

## Electronic Organ Placement Working Group LiveMeeting

July 16, 2007  
2:00 – 3:30 pm, EDT

**Attendees:** Marlon Levy, Mark Paster, Vicki Fioravanti, Rick Hasz, Mitchell Henry, Brian Lunde, Rich Durbin, Christopher McLaughlin, Tom Mone, Cassandra Smith-Fields, and John Roberts

UNOS Staff: Leah Edwards, Sonja Moore, Blaine Hess, Chris Williams, Paula Bryant, Kelly Balagtas, Catherine Monstello, Bonnie Felice, Darcy Pritchett, Carly Engelberger, Cathy Short

### General Announcements:

The Electronic Organ Placement Working Group meeting began with the following general announcements:

- The meeting is recorded in Live Meeting for reference purposes.
- Recent management changes in the UNOS IT Department were announced including the following new roles and responsibilities:
  - Blaine Hess – Acting Assistant Executive Director of IT
  - Kelly Balagtas – Acting Director of IT Development
  - Brad Burschem – Acting Director of Systems Engineering

Dr. Levy began the meeting by relating his thoughts and feedback he had received about DonorNet® from the transplant community. He noted that while DonorNet® has been viewed as incredibly successful by many, the major complaint from transplant centers has been the need to better filter organ offers. Many centers are still receiving far too many organ offers. Specific examples of these situations were discussed by the group.

### DonorNet® Data and Statistics:

Leah Edwards reviewed DonorNet® data collected between May 1<sup>st</sup> and July 6<sup>th</sup>. She noted that in many of the areas of review there have not been any dramatic changes. The following topics were discussed in detail:

- **Number of Centers Electronically Notified per Match Beyond the Acceptance** – A closer look at this metric would be worthwhile. Specifically, examine whether or not the organ was transplanted at acceptance. Also, examine this data in relation to the match classifications (for example: how does this statistic differ for status 1A candidates or pediatric candidates).
- **Status of All Electronic Candidate-Level Offers** – A closer look at offers that **Exceeded Evaluation Time** would be worthwhile. Research common reasons and if there are patterns of re-occurrence at certain centers. Is there the possibility that this is happening due to a technology issue?
- The following additional statistics were requested:
  - Median acceptance number for different organ types
  - Exhausted matches by DSA

Leah concluded by offering to tabulate any new statistics that would be helpful to the Working Group.

**DonorNet® Feedback Document:**

The Working Group reviewed and discussed a prepared document of DonorNet® user feedback that had been received by UNOS staff. Much time of the meeting time was spent discussing both positive and negative user feedback. The Group focused on plans for more thorough and systematic user surveys. It was noted that the UNOS regional administration department began a formal survey last week of transplant administrators. In addition, a one page on-line IT survey has also been created and will be distributed in the next few weeks. This survey focuses primarily on technology use and DonorNet® process and support satisfaction. It was recommended that the OPO procurement directors be surveyed similar to the transplant administrator survey. Mark Paster of AOPO volunteered to work with UNOS staff to develop and distribute such a survey.

In addition to the general discussion, the following issues were raised:

- Is it still appropriate to make an ECD kidney offer without HLA? Maybe the Kidney Committee could reconsider this policy.
- How should changes to donor information be communicated after a notification has been sent? It was noted that a “donor highlights” field is being added with the intent of the OPO including some of these important data changes for centers’ review.
- Have TXCs and OPOs added staff due to additional number of organ offers? It is hoped that the surveys mentioned above can capture whether this has occurred.

**Review of Programming Priorities:**

Bonnie Felice reviewed the programming priorities and the DonorNet® enhancements that have been completed since national implementation. There was a brief discussion observing that since implementation several of the original system objectives have changed due to user experience. An example cited was the original design to provide enough information for a refusal or Provisional Yes, which is changing to centers wanting enough information to make a full acceptance of the organ. In addition, several proposed temporary relief measures were also considered. A proposed measure to limit the number of accumulated Provisional Yes responses before additional offers can proceed for regional and national offers was the only one the Group thought may be a useful short-term fix. However, it was recommended that data be reviewed to confirm whether this worthwhile, and if programmed, the Provisional Yes limits should be based on center, not candidate.

The following points were also made during these discussions:

- There should be a serology field added for CMV and it should be required for intestine offers.
- Improving the screening criteria is still the ultimate goal to reduce the number of offers.

**Policy Changes:**

It was noted that several OPTN/UNOS policies, including the zero mismatch sharing policy, will need to be modified to comply with the recent Executive Committee resolution for national organ placement. Some of these modified policies will need to be proposed for Board approval in September in order to allow current programming modifications to be implemented, such as allowing OPOs to apply the renal minimum acceptance criteria to kidney matches. Proposed modifications to Policy 3.5.3.5, which addresses zero mismatch and payback sharing, were briefly discussed. Due to a lack of remaining meeting time, it was decided to address these policy modifications during the next Working Group meeting which will be scheduled in approximately three weeks. A tentative agenda for that meeting will be: review of recent system data; programming progress; and proposed policy modifications.

The meeting was adjourned.