.

Potential Descriptive Data Analysis:

- The number and percent of offers with an initial provisional yes (PY) response
- The number and percent of initial PY responses
  - That become yes (Y)
  - That become no (N)
- An analysis of "out of turn responses"
  - The number and percent with an initial PY
    - The number and percent that become Y
    - The number and percent that become N
    - The number and percent that never become primary
  - The number and percent with an initial N
    - The number and percent that never become primary

- For electronic notifications (based on the block notifications) Look at this by KDPI
  - The time to PY
  - The time to N
- For first candidate with a PY at the first center in the block notification and for first candidate with a PY from the second center in the block (2018 on)
  - Time from PY to Y

Summary of discussion:

A member asked if the *Host Match Run* table presented data from before OPOs routinely put in acceptance offers. UNOS staff explained that the data did not look at the timing because it was before acceptances were managed in real time. Another member asked if some centers enter "Provisional Yes" more often than others. UNOS staff explained this analysis did not go that far but previous data has shown variability. A member asked if, according to the table, 66% of the time a center's "Provisional Yes" turned out to mean they were not interested. The UNOS staff explained that number is correct but data looks at the "whats" and it is hard to gather the "whys" through this. A member asked these data were a primary offer at one point. UNOS staff explained that all of the data are before the final acceptor so none were offers in which centers never had an opportunity to accept. Another member asked if the final acceptance number, 23,482, was how many organs were transplanted. UNOS staff responded that number was how many organs were eventually accepted. A member asked if these data represents organs that ultimately were transplanted. UNOS staff needed to confirm, but believed this analysis was data on eventual transplants. Another member expressed interest in viewing data that showed all offers that went out as "Provisional Yes" and then were not transplanted.

A member asked if the data included situations where centers enter "Provisional Yes" for several different patients but upon further analysis realize the offer is not a good fit for one or two patients and rescinds those offers. UNOS staff explained if those candidates were below the final acceptor they would not have been included in the analysis, only those prior to the accepted center. Another member explained, in their region, a lot of organ procurement organizations (OPO) are not in the practice of entering in the acceptance so it is open for a longer time period and wondered if this data table included incomplete match runs. UNOS staff responded that this analysis was not looking at time issues, it had a three-month buffer and did not require real time analysis. A member stated that if the Workgroup is trying to look at the overall efficiency of the allocation process it is important to have data on the organs that are not accepted.

Regarding the *potential descriptive data analysis,* a member asked if any of the suggested data will show how long a person had a "Provisional Yes" until they ultimately said no because they are interested in data that will help uncover patterns of behaviors at different centers. UNOS staff explained the last bullet, "time from PY to Y', is the closest attempt to uncover those patterns. However, it is difficult because the acceptances are the only entry managed in real time, "Provisional Yes" to refusal is not. Another member asked if there was a way to look at refusals that appear to be entered in real time. A member explained, particularly when an organ offer is placed out of turn, it is hard to tell when centers become primary offers in the system. A button was put into DonorNet that alerted a center when they were primary and backup, which could have been used as a timestamp, but this was not utilized regularly.

A member asked how much committee and organizational will there is to look at the problem. UNOS staff responded that they believe there is a lot of will considering the Policy Oversight Committee (POC) identified strategic policies and the Provisional Yes project aligns precisely with this. Another member asked if there is a budget for these potential enhancements. UNOS staff responded that it is yet to be

determined and will be looked at in context when determining the resource requirements and cost benefits.

A member asked if there was information from UNOS and the OPTN about match processes and donor characteristics that is not reflected in DonorNet. UNOS staff responded that they are limited to the data in DonorNet but there are attachments that can be accessed. Another member asked if there has been natural language processing done on the text for useful information. UNOS staff responded they have tried natural language processing; it is a rich data source but it is important to remember none of that data is required. Workgroup members are urged to think about the data differently because it would allow a deeper dive of the data. A member asked if there has been a summary analysis on refusal codes. UNOS staff responded that there has been analyses but not in terms of performance. Another member asked if it would be beneficial to break out analysis by organ type because of the different variables. UNOS staff asked if there would be an organ system most useful to analyze first. A member suggested comparing organs that are different from each other, such as heart and liver. Members agreed that looking at all organs have a lot of value.

A framework to conceptualize the relationship between "Provisional Yes", allocation time, and organ utilization was presented to the Workgroup. UNOS staff explained they want to be able to provide descriptive analytics in order for the Workgroup to better understand the match processes and subsequently allocation time and organ utilization. There were no further questions from Workgroup members.

2. Questionnaire Discussion

The Workgroup Chair reviewed the questionnaire answers.

Summary of discussion:

Within the questionnaire, it was apparent that there is a lack of clarity what a backup offers means to each constituent. There were not a lot of comments made regarding the advantages of the "Provisional Yes" system. One advantage mentioned was the access to donor information. Several disadvantages were mentioned such as inefficiency and a waste of time and resources for the accepting center. Both OPOs and transplant centers agreed there is too much time between initial offer and decision making. Transplant centers mentioned that OPOs send out offers unrealistically far down the list. OPOs explained they do that in order to get refusals from programs who will not accept so for the OPOs are able to get more aggressive programs who will accept.

A member suggested a system that allows for additional electronic filters that are accurately and correctly used by transplant centers and OPOs. This system could help get past programs who will not accept and hold both transplant centers and OPOS.

Another member discussed the Systems Improvement Group, by the OPTN, which looked at how the system overall could be improved. They explained there were a number of findings that could make the system better such as "Conditional Yes" versus "Provisional Yes" and the sharing of images. The member explained their interest in a "Conditional Yes" system as well as more transparency.

Next steps:

The Workgroup will continue discussion on the "Provisional Yes" system.

3. Next Steps

Summary of discussion:

The report to POC will be pushed to July so the Workgroup has more time to discuss.

<u>Next steps:</u>

Questionnaires will continue to be filled out and analyzed. Another meeting will be scheduled.

Upcoming Meeting

- TBD