

**OPTN Operations & Safety Committee
Match Run Rules Workgroup
Meeting Summary
August 18, 2022
Conference Call**

Jill Campell, BSN, RN, CPTC, Chair

Introduction

The Operations & Safety Committee Match Run Rules Workgroup (the Workgroup) met via Citrix GoToMeeting teleconference on 08/18/2022 to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Review and Discussion: Review of Tiered System Assumptions (Tier I and Tier II)

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

1. Review and Discussion: Review of Tiered System Assumptions (Tier I and Tier II)

The Workgroup reviewed the proposed concepts and system requirements for Tier I and Tier II offers in a presentation delivered by IT staff.

Data summary:

- Two active Tier II offers at all times
- System will automatically apply a refusal code if they exceed evaluation time
- There may be instances when a program receives a Tier II offer without receiving a Tier III alert first
 - This is expected to be most common within the first four sequences of a match run
- Programs should not be allowed to proactively enter Tier I responses at Tier II
 - Tier I indicates commitment to the donor based off of current information

Summary of discussion:

The Chair wondered if the organ procurement organization (OPO) offering the organ would be able to change the response on an offer that exceeded evaluation time. A member also inquired if this meant the offering OPO could extend a Tier I offer to a program that had previously exceeded their evaluation time at Tier II. It was suggested that it may become potentially complex if an OPO can undo a refusal to extend a third Tier II offer to a program that had previously exceeded their evaluation time.

A member working at an OPO noted that there are times when they undo an exceeded evaluation time refusal when they have been working with the program and understand the constraints the program is working with; they stated that there are also programs who repeatedly do this for whom they do not change the code. A second member did not support allowing refusal code changes after a program exceeds evaluation time, as allowing that would make the standardization of practice and accountability aspect more cumbersome.

The Chair inquired if the OPTN Donor Data and Matching System would be able to determine if programs had opened the organ offer and reviewed the data. They considered this because they felt it was more likely a program exceeds their time limit for evaluation by forgetting to input a response rather than entirely missing the offer. IT staff replied that they would determine if the system had this

functionality. It was suggested and endorsed by multiple Workgroup members that a timer could be added to the donor profile to show the amount of time a reviewing program had left to input a response.

A member requested the system highlight changes to the donor profile when programs re-enter the profile after an extended amount of time has passed.

Another member suggested programs be able to “accept primary” and “accept backup” so that allocating OPOs understand where there is the highest chance for acceptance if the primary center refuses the organ following acceptance. The Workgroup also requested the terminology “acceptance Tier II”, which indicates that a program has met the Tier II requirements, be changed to “interested Tier II”. The Chair also requested a tool that indicates when a program moves from Tier II to Tier I.

The Workgroup preferred to have the ability to indicate Tier I interest at Tier II for instances when allocation progresses very quickly, and programs should not have to wait for a Tier I offer to be extended. A member expressed concern that the extra steps and limitations would delay allocation if this feature were not allowed. Another member also expressed concern that, if programs could preemptively indicate Tier I interest, the meaning of Tier I could be obfuscated if programs have to re-evaluate offers when notified that they are now Tier I. However, a member from an OPO noted that if a program indicated Tier I interest early on in the process, they would now know which program was very interested in the donor.

A member also expressed concern that the approach of fixing policy requirements to each tier may not address the problem of provisional yes because they can still imagine ways programs will work around them; they noted the ability for programs to preemptively indicate Tier I interest at Tier II as an example of an area where programs could misuse the tiered framework. There was also concern expressed about the ability to monitor whether programs have actually completed the required steps – they worried it would revolve around OPOs submitting complaints with no data to hold transplant programs accountable. It was also clarified that there would not be tracking within the system to indicate which policy requirements a program had completed.

Next steps:

Staff will incorporate the feedback from the Workgroup into the system design.

Upcoming Meeting

- September 15, 2022

Attendance

- **Workgroup Members**
 - Jill Campbell
 - Katherine Audette
 - Doug Butler
 - Catherine Kling
 - Sharyn Sawczak
 - John Stallbaum
 - Justin Wilkerson
- **HRSA Representatives**
 - Vanessa Arriola
 - Jim Bowman
 - Raelene Skerda
- **UNOS Staff**
 - Isaac Hager
 - Krissy Laurie
 - Carlos Martinez
 - Kerrie Masten
 - Rob McTier
 - Alan Nicholas
 - Joann White