

**OPTN Kidney Transplantation Committee Meeting  
Expedited Placement Workgroup  
Meeting Summary  
April 21, 2025  
Conference Call  
Chandrasekar Santhanakrishnan, MD, Chair**

## Introduction

The Expedited Placement Workgroup met via WebEx on April 21, 2025, to discuss the following agenda items:

1. Welcome
2. Member responsibilities in the expedited offer process

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

### 1. Welcome

Summary of discussion:

**No decisions were made.**

The Chair welcomed the Workgroup and emphasized the importance of providing clear and transparent information as the Expedited Placement (EP) policy continues to take shape. Considering public comment feedback on Continuous Distribution (CD), which emphasized transparency, the Chair noted that the Workgroup should aim to clearly explain the proposed process. The Kidney Committee is expected to vote on the policy by June, and the Workgroup's goal is to finalize the EP policy for public comment in summer 2025.

### 2. Member responsibilities in the expedited placement process

Summary of discussion:

**Decision #1: The Workgroup agreed to a 60 minute simultaneous review period for transplant programs.**

**Decision #2: The Workgroup agreed OPOs should send expedited offer notifications in limited batches for simultaneous review by transplant programs, prioritizing programs within 250nm**

**Decision #3: The Workgroup agreed the OPO should be responsible for placing national offers under Expedited Placement.**

The Workgroup reviewed requirements for organ procurement organizations (OPOs) under Expedited Placement that have been developed in previous meetings.

Prior to initiating kidney expedited placement, the OPO will have:

- Offered through priority classifications and confirmed acceptance or refusal
- Confirmed that the donor meets at least 2 of the designated clinical criteria, **OR** 6 hours of cold ischemic time have accrued
- Reported the following information:

- Anatomical description, including number of blood vessels, ureters, and approximate length of each
- Kidney perfusion information, if performed
- Images of the kidney(s), including front and back of the kidney(s) and view of the aortic patch
- Biopsy results, if performed per *Policy 2.11.A Required Information for Deceased Kidney Donors*
- Expedited offer filters will be applied when OPO initiates expedited placement and the simultaneous offer evaluation period will begin

The Workgroup then reviewed OPO offer notification limits currently in place.

- Current notification limits OPOs may offer to:
  - Any potential transplant recipient (PTR) within the OPO's donation service area (DSA) or 250nm
  - PTRs at up to 5 transplant programs outside of the DSA/beyond 250nm
- Notification limits prevent further offers from being sent until a response (e.g. provisional yes (PY)) is received from a transplant program
  - As the notified transplant programs submit PYs, the OPO can send additional offers
  - Transplant programs may enter a PY for a PTR before receiving an offer for that PTR

The Workgroup considered the mechanisms of the OPO simultaneous offer process, whether current notification limits should apply, the length of the evaluation period for transplant programs, and how programs would respond for PTRs remaining on an EP match run.

#### *OPO offer notification process*

Members discussed how OPOs should send offer notifications under the Expedited Placement pathway. A member noted that if OPOs send a single round of expedited offers to all transplant programs with PTRs on the match, that may result in transplant programs receiving too many offers and would not improve the current process. Workgroup members generally supported prioritizing notifications to programs within a 250nm circle and utilizing notifications to a limited set of PTRs at a time. A member suggested OPOs may switch to offering to larger groups of PTRs after PTRs within 250nm have declined or perhaps if the 6 hour CIT threshold is exceeded. Members expressed that OPOs should be responsible for the national allocation of the organ under Expedited Placement.

Another member asked if EP offers will be clearly marked on the match run and if that will assist transplant programs in conducting an efficient review. The Workgroup Chair suggested that the proposed EP offer filters could also reduce the number of offers that transplant programs receive, improving efficiency. However, members agreed that they cannot fully predict the effectiveness of these mechanisms.

#### *Simultaneous evaluation period*

The Workgroup discussed the length of the simultaneous evaluation period, with most members preferring 60 minutes over 90 minutes. Members agreed that if the kidney is expected to be recovered and post-recovery information provided, 60 minutes is sufficient for programs to make a final acceptance or refusal.

Workgroup members confirmed that if a program does not respond within the 60-minute window, the OPO would enter a bypass, and the organ would go to the highest-ranked accepting PTR. One member recommended that the policy proposal contain visual graphics to clearly explain how the process differs between EP and standard allocation.

### *Designating candidates eligible for EP*

Members discussed whether transplant programs should be able to designate certain candidates as eligible for the Expedited Pathway (EP). Several members raised concerns that without a designation, programs would need to decline a large number of EP offers and the process would be inefficient. Members expressed interest in tools to better optimize which candidates receive EP offers. Members suggested a designation method within the candidate's registration, similar to what is in place for Expedited Liver pathway, would create smaller EP match runs, improving efficiency, and reducing the resource burden for transplant programs.

Members expressed different opinions on whether candidates should be automatically "opted-in" or "opted-out" upon implementation of expedited placement or defaulted to "opting-out." One member indicated a preference for opting-in all candidates at implementation and requiring transplant programs to remove candidates who are not a good match for expedited offers. Another member offered that an automatic opt-out would require transplant programs to carefully designate candidates that are most appropriate for EP offers and this would achieve greater efficiency in the system. Members agreed this question may be important to pose for public comment.

### *Informing candidates*

Members emphasized the importance of educating candidates early about the types of kidneys they may be offered through Expedited Placement (EP). A member pointed out the advantage of processes like the high Kidney Donor Profile Index (KDPI) consent or the Expedited Liver checkbox is that they must occur in advance of an offer. Members agreed that it will be important to ensure candidates agree to EP offers during their initial evaluation, and failing to do so may lead to late declines. Another member stressed the value of consistency for candidates and supported making EP education part of the initial evaluation process. Another member highlighted that programs participating in the IOTA model will be required to discuss organ offers with their candidates twice per year, and the proposed candidate education policy the Workgroup has developed should align with those requirements. Other members discussed the importance of showing candidates data such as graft survival rates and outcomes after extended time on dialysis when discussing hard-to-place kidneys.

Members considered whether requirements should be put into the candidate education policy to mandate conversations at certain times, such as at initial evaluation. A member offered this may be unnecessary due to overlapping IOTA requirements.

### *Program monitoring*

The Workgroup concluded with a brief discussion of the need for monitoring requirements for programs that frequently decline offers after entering a provisional yes. In previous discussions, Members had also raised concerns about how declining EP offers could impact transplant program metrics. The Workgroup agreed that a broader discussion is needed on the topic and initial feedback from the MPSC Committee should be gathered.

### Next steps

The Workgroup will continue discussions to finalize policy details for the Expedited Placement proposal. The Workgroup will review the results of the data requests in its next meeting.

### **Upcoming Meeting(s)**

- May 12, 2025, 3:00 ET
- June 9, 2025, 3:00 ET

## Attendance

- **Workgroup Members**
  - C.S. Krishnan
  - Jason Rolls
  - George Surratt
  - Anja DiCesaro
  - Carrie Jadlowiec
  - Oluwafisayo Adebisi
  - Sanjeev Akkina
- **HRSA Representatives**
  - Sarah Laskey
- **SRTR Staff**
  - Jon Miller
  - Jodi Smith
- **UNOS Staff**
  - Kaitlin Swanner
  - Carly Rhyne
  - Thomas Dolan
  - Rebecca Fitz Marino
  - Ben Welford
  - Sarah Booker
  - Asma Ali
  - Sharon Shepherd
  - Keighly Bradbrook
  - Amelia Devereaux