Introduction

The Normothermic Regional Perfusion (NRP) Workgroup met via Citrix GoToMeeting teleconference on 10/13/2022 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Opening Remarks
2. Key Terms
3. Outline/Takeaways

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

1. Opening Remarks

The Chair focused the group by reminding them of the charge and scope of the workgroup and project.

Summary of discussion:

A member remarked that there’s so much vigorous debate in this group, but there was not a robust ethical debate prior to the initiation of NRP. As such, the Workgroup is working backwards to have the debate now while the practice is ongoing.

2. Key Terms

The Chair reviewed key terms and inquired if the current terminology sufficiently describes the elements as they pertain to NRP.

Summary of discussion:

A member provided clarification on some of the terms the Workgroup has been using in email communications to avoid misunderstandings. Members considered that the variability NRP protocols across institutions can lead to confusion when discussing the practice. Members discussed blood vessel ligation and the implications of creating a closed circuit for NRP. The Workgroup agreed that when speaking about NRP it is acceptable to refer to the reperfusion as resuscitation of the organs, but it is not resuscitation of the person. A member cautioned that the principle of “do no harm” should be considered heavily when developing the paper. A member suggested that not honoring a patients’ decision to be an organ donor would be causing harm, and raised the question of consent and intent of NRP. Members debated the interpretation of the Universal Determination of Death Act (UDDA) and how to understand it as a living document while still working within the scope of their project. The Workgroup spoke about a prior Ethics Committee white paper on imminent death donation and whether the ethical principles would align somewhat with NRP. Staff will be providing more information on that paper next Workgroup meeting as not all members were familiar with it.
3. Outline/Takeaways

The Chair reviewed the outline and asked the Workgroup if the current outline was still appropriate based on their discussion.

Summary of discussion:

Members discussed the outline as developed so far, agreeing on the order of sections as well as how to break down these sections according to each subgroup. The Workgroup will begin working on drafting sections of the paper and sending them to one another for review.
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