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COMMITTEE UPDATE
Concept Document: Next Steps Toward Improving Liver Distribution

Survey Results
Background

- RFI: December 18, 2009: 87 responses
- Forum in Atlanta: April 12, 2010: ~160 in attendance plus 70 via LiveMeeting
- Concept Document & survey link 12/31/2010: 227 responses
  - Wide Distribution List
Several organizations (ASTS, NYSDOH, NYCLT, OSOTC) also provided letters of response not included in tabulations.
Responses by Region
(13 with unknown State/Region)

Note: Responses indicated state, not center or region.
Responses from VA attributed to Region 11
Overall Responses

Would you support a national share 15 policy?

Is there a subgroup of liver transplant candidates with low MELD/PELD scores who may be unduly disadvantaged by a...

Do you think broader sharing for patients with high waiting list mortality is reasonable?

OPTN
## Cross Tabulation of Tiered Sharing Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHARE35</th>
<th>SHARE32</th>
<th>SHARE29</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Of the 84 indicating ‘no’ to all three, 21 indicated that they would support some other level of sharing (e.g., 15, 20, all)
### Cross Tabulation of Tiered Sharing Question – Including “Other”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share 35</th>
<th>Share 32</th>
<th>Share 29</th>
<th>Other share</th>
<th>None of above</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **63 (28%)**
- **164 (72%)**
Overall Responses

Should the Sharing Threshold (ST) concept be incorporated if tiered MELD/PELD sharing is endorsed?

Would you support a national policy for facilitated placement of donor livers that are not used locally or regionally?

- Yes: 185
- No: 12

- Yes: 208
- No: 19
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Committee Proposal (March 2011)

- Share 15 National
- Share 35 Regional with Sharing Threshold of 3
- Alone or in combination
- With or without ST
## Adult liver allocation algorithm

### Current allocation system
1. Regional status 1A
2. Regional status 1B
3. Local M/P ≥ 15
4. Regional M/P ≥ 15
5. Local M/P < 15
6. Regional M/P < 15
7. National status 1A
8. National status 1B
9. National M/P ≥ 15
10. National M/P < 15

### Share 15 national system
1. Regional status 1A
2. Regional status 1B
3. Local M/P ≥ 15
4. Regional M/P ≥ 15
5. National status 1A
6. National status 1B
7. National M/P ≥ 15
8. Local M/P < 15
9. Regional M/P < 15
10. National M/P < 15
Regional Share 35+ with Sharing Threshold 3 under Current allocation system

1. Regional status 1A
2. Regional status 1B
3. **Regional Share M/P 35+ with Sharing Threshold 3**
4. Local M/P 15-31
5. Regional M/P 15-34
6. Local M/P < 15
7. Regional M/P < 15
8. National status 1A
9. National status 1B
10. National M/P ≥ 15
11. National M/P < 15

3.1 Local M/P 37-40
3.2 Regional M/P 40
3.3 Local M/P 36
3.4 Regional M/P 39
3.5 Local M/P 35
3.6 Regional M/P 38
3.7 Local M/P 34
3.8 Regional M/P 37
3.9 Local M/P 33
3.10 Regional M/P 36
3.11 Local M/P 32
3.12 Regional M/P 35
Percent of liver transplants benefit from the sharing thresholds system among all transplants
Path Forward

- Spring/Summer 2011: Finalizing evidence/data/modeling for fully-formed proposal
- Fall/Winter 2011: Public Comment
- Early 2012: Evaluate and respond to public comment, draft final proposal for Board consideration
- June 2012: Submission to the Board
Other Updates

- Three Proposals for Public Comment
  - March-June 2011
  - Improved HCC Imaging
  - Reduce Waiting List Mortality for Adults Liver-Intestine Candidates
  - Split Liver AAS

- Will Review Comments in July

- Possible Board Submission November 2011
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Other Updates

- MELD Enhancements & Exceptions Subcommittee
- Liver Utilization Working Group
- Ongoing Review of Status 1 Cases