

**Opinion no. 63 of 12 October 2015  
relating to certain aspects of the  
'Donation after Circulatory Death' (DCD)  
draft protocol by the Belgian  
Transplantation Council and the Belgian  
Transplantation Society**

# 1. Request for opinion

On 8 April 2015 the Minister for Social Affairs and Public Health, Maggie De Block, asked the Advisory Committee to express an opinion on various aspects of a draft protocol on the issue of Donation after Circulatory Death (hereafter abbreviated to 'DCD') which was submitted to her by the Belgian Transplantation Council and the Belgian Transplantation Society<sup>2</sup>:

'The Belgian Transplantation Council has issued advice relating to a protocol concerning the donation of organs after cardiac arrest. You will find this protocol in the annex.

I am asking for your opinion on this matter, particularly as regards the methodology for selecting and processing potential donors. The three crucial points needing consideration are set out below.

Firstly, the recognition of the futility of continuing certain treatments for patients whose prognosis and chances of recovery must be taken into consideration. In some cases, the quality of life after any recovery is assessed. We should ask ourselves whether it is not preferable that the attending multidisciplinary medical team's decision be confirmed by a medical expert who is not part of the aforementioned team.

Secondly, any restrictive medical/pharmaceutical conditions that must be met in dealing with the donor. In the document, in this context it involves 'utilitarian euthanasia'. I presume this is an unusual medical intervention when a patient is dying and has no therapeutic value for the patient concerned.

A third question we might ask is whether the principle of 'presumed consent', as defined in the law of 13/06/1986, on the removal and transplantation of organs is also applied in the case of NHBD. The legislation was prepared in a context where it was common to remove organs from donors who were brain-dead. At that time the NHBD process was not applied. Finally, we could ask if there is as much public support for organ donation after circulatory failure as after confirmation of brain death. Brain death is generally perceived as irreversible whereas the proposed protocol stipulates significant interventions during the death process which in principle does not always result in a state where the removal of organs is still an option. Finally, some people might be under the mistaken impression that institutions where the NHBD process is applied do not sufficiently apply all therapeutic methods likely to save the patient's life. It therefore seems appropriate to properly educate the public in this regard.'(our translation)

---

<sup>1</sup> In the international literature, the term "Non Heart Beating Donors" (NHBD) has long been used. However, it is being rejected more and more in favour of the term DCD, a more accurate term from a medical point of view. An even more recent development is appearing in favour of the use of the terms 'DCDD' (donation after circulatory *determination* of death) and «cDCDD» (*controlled* DCDD) (see for example the August 2015 edition of *The American Journal of Bioethics*. All these terms refer to the same procedure for organ donation after circulatory and respiratory arrest.

<sup>2</sup> Printed up at the end of this notice.

## 2. Considerations and recommendations

The issue of DCDs has been addressed in depth in this draft protocol by the Belgian Transplantation Council and the Belgian Transplantation Society, in which legal and ethical considerations are also addressed. In view of this source data, this opinion will focus on the Minister's questions.

1 / With reference to futility

The draft protocol employs a dual terminology.

a. Paragraph 4.2.2.1 deals with patients for whom continuing any treatment is considered to be a 'medical futility'. In view of the description given below, the term 'physiological futility' should be clearly explained here. This concerns patients for whom any continuation of treatment is of no avail and which only increases their suffering. In this context it is clear that, for a conscientious physician, aggressive treatment must be avoided. In its Opinion no. 41 of 16 April 2007<sup>3</sup> relating to informed consent and DNR codes, this matter was discussed by the Committee in depth. Given that continuation of treatment is of no avail in this case it is advisable to prepare close relatives for potential organ donation. In this respect, there would obviously be no question of 'utilitarian euthanasia', as mentioned in the text, but it would be a medical procedure carried out with the necessary rigour, with respect for human dignity. Nonetheless, bearing in mind the debates which sometimes arise as a result of these decisions, a multidisciplinary consultation is desirable in accordance with Opinion 41. The physician and team responsible for the transplantation cannot play any role here. Furthermore, the intervention of an independent physician will certainly help to increase the family's confidence in the physicians and promote a positive attitude towards donation. This is fully comparable with a court's decision to always consult a second independent physician when such a radical and irreversible decision is being made (cf. the law on euthanasia). Indeed, even though no legal obligation exists in this matter, the explicit ethical rule is to communicate with the patient's family (e.g. their representative according to the law on patient rights). This communication is desirable and necessary because in these circumstances a 'futile' time frame for the patient but a 'useful' one for the transplant will have to elapse before the circulatory arrest takes effect.

b. Paragraph 4.2.2.2. deals with treatment withdrawal, proportionality and public support. In these circumstances it is not about 'medically futile' treatment but about an intention to extend the scope of what has been called 'qualitative futility'<sup>4</sup>: 'treatment is considered to be

---

<sup>3</sup> See <http://www.health.belgium.be/bioeth>, under the heading 'Opinions'.

<sup>4</sup> According to Schneiderman et Jecker "a treatment should be considered futile if it merely preserves permanent unconsciousness or cannot end dependence on treatment that can only be provided in an acute care hospital" (Schneiderman, L. J. in N.A.S. Jecker. 2011. *Wrong Medicine: Doctors, Patients, and Futile Treatment*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

futile if all it does is maintain a permanent state of unconsciousness or does not end dependence on treatment which cannot be provided in a hospital department specialising in acute care.' Extreme caution is advisable. It is not, in fact, a purely medical/technical stance under discussion here, but a balance of medical considerations, the patient's wishes regarding their future quality of life and the cost to society of chronic intensive care. In these circumstances, physicians' choices concerning the donation and removal of organs for transplantation could also be driven by economic motives. Including economic considerations in the donation process would constitute an ethically unacceptable step forward.

c. If the treatment is stopped due to the patient choosing not to continue living while their quality of life is limited, it goes without saying that this decision should be respected, in accordance with the law on patient rights and on the principle of free will. It can be valuable in this context for the patient to express this desire in a prior declaration with the request set out. The representative can help to determine what the patient's wishes would be when circumstances are such that he can no longer indicate his decision for himself.

Similarly, as mentioned in 1a, the opinion of a physician other than the attending physician is required in this particularly sensitive situation. This physician will intervene, in a manner of speaking, as the patient's donor advocate<sup>5</sup>, as is the case when organs are removed from a living donor. This additional opinion will allow greater objectivity to be brought to the decision-making process and thus reassure the public regarding whether the situation has been critically examined and whether informed decisions have been made.

## 2 / Regarding the term 'utilitarian euthanasia'.

The Advisory Committee on Bioethics believes that this term is clearly inappropriate in this instance. Indeed, it is not a question of euthanasia in the sense described by Belgian legislation. Therefore, the Committee proposes not to use the term 'utilitarian euthanasia' in the protocol (Chapter 4.2). In addition, a select committee from within the Committee itself shall look into a request for an opinion on the issue of organ donation after euthanasia.

## 3 / Regarding the principle of implicit authorisation

The Advisory Committee on Bioethics first of all draws attention to the fact that the Belgian system of implied authorisation for organ donation (also called 'presumed consent' or 'opting-out') assumes that people are given the right information. Thus the distinction between 'medical or physiological futility' and the 'qualitative futility' is very important. It is clear that if too much emphasis is placed on 'qualitative futility', there is a danger that people's confidence in the system of implied authorisation could be adversely affected. Given the current acute shortage of organs, this loss of confidence would be a major handicap. A small increase in

---

<sup>5</sup> See the opinion on this matter in a Committee letter of 19 March 2013 at <http://www.health.belgium.be/bioeth> under the heading 'Opinions/opinions by letter'

opportunities for donation could lead, paradoxically, to a drop in the number of prospective donors.

#### 4 / The five-minute rule

Bearing this in mind, the indication in the text that a two-minute cardiac arrest might now be sufficient to start the transplantation process constitutes a dangerous precedent and contradicts the international consensus<sup>6</sup> which requires a period of at least five minutes. Although a shorter time is probably better for the quality of the donor organs, the Committee considers it more desirable to respect the consensus pending new empirical data.

---

<sup>6</sup> Brody B, Halevy A, Is futility a futile concept? *J Med Philos*, 1995, 20, 123-144; Bernat JL, Capron AM, Bleck TP et al, The circulatory-respiratory determination of death in organ donation, *Crit Care Med* 2010, 38, 963-70; Anderson T.A., Bekker P, Vagefi P.A, Anesthetic considerations in organ procurement surgery : a narrative review, *Can J. Anest*, 2015, 62, 529-539.

This opinion was prepared by select commission 2015-2 consisting of:

Joint chairpersons	Joint reporters	Members	Members of the Bureau
R. Rubens	R. Rubens	D. Bron	P. Cosyns
J. Herremans		E. Heinen	
		R. Kramp	
		R. Reding	
		P. Schotsmans	
		S. Sterckx	

**Member of the secretariat**

L. Dejager

**The working documents of the select commission** - the question, personal contributions of the members, minutes of the meetings, documents consulted - are kept on file at the Committee's Documentation Centre where they are available to be consulted and copied.

This opinion is available to be consulted at [www.health.belgium.be/bioeth](http://www.health.belgium.be/bioeth)

\*\*\*

**ATTACHMENT TO OPINION No 63 of 12 OCTOBER 2015 RELATING TO CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE 'DONATION AFTER CIRCULATORY DEATH' (DCD) DRAFT PROTOCOL BY THE BELGIAN TRANSPLANTATION COUNCIL AND THE BELGIAN TRANSPLANTATION SOCIETY**

**1. Introduction**

**2. DCD Categories**

2.1. Actual classifications

2.2. Belgian modified Maastricht classification for Donors after Circulatory Death

2.2.1. Uncontrolled

2.2.1.1. Category I: Dead on arrival

2.2.1.2. Category II: Unsuccessful resuscitation

2.2.2. Controlled

2.2.2.1. Category III: Awaiting cardiac arrest

2.2.2.2. Category IV: Cardiac arrest while brain death

2.2.2.3. Category V: Euthanasia

**3. Legal aspect**

3.1. Introduction

3.2. Patient unsuitable for DCD donation in Belgium

3.3. Protection of deceased donors

3.3.1. Selection of donors

3.3.2. Transplantation center

3.4. Conditions for recovery of organs from deceased donors

3.4.1. Who is a donor?

3.4.2. Who can oppose?

3.4.3. How to oppose?

3.4.4. Surviving relatives

3.4.5. Voluntary and unpaid

3.5. Confirmation of donor's death

3.5.1. Three physicians

3.5.2. Official report

3.6. Confirmation of brain death

3.6.1. Respect for the deceased

3.6.2. Violence

3.6.3. Unknown or suspicious

3.7. Anonymous donation

3.8. Requirements for recipients

3.9. Quality and safety

3.9.1. Characterization of recovered organs and donors

3.9.2. Transportation of organs

3.9.3. Traceability

3.10. Reporting system

3.11. Euthanasia

#### 4. Ethical considerations

4.1. Ethical considerations and recommendations concerning organ donation after circulatory death

4.1.1. Introduction

4.1.2. Recommendations: from patients to potential donors

4.1.3. Some important considerations

4.1.3.1. Selection of patients for DCD procedures

4.1.3.2. Comfort therapy

4.1.3.3. Organ preserving therapies

4.1.3.4. Definition of death

4.1.3.5. Organ retrieval

4.2. The practice of donation after DCD of Maastricht category 3: can ventilator switch off followed by organ procurement be considered as utilitarian euthanasia?

4.2.1. Introduction

4.2.2. Explanation of terms

4.2.2.1. Donation after DCD of Maastricht category 3

4.2.2.2. Treatment withdrawal

4.2.2.3. Euthanasia

4.2.3. Accompanying in their end of life

4.2.4. Conclusions

#### 5. Identification of potential uncontrolled DCD donors –Categories 1 and 2

5.1. Definition and scope

5.2. Importance of warm ischemia for DCD categories 1 and 2

5.3. Current situation in Belgium

5.4. Protocols across the world

5.5. Typical procedure

5.6. General criteria and contra-indications

5.7. Medico-legal considerations

5.7.1. No-touch period

5.7.2. Family approach

5.7.3. Family consent

5.7.4. Ethical and psychological considerations

5.8. Surgical perfusion technique

5.9. Interruption of the CPR

5.10. Reasons for unsuccessful procedures

5.11. The future of uncontrolled procedures in Belgium

#### 6. Identification of potential controlled DCD donors – Category 3

6.1. Definition

6.2. Medical management

6.3. Sequential stages during controlled DCD procedures

6.4. Communication aspects

**6.4.1. Communication with family**

**6.4.2. Communication with all teams involved**

6.5. Eligibility criteria for DCD

6.6. Withdrawal of life-sustaining therapy

**6.6.1. Planning**

**6.6.2. Comfort therapy**

6.7. End of life care management in the operating room

6.7.1. Involvement of anesthesiologists

- 6.7.2. Analgo-sedation
- 6.7.3. Other medication
- 6.7.4. Circulatory arrest
- 6.7.5. No-touch period
- 6.7.6. Diagnosis of death

## **7. Identification of potential controlled DCD donors - Category 4**

## **8. Euthanasia**

## **9. Procurement**

- 9.1. For the abdominal organs
  - 9.1.1. Super rapid laparotomy
  - 9.1.2. Hypothermic in situ preservation with the double-balloon triple-lumen catheter
  - 9.1.3. Normotherpic in situ preservation
- 9.2. Rapid laparotomy or pre-mortem cannulation?
- 9.3. Lung procurement from DCD donors

## **10. Definitions of warm ischemia time**

## **11. Allocation procedure within Eurotransplant**

- 11.1. Kidneys
- 11.2. Liver, lungs and pancreas

## **12. Outcome after DCD organ transplantation**

- 12.1 Outcome after DCD kidney transplantation
- 12.2 Outcome after DCD liver transplantation
- 12.3 Outcome after DCD lung transplantation
- 12.4 Heart transplantation

## **13. Expansion or erosion into DBD donor pool by the use of DCD donors**

## 1.Introduction

*P.Evrard MD, PhD and H.VanVlierberghe MD PhD*

Organ transplantation improves the quality of life and increases the life expectancy of patients with end- stage organ failure. The Belgian law supports the opting out system to approach possible donors. As a consequence and due to governmental campaigns, the number of brain death donors per million inhabitants in Belgium is amongst the highest in the world. Still patients do not reach transplantation as the number of patients on the waiting list outnumbers the amount of organs available. Therefore alternative sources of organs need to be sought. Living organ donation, splitting of organs... could contribute and diminish the gap between the number of listed and transplanted patients. These sources will not be covered in this document.

“Non Heart beating donors (NHBD)” or in a more recent and international definition «Donors after Circulatory Death (DCD)” are a potential and additional group of deceased persons, being able to add organs to the pool. DCD describes the recovery of organs for the purposes of transplantation that follows death confirmed using circulatory criteria. This differs in respect with the actual model for deceased donation, which is the donation after the confirmation of death using neurological criteria (“Heart beating donation (HBD)” or “Donation after brain death (DBD)”). In the beginning of the era of transplantation, the most of the donors were DCD, whereas later (and due to better outcome), DBD became the standard. Recent re –interest rose in DCD donors, as a consequence of better preservation techniques and a better insight in different categories of DCD donors (the so-called Maastricht classification). In recent literature, more and more data are available that the results after organ (kidney, liver, lung...) transplantation using DCD are acceptable or good. Also in Belgium, different organs were transplanted with DCD donors.

Since organ donation is based on a broad platform (general society and professionals), it is important to communicate on this in a transparent and uniform manner. Therefore the Belgian Transplantation Council and the Belgian Transplantation Society organized a working group on DCD covering its aspects (Legal and ethical aspects, aspects about retrieval and perfusion, surgical aspects...). This working group consisted out of experts from all universities and university hospitals and from experts of some non-university hospital.

This document is the result of several meetings and is the result of a consensus between the experts.

It is the most sincere hope that this document finds its way to the general and professional society and in this way contributing to the acceptance of DCD donors as a valuable and necessary way to enlarge the numbers of donors.

## 2. DCD categories

*P.Evrard MD, PhD*

### 2.1. Actual classifications

The *NHBD Maastricht classification* (Table 1)<sup>1</sup> has been largely used over the last 15 years. This classification has the advantage of characterizing the DCD processes that may have their own particularities, including ethical or surgical aspects. It also has the advantages of simplicity and usefulness. Up to now, all other attempts to improve the Maastricht classification added new categories based on different ischemic graft insults leading to potential different transplant results, despite the fact that the DCD situation was already included in the Maastricht classification.

A Spanish national consensus proposed a “Modified Maastricht classification for DCD (Madrid 2011)” adapted to the reality and experience of its country with category 1 and 2 (table 2)<sup>2</sup>. The Eurotransplant organization officially recognized the particular donation after euthanasia in The Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxemburg. The modified and more complete categorisation proposed by Detry et al better define the different situations encountered in the different groups and countries with active DCD program (table 3)<sup>3</sup>. The WHO Critical Pathway for deceased donation classified DCD according to the phase of the process as possible, potential, eligible, actual and utilized donor (fig 1)<sup>4,5</sup>. These last classifications are more complex.

### 2.2. Belgian modified Maastricht classification for Donation after Circulatory Death

The proposed new classification conserves the skeleton for further improvement, as it is simple, clear, and **classifies easily the different DCD types by processes** for ethical issues and for the non-medical or non-specialised reader interested in the field (table 4). This is also an argument for public consideration and trust in the difficult field of organ donation.

All the relevant times should be defined and reported separately for ischemia calculation.

The first level of definition is simple and based on whether the situation is controlled or not. These are usually kept from the old into the new classifications.

#### *2.2.1. Uncontrolled*

##### ***2.2.1.1. Category I: Dead on arrival***

Includes victims of a sudden death, whether traumatic or not, occurring out or in the hospital and who, for obvious reasons, have not been resuscitated. Once the circulatory death is certified by a physician on the scene, the dead body can be transferred into hospital for organ recovery depending on country regulation and laws.

##### ***2.2.1.2. Category II: Unsuccessful resuscitation***

Includes patients who suffer a CA and in whom CPR has been applied and resulted unsuccessful. CA occurs out or in the hospital, being attended by health-care personnel with immediate initiation of CPR. The circulatory death is only declared after a no touch period which excludes possible auto-resuscitation.

#### *2.2.2. Uncontrolled*

##### ***2.2.2.1. Category III: Awaiting cardiac arrest***

Includes patients in whom withdrawal of life-sustaining therapies is applied, as agreed upon within the health-care team and with the relatives or representatives of the patient. DCD

procurement is a medically planned, controlled procedure in an ICU patient in whom further medical treatment is deemed futile (fig 2). It is the treating physician who is responsible and takes the medical decisions concerning the end of life (MDEL): consensus about limiting orders like do not resuscitate (DNR), do not start new treatments (withholding), stop useless (ineffective) treatments (withdrawal), start comfort therapy and/or palliative care. The intention of comfort therapy is to promote the wellbeing of the patient; some types of comfort therapy can be life shortening as non-intended side-effect (Principle of Double Effect). Negative side-effects (life shortening) are proportionally acceptable. The highest value is a human dying process for the terminally ill patient. Once the decision is taken, the transplant team is informed and procedures for organ donation may start. The patient's death results from stopping of ventilation followed by cardiac arrest, correctly humanly and medically supported. Resort to a type III DCD donor remains the consequence of the decision to stop a treatment becoming useless, going against patient's dignity. The distinction of decisional places and decisional times will avoid any intentional causal link between the decision of stopping treatment in the Intensive Care Unit and of stopping ventilation in the operating theatre. A cross information to all intervening people concerning the aims sought will allow each of them to take on their own ethical responsibilities. The circulatory death is only declared after a no touch period which excludes possible auto-resuscitation.

#### **2.2.2.2. Category IV: Cardiac arrest while brain death**

Includes patients who suffer a CA after the determination of death by neurological criteria, but before the aortic cross clamping in the operating theater has been performed. It is likely that restoration of cardiac activity is first attempted, with a switch to the surgical protocol of donation, if this fails.

#### **2.2.2.3. Category V: Euthanasia**

Includes patients who grant access to medically-assisted circulatory death. Euthanasia is legally approved in some countries and defined as the "act practised by a third party who deliberately puts an end to the life of a person, on request of this one". Some individuals who have granted access to euthanasia expressed their willingness to have their organs procured after death. Organ donation after euthanasia is allowed under the scope of donation after circulatory death. Most patients who require euthanasia in Belgium and in the Netherlands are cancer patients who are clearly not candidates for DCD donation. But a small proportion of these cases are patients with e.g. severe, stable neurological deficits, whose medical affectation cannot be transmitted through organ donation. These patients are potential DCD donors. Most euthanasias are performed at home by the regular family physician, but DCD donation after euthanasia requires one to perform the euthanasia in an OR (or in a preparation room close to the OR to allow the presence of the family at the time of death).

**Table 1: Maastricht Categories for Donation after Circulatory Death**  
(Kootstra, 1995).

U N C O N T R O L L E D  D C D	I	<b>Dead on arrival</b>	Includes victims of a sudden death, whether traumatic or not, occurring out of the hospital and who, for obvious reasons, have not been resuscitated.
	II	<b>Unsuccessful resuscitation</b>	Includes patients who suffer a CA and in whom CPR has been applied and resulted unsuccessful. CA occurs within the hospital, being attended by health-care personnel with immediate initiation of CPR.
C O N T R O L L E D  D C D	III	<b>Awaiting cardiac arrest</b>	Includes patients in whom withdrawal of life-sustaining therapies is applied, as agreed upon within the health-care team and with the relatives or representatives of the patient.
	IV	<b>Cardiac arrest while brain death</b>	Includes patients who suffer a CA in the process of the determination of death by neurologic criteria or after such determination has been performed, but before the transfer to the operating theater. It is likely that restoration of cardiac activity is first attempted, with a switch to the protocol of donation after circulatory death, if this fails.

CA: cardiac arrest, CPR: cardio-pulmonary resuscitation

**Table 2: Modified Maastricht Classification for Donation after Circulatory Death (Madrid 2011)**

U N C O N T R O L L E D  D C D	I	<b>Dead in the out-of-hospital setting</b>	Includes victims of a sudden death, whether traumatic or not, occurring out of the hospital and who, for obvious reasons, have not been resuscitated.
	II	<b>Unsuccessful resuscitation</b>	Includes patients who suffer a CA and in whom CPR has been applied and resulted unsuccessful. <b>II.a. Out-of-hospital</b> CA occurs in the out-of-hospital setting and is attended by an extra-hospital emergency service which transfers the patient to the hospital with cardiac compression and ventilatory support. <b>II.b. In-hospital</b> CA occurs within the hospital, being attended by health-care personnel with immediate initiation of CPR.
C O N T R O L L E D  D C D	III	<b>Awaiting cardiac arrest</b>	Includes patients in whom withdrawal of life-sustaining therapies is applied*, as agreed upon within the health-care team and with the relatives or representatives of the patient.
	IV	<b>Cardiac arrest while brain death</b>	Includes patients who suffer a CA in the process of the determination of death by neurologic criteria or after such determination has been performed, but before the transfer to the operating theater. It is likely that restoration of cardiac activity is first attempted, with a switch to the protocol of donation after circulatory death, if this fails.

*\*Includes withdrawal of any type of ventricular or circulatory support (i.e. ECMO)*

**Table 3: Modified Maastricht Classification for Donation after Circulatory Death**  
(Detry, 2012)

U N C O N T R O L L E D  D C D	I	<b>Dead in the out-of-hospital setting</b>	<p><b>1A</b> Cardiocirculatory death outside hospital with no witness. Totally uncontrolled</p> <p><b>1B</b> Cardiocirculatory death outside hospital with witnesses and rapid resuscitation attempt. Uncontrolled</p>
	II	<b>Unsuccessful resuscitation</b>	<p><b>2A</b> Unexpected cardiocirculatory death in ICU. Uncontrolled</p> <p><b>2B</b> Unexpected cardiocirculatory death in hospital (ER or ward), with witnesses and rapid resuscitation attempt. Uncontrolled</p>
C O N T R O L L E D  D C D	III	<b>Awaiting cardiac arrest</b>	<p><b>3A</b> Expected cardiocirculatory death in ICU. Controlled</p> <p><b>3B</b> Expected cardiocirculatory death in OR (withdrawal phase &gt; 30 min). Controlled</p> <p><b>3C</b> Expected cardiocirculatory death in OR (withdrawal phase &lt; 30 min). (Highly) controlled</p>
	IV	<b>Cardiac arrest while brain death</b>	<p><b>4A</b> Unexpected cardio circulatory arrest in a brain dead donor (in ICU). Uncontrolled</p> <p><b>4B</b> Expected cardiocirculatory arrest in a brain dead donor (in OR or ICU). (Highly) controlled</p>
	V	<b>Euthanasia</b>	<p><b>5A</b> Medically-assisted cardiocirculatory death in ICU or ward. Controlled</p> <p><b>5B</b> Medically-assisted cardiocirculatory death in OR. Highly controlled</p>

**Table 4: Modified Maastricht Classification for Donation after Circulatory Death (Belgium 2013)**

U N C O N T R O L L E D  D C D	I	<b>Dead on arrival</b>	Includes victims of a sudden death, whether traumatic or not, occurring out or in the hospital and who, for obvious reasons, have not been resuscitated.
	II	<b>Unsuccessful resuscitation</b>	Includes patients who suffer a CA and in whom CPR has been applied and resulted unsuccessful. CA occurs out or in the hospital, being attended by health-care personnel with immediate initiation of CPR.
C O N T R O L L E D  D C D	III	<b>Awaiting cardiac arrest</b>	Includes patients in whom withdrawal of life-sustaining therapies is applied, as agreed upon within the health-care team and with the relatives or representatives of the patient.
	IV	<b>Cardiac arrest while brain death</b>	Includes patients who suffer a CA during a DBD procedure.
	V	<b>Euthanasia</b>	Includes patients who grant access to medically-assisted circulatory death.




Figure 1: WHO Critical Pathway for deceased donation<sup>4</sup>




Figure 2. Process of controlled donation after circulatory death<sup>3</sup>

### 3. Legal aspect

*An Vijverman and Geneviève Schamps*

#### 3.1. Introduction

The legal aspects of DCD organ donation in Belgium are laid down in the Law of 13 June 1986 on the organ donation and transplantation, as modified by the Royal Decree of 22 December 2003 and by the Laws of 25 February 2007, 19 December 2008 and 3 July 2012.

The Law of 3 July 2012 implemented the Directive 2010/45(53)/EC of 7 July 2010 on standards of quality and safety of human organs intended for transplantation.

The legal aspects of end of life care are laid down in the Law of 22 August 2002 on the patient's rights.

The Law of 19 December 2008 defined more specifically the recovery and use of human tissue for medical application or scientific research.

#### 3.2. Patients unsuitable for DCD donation in Belgium

There are four categories of DCD donors according to the Maastricht classification but patient declare dead by the physician on the scene could not be transported by ambulance (category I: dead on arrival outside the hospital).

#### 3.3. Protection of deceased donors

##### *3.3.1. Selection of donors*

A physician must ensure that donors are selected on the basis of their health and medical history.

##### *3.3.2. Transplantation centre*

In Belgium, only physicians from a transplantation centre can remove and transplant organs from deceased donors in a recognised transplantation centre (= a hospital service recognised as such) or in a hospital that has concluded a collaboration agreement with the transplantation centre which is responsible for the transplantation.

A transplantation of a heart or a heart-lung can also be carried out by a team of a health care program "cardiac pathology T" that has concluded a collaboration agreement with a transplantation centre.

#### 3.4. Conditions for recovering organs from deceased donors

##### *3.4.1. Who is a donor?*

Organs and tissue intended for transplantation may be removed from anyone who is registered in the Belgian population register or in the foreigners' register since more than 6 months. The donor may moreover not explicitly have opposed against organ donation (= opt-out system).

A person who is not registered in the Belgian population register or in the foreigners' register since more than 6 months, can only be a donor when he/she has expressly agreed with the donation (= opt-in system).

Moreover, each person who is able to express his will may also specifically express his will to be a donor after his death.

#### *3.4.2. Who can oppose?*

A person who has reached the age of 18 and is able to express his will can express his opposition alone.

A person younger than 18 but able to express his will can oppose either alone during his life or the opposition can be expressed by one of his parents or his tutor.

If a person is younger than 18 but is not able to express his will, the opposition can be expressed (as long as this person is alive) by one of his parents or his tutor.

If a person not capable to express his will due to his mental state, the opposition can be expressed – provided that this person is alive - by his legal representative, his provisional administrator or – in their absence- by his closest relative.

#### *3.4.3. How to oppose ?*

According to the Royal Decree of 30 October 1986 (and the Circular of 19 February 1987), the opposition can be recorded in the Belgian population register.

It is however also possible to oppose in any other way, (e.g. a written document, an oral declaration to a close relative or a trusted person, et cetera).

#### *3.4.4. Surviving relatives*

Since the Law of 25 February 2007, a physician who recovers organs or tissue has not to take into account the opposition by the surviving relatives of the donor. The surviving relatives can be informed on an organ donation, but they cannot oppose against the procurement, nor is the informed consent of the surviving relatives required.

But the physician who intends to remove the organ has to inquire about the existence of an opposition expressed by the potential donor.

#### *3.4.5. Voluntary and unpaid*

Donations of organs of living and deceased donors are voluntary and unpaid (living donors can however receive a compensation for direct and indirect expenses and loss of income related to the donation). A Royal Decree will be adopted in the future to define the conditions of this compensation.

### 3.5. Confirmation of the donor's death

#### *3.5.1. Three physicians*

The death of the donor must be established by three physicians, excluding the physicians who are treating the recipient or who will perform the removal or the transplantation. This confirmation must be based on the most recent state of science in establishing death.

#### *3.5.2. Official report*

The physicians shall state the time of death and the way in which the donor's death was confirmed in a dated and signed report. This official report shall be kept for a period of ten years.

### 3.6. Cause of death

#### *3.6.1. Respect for the deceased*

Recovering of the organs and closing of the dead body must be carried out with respect for the deceased and for the feelings of the family.

#### *3.6.2. Violence*

If the cause of death is violence, the physician carrying out the Recovering of organs must draft a report which is forwarded immediately to the Procureur des Konings/Procureur du Roi.

### *3.6.3. Unknown or suspicious*

If the cause of death is unknown or suspicious, no organ may be removed, unless the Procureur des Konings/Procureur du Roi is informed in advance and does not oppose.

### 3.7. Anonymous donation

The identities of the donor and of the recipient may not be disclosed.

### 3.8. Requirements for recipients

Organs or tissue can be allocated in Belgium to recipients having the Belgian nationality; to recipients being resident in Belgium since at least 6 months; or to recipients having the nationality of a country sharing the same allocation organism as in Belgium (Eurotransplant) or being domiciled in such country since at least 6 months.

### 3.9. Quality and safety

#### *3.9.1. Characterisation of recovered organs and donors*

All recovered organs and all donors must be characterised before the transplantation. This characterisation must be done on the basis of a model document attached to the Law of 3 July 2012.

#### *3.9.2. Transportation of organs*

Appropriate operating procedures must be in place to ensure the integrity of the organs during transport and a suitable transport time.

#### *3.9.3. Traceability*

All organs procured, allocated and transplanted in Belgium must be traced from the donor to the recipient and vice versa in order to safeguard the health of donors and recipients. This traceability implies the implementation of a donor and recipient identification system. All data required for full traceability is kept for a minimum of 30 years after the donation.

### 3.10. Reporting system

There must be a reporting system in place to report, investigate, register and transmit relevant and necessary information concerning serious adverse events that may influence the quality and safety of organs and that may be attributed to the testing, characterisation, procurement, preservation and transport of organs, as well as any serious adverse reaction observed during or after transplantation which may be connected to those activities. An operating procedure must be in place for the management of serious adverse events and reactions.

### 3.11. Euthanasia

The Law of 28 May 2002 decriminalizes euthanasia if the legal conditions are observed. Euthanasia is defined as an "act performed by a third party who intentionally puts an end to a person's life at this person's request". This third party must be a physician.

There is no legal provision in Belgian Law that prohibits the possibility for a person who asks for euthanasia to express also his will to give his organs after his death.

The Law of 22 August 2002 on patient's rights set the right to refuse a treatment on a free and well-informed decision. The compliance with this decision mustn't be confused with an act of euthanasia.

#### 4. Ethical considerations

*P. Schotsmans and D. Jacquemin*

##### 4.1. Ethical Considerations and Recommendations Concerning Organ Donation after Circulatory Death

###### 4.1.1. Introduction

Organ shortage remains a real challenge for transplantation medicine. After having developed effective organ recruitment procedures after brain death, the possibilities of integrating organ donors after circulatory death (DCD) are now considered.

DCD is a new terminology: "non heart beating donation (NHBD) and its four categories type I, II, III and IV" were more common. It is however medically more adequate to speak in terms of DCD.

Organ recruitment after DCD confronts us with several ethical, but also practical challenges. We concentrate on the ethical aspects.

An overview of the challenges:

- the decision to withhold and withdraw therapy (treatment limiting orders);
- the non-predictability of the moment of death based on irreversible circulatory arrest;
- the time of death and the (un)certainly of the diagnosis of death;
- the necessary extremely short time window between the confirmation of death and the withdrawal of the organs;
- the observation that patients are not yet dead at the moment of the decision making to start the procedure of DCD, and therefore the inclusion and application of patients' rights law (in essence the communication and deliberation with the family members);
- emotional reactions of physicians, nurses, family members and patients at the moment of transfer to the operation room where the patient will die;
- concerns about provoking more suffering for the donors (administration of e.g. *Heparine*, invasive procedures like catheters induction, reperfusion of the brain after declaration of death).

###### 4.1.2. Recommendations: from patient to potential donor

- Decision to limit treatment: the **treating** physician and his team are making totally independent this decision.
- The treatment limitation is postponed in order to prepare the patient to become a potential donor. A fully documented limiting treatment order guarantees a clear distinction between the end of curative treatment and the start of the caring process for the potential donor.
- The continuing care for the patient as potential organ donor cannot be considered as therapeutic aggression and/or obsession.
- The procedures are openly discussed with the patient (if possible), family members and the caring team. Notifications of these conversations are written down in the medical records of the patient.
- The organ preserving measures may not provoke any suffering for the patient.

- Comfort care must always be provided. Eventually this may shorten the dying process, although this may not be the intention.
- The global procedure (limiting orders, confirmation of death and organ donation) must follow an explicit and openly communicated written protocol.

#### *4.1.3. Some important considerations*

##### **4.1.3.1. Selection of patients for DCD procedures**

It is extremely important that the eventuality of organ donation is not influencing the treatment of the patient. The treating physician remains fully responsible for the care of the patient: she or he decides about the efficiency of further treatment and eventually to write down limiting treatment orders.

Communication with family members is necessary: in accordance with the concrete organization of the medical environment, this communication may be done by the treating physician and/or the local organ donation or the transplant coordinator.

This communication gives family members the opportunity to express their opinions concerning the DCD procedure. It should be clearly explained to them that the moment of death is not certain and that eventually the DCD procedure must be canceled. Tissue donation remains however always a possibility.

##### **4.1.3.2. Comfort therapy**

After the decision to stop further curative treatment, the moment of death remains uncertain: it is important to preview comfort therapy in order to avoid anxiety, pain and distress. It is eventually indicated and certainly ethically justifiable to apply these therapies, even in the awareness that these therapies may shorten the dying process (i.e. the centuries old principle of double effect). It is ethically unacceptable to end intentionally the life of the patient in order to make him ready for organ donation.

##### **4.1.3.3. Organ preserving therapies**

Organ preserving therapies are ethically acceptable, under the condition that they do not provoke more suffering

##### **4.1.3.4. Definition of death**

While dying is a process, to be dead is a moment. It is extremely important to withdraw organs only after the moment the patient has died. Death must be certified by three independent physicians (Belgian Legislation on Organ Transplantation). In contradiction with the criteria for brain death, there is still an ongoing debate on the criteria for the irreversible character of circulatory arrest. A “no touch” period of at least 2 but not more than 5 minutes is therefore indicated.

##### **4.1.3.5. Organ retrieval**

Organ retrieval may only start after the confirmation of death by 3 physicians, excluding those who are treating the recipient or who will perform the procurement and/or the transplantation of organs.

4.2. Can ventilator switch off followed by organ procurement be considered as utilitarian euthanasia?

##### **4.2.1. Introduction**

To answer to the question: “Can ventilator switch off followed by organ procurement be considered as utilitarian euthanasia?”, it is important – to avoid any confusion – to clarify the

meaning of three concepts: 1) NHBD of the category 3 (the term “Donation after Circulatory Death (DCD) determination of Maastricht category 3” should be preferred to NHDB), 2) euthanasia and 3) the ethical rule of treatment proportionality. It is clear indeed that an approach that would be insufficiently argued and that would disregard the action finality – i.e. withdrawing treatments that have become futile – could not only result in a blurring of roles between stakeholders but could also be seen as an act of killing instead of an interruption of therapies that are no longer beneficial for the patient.

#### *4.2.2. Explanation of terms*

##### **4.2.2.1. Donation after Circulatory Death (DCD) of Maastricht category 3**

This procurement technique is applicable to patients for whom treatment continuation would be considered as medical futility since, although they are not brain dead, the poor outcome is inescapable. In this context of medical futility, prolonging treatment would be useless or even deleterious for the dignity of the patient and hence withdrawal of care appears to be the best option.

##### **4.2.2.2. Treatment withdrawal**

The withdrawal of treatments that have become futile is ethically justified, based on the principle of proportionality – i.e. the choice of treatments has to be balanced with risks, costs, feasibility and expected results according to the condition of the patient and available resources<sup>6</sup>.

It is fundamental that the decision-making process leading to treatment withdrawal strictly remains based on the determination of futile therapy and in accordance with the ethical principle of proportionality. To guarantee that this is respected, the withdrawal decision should be the result of a consensus obtained within the medical team in charge of the patient. The discussion on organ donation must always take place after the decision to withdraw medical treatments. In those cases where the physician who will accomplish treatment withdrawal (operating room) is not involved in the end-of-life decision (intensive care), he must have acquired the moral conviction that the decision to withdraw therapies was indeed the best option. As soon as organ donation is discussed a formal meeting should take place between both physicians.

##### **4.2.2.3. Euthanasia**

The article 2 in the Law of May 2002 defined the euthanasia as : “*act performed by a third party who intentionally puts an end to a person’s life at the request of the said person*”<sup>7</sup>. Given this definition, the act of stopping therapies cannot be considered as euthanasia since the aim is not to intentionally and actively terminate the life of the patient but instead to guarantee a respectful and peaceful end of life.

The “utilitarian” terms needs some clarification. It is indeed important to bear in mind that, although the concept of *donation after circulatory death determination* may raise the utilitarian issue, the patient is by no way instrumentalized since the primary aim of the withdrawal of futile therapies is to ensure the best interests of the patient.

#### *4.2.3. Accompanying patients in their end of life*

Ventilator switch off is a difficult moment for caregivers, particularly if circulatory arrest is not fast enough and hence impedes the adequate timing for optimal preservation of organs, which is essential for the survival of other patients.

In the context of organ donation after circulatory death determination – as in any end-of-life situation occurring in the ICU – the dying process has to be medically accompanied with humanity and dignity. It is during this period that the concept of “utilitarian euthanasia” may be suggested<sup>8</sup>. However, as stated above, the decision to withdraw futile therapies is taken

first; organ recruitment after the circulatory death determination is being considered only after this decision.

Switching off ventilator and adequately accompanying the dying process may be considered as responsibility abuse by healthcare professionals. Death could indeed be mistakenly viewed as the consequence of the caregivers' action since it occurs after their intervention. This subjective position would not consider the fact that the patient "holds" his own death and that his incurable illness legitimates the decision to withdraw treatments and to provide comfort therapies.

Lack of understanding the context and the decisional algorithm may lead physicians who are not involved in the end-of-life process to decline their implication in treatment withdrawal on the basis of *conscientious objection*<sup>9</sup>. This could preclude other patients from having their life saved thanks to an organ transplant.

#### 4.2.4. Conclusions

Although ventilator switch off associated with human medical assistance leads to circulatory arrest and hence patient's death, **this is in no way euthanasia**.

Donation after Circulatory Death (DCD) determination of Maastricht category 3 is only considered once the decision to withdraw futile treatments has been taken; the later being in accordance with the respect of patient's dignity.

It may be of interest to distinguish the place where ventilator switch off occurs from the place where the withdrawal decision is taken.

Horizontal sharing of information related to treatment withdrawal and organ recruitment with all actors will allow them to shoulder their own ethical responsibilities.

## 5. Identification of potential uncontrolled DCD donors - Categories 1 and 2

*Franck Verschuren and Hervé Lebbinck*

### 5.1. Definition and scope

The interest for organ Donation after Circulatory Death (DCD) as a potential alternative for increasing the number of transplanted organs has emerged in the early nineties. In 1995, Pr Koostra proposed a classification of 4 DCD categories, called the "Maastricht categories" since they were created during an international DCD meeting in Maastricht. It is easy to separate Maastricht categories 1 and 2 according to the fact that the cardiac arrest of the patient happens *outside* the hospital (category 1) or *inside* the hospital (category 2). Those two categories are clearly different than the other Maastricht categories 3 and 4, since categories 1 and 2 represent a clinical *uncontrolled* situation where the cardiac arrest has occurred, as opposed to the controlled situation of an awaited cardiac arrest after therapeutical withdrawal. Categories 1 and 2 are therefore similar in many points, the most important reason for classifying them into two categories being the potential difference in the duration of the organ ischemia (called warm ischemia) which is supposed to be longer in case of a cardiac arrest outside the hospital necessitating a longer transport time. In the practice, categories 1 and 2 are often mixed and interrelated, with typical situations of a patient presenting a cardiac arrest outside the hospital with no initial consideration for organ donation, who will be transported to the hospital where the death will be certified in the emergency department before an organ procedure.

It is important to notice that the accurate definition of a DCD Maastricht category 1 was initially called "death on arrival", which is not compatible with potential organ donation in Belgium, since the law prevents transporting a death patient to the hospital. It is therefore more appropriate to speak of "cardiac arrest on arrival" which more clearly corresponds to the uncontrolled situation of a patient being reanimated outside the hospital, and then

transported to the hospital under reanimation, and finally being considered as dead after a medical decision inside the emergency department.

In conclusion, the scope of this chapter will focus on “uncontrolled DCD from Maastricht categories 1 and 2”

## 5.2. Importance of warm ischemia

The final interest of creating Maastricht categories was probably related to the need for an international language for appreciating the quality of the future transplanted organs. The definition of warm ischemia for uncontrolled DCD is the time in minutes between the first cardiac arrest and the start of the cold perfusion for organs preservation after the death. This warm ischemia time is of crucial importance for appreciating the quality of the organs. It is therefore easy to understand that this warm ischemia time might be much shorter when the death occurred inside the hospital (category 2) than outside (category 1). But many other aspects will interfere with this too simple way of considering organs quality for transplantation: (1) the time between cardiac arrest and the start of a cardio-pulmonary reanimation (CPR); (2) the time of a low blood pressure before the occurrence of the cardiac arrest; (3) the quality of the cardio-pulmonary reanimation and the occurrence of several return of spontaneously circulation before the final death; (4) the location of the death inside the hospital either the emergency department or the intensive care unit; (5) the presence of witnesses after the cardiac arrest outside the hospital. While waiting for future research on the influence of all those factors on the quality of the transplanted organs, and in absence of current clear consensus, the definition and the criteria for warm ischemia in DCD categories 1 and 2 may be proposed as the following:

1. The “total warm ischemia time”, which is the time between the first cardiac arrest until the start of the cold flush after the death, must be lower than 2 hours
2. The lap between the first cardiac arrest and the start of a first CPR must be lower than 15 minutes. Therefore, the “absolute warm ischemia time”, which is the time between starting CPR and the cold flush, must be lower than 1h 45 min.

## 5.3. Current situation in Belgium

If DCD donation has progressively increased in Belgium for achieving more than 20% of the deceased donation potential and more than 50 transplanted kidneys in 2010, the number of organs from categories 1 and 2 were only 5 kidneys during the same year, coming from 2 or 3 centers in the country. The experience of DCD from category 2 has started in 2000 in the Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc and in 2008 at Hospital Sint-Augustinus Veurne, with an average of 1 to 2 successful kidney donations every year. The current practice of uncontrolled DCD from Maastricht categories 1 and 2 allows recovering only kidneys as organs, as well as bones or valvular tissues, which are beyond the scope of this chapter. Many reasons explain why uncontrolled DCD is less expanded than controlled DCD from Maastricht category 3: (1) the uncontrolled occurrence of cardiac death happens in any time over day, night or week-ends; (2) the need for a short warm ischemia time is demanding for the transplantation teams; (3) the multi-organ procurement is difficult to achieve; (4) the risk of family refusal because of a too short reflexion time may be higher; (5) the literature for expanding local experiences is poor.

## 5.4. Protocols around the world

The recourse to DCD as a potential source of transplanted organs has now emerged in many countries over the world, like USA, UK, Australia, the Netherlands, France, Spain or Canada. But the experience in categories 1 and 2 is restricted to a few of them, France and Spain sharing with Belgium this particularity. France has started a national uncontrolled DCD program in 2007, with two specific aspects: (1) the cornerstone of a well-developed pre-hospital medical intervention teams and (2) the refusal of practising any controlled DCD from Maastricht category 3. They transplanted 60 kidneys in 2010 from this uncontrolled DCD approach, which represent 4% of their deceased donors. In Spain, particular aspects of uncontrolled DCD from categories 1 and 2 are related to (1) the placement of ECMO outside the hospital and (2) the multiorgan procurement with liver and kidneys donation.

### 5.5. Typical procedure

Let us summarize and explain a typical presentation:

19 years old patient
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>17h00</b>: faints at home, without prodromes</li> <li>• <b>17h10 – 18h30</b>: pre-hospital intervention team discovers asystoly and starts CPR and advanced life support, but without any return to spontaneous circulation</li> <li>• <b>18h30</b>: the patient is admitted in the emergency department while CPR is maintained during transport, ideally with an auto-pulse compression</li> <li>• <b>18h56</b>: CPR is considered as futile; death is considered</li> <li>• <b>19h01</b>: CPR and ventilation are stopped ; start of the « no-touch » period</li> <li>• <b>19h06</b>: femoral canulation by the surgical team</li> <li>• <b>19h20</b>: canulation performed</li> <li>• <b>20h00</b>: admission in operating room</li> </ul>


NB: in this example, the “total warm ischemia time”, which is the time between the first cardiac arrest until the start of the cold flush, is 2h and 20 minutes (17h to 19h20), which is longer than the recommended maximum time of two hours.

### 5.6. General criteria and contra-indications

Four hospitals in Belgium currently have a local written protocol for a potential DCD from Maastricht category 2. If most of the items are similar, the few discrepancies will be explained and discussed.

- The “total warm ischemia time”, which is the time between the first cardiac arrest until the start of the cold flush after the death, must be lower than 2 hours
- The lap between the first cardiac arrest and the start of a first CPR must be lower than 15 minutes. Therefore, the “absolute warm ischemia time”, which is the time between starting CPR and the cold flush, must be lower than 1h 45 min.
- The total time of reanimation must be lower than 1h30
- As DBD there is no age limit but usually limited to 60 years. In practice, most patients considered for this procedure are young and healthy patients with trauma or cardiac ischemia as aetiology of the death.
- There is no ruptured abdominal aneurysm or any major abdominal vascular or renal injury
- The traditional contra-indications for DBD transplantation are respected: neoplasm (<5 years of remission), septicaemia, intravenous drug abuse

- Finally, contra-indications may be discussed case-by-case according to the patient's status before the cardiac arrest, the interpretation of the warm ischemia time, the availability of the transplant team



## 5.7. Medico-legal considerations

These are the same as for DCD Maastricht category 3, in terms of need for a certified death by 3 independent doctors, the consultation of the national registry, the information to the prosecutor of the king, respect of the corpse, and approach of the family

### 5.7.1 No-touch period

Most of the time, the surgical transplant team is not yet available when the medical team considers the futility of the CPR. In these cases, CPR and ventilation are maintained until the arrival of the transplant team. At that moment, all medical intervention on the patient is stopped, which corresponds to the start of the “no-touch period”. The end of the no-touch period corresponds with the accurate time of the certified death, since this no-touch period certifies the irreversible status of the cardiac arrest. This “no-touch period” must be seen as a “red line” between the status of patient becoming a status of potential donor. The respect of this time is crucial. The duration of this period is a point of debate in the literature, and must be “at least 2 minutes”. It is reasonable to propose a duration of at least 2 minutes but not more than 5 minutes for this “no-touch period” in Belgium. The surgical team should never be physically present inside the reanimation room before the death of the patient.

### 5.7.2. Family approach

The discussion on organ donation must start after the information on the death. Most of the time, this discussion happens during the time the surgical team is busy with the femoral cannulation, which is ethically acceptable since the cannulation happens after the death. When the cannulation is finished, it is still possible for the family to see their death relative in the emergency room. Except if the deceased person previously registered the explicit wish to donate, the discussion on organ donation with the family must respect the Belgian law and avoid putting too much pressure on the decision: the main idea is asking to the nearest relative

if the deceased one had previously pronounced any opposition or wish to organ donation. If the relatives are not present after 2 hours of death, the procedure is stopped. The quality of the information concerning organ donation is probably made easier if the relatives were clearly aware of the catastrophic clinical situation during the CPR. The relationship between the care givers and the family must be of high quality, so that the family can trust the physician when he will speak over donation. The presence of the family inside the reanimating room during the CPR may facilitate this trust, and must be encouraged.

### 5.7.3. Family consent

Differences exist in Belgian protocols on the need for a written consent by the family. There is no legal obligation for such a written consent, and the spontaneous acceptance or refusal by the nearest relative of the deceased person is most of the time so evident that any written consent is of limited interest.

### 5.7.4. Ethical and psychological considerations

The “dead donor rule” legally imposes that any donation follows the death, and never precedes it. But in the practice, the senior physician in charge of a difficult reanimation may think of potential donation during this phase. He may also inform the transplant coordination team during this phase. It is therefore mandatory for the physician in charge to be conscious that the evocation of donation cannot modify the quality of the reanimation. Other aspects concern the potential interest of separating the medical and/or nursing team from one to the other side of the “no-touch” period line, so that other care givers take care of two aspects of the same person: the patient and the donor. Finally, any DCD procedure should be followed by a systematic psychological debriefing.

## 5.8. Surgical perfusion techniques

The surgical perfusion technique is the responsibility of the surgeon on duty. The abdominal organs preservation is performed by cannulation of the femoral artery using a double balloon triple lumen catheter and insertion of a catheter in the femoral vein for venous decompression (figure 3). The thoracic organ preservation is performed with topical cooling via chest drains. Another possibility for in situ preservation –albeit only done in very few centers and currently not in Belgium- is the normothermic preservation by means of extra-corporeal membrane oxygenation. (see Preservation chapter)




Figure 3

## 5.9. Interruption of the CPR

The decision of stopping CPR does not currently answer to strict and undiscussed criteria, and remains a medical and responsible decision. Such a decision must be taken independently of any organ donation procedure of course.

- An accurate aetiology of the cardiac arrest will have to be established
- Particular cautions must be taken for children or young adults in terms of establishment of a normal core temperature (at least 34°5 C) and biological parameters (pH > 7.20; PaO<sub>2</sub> >60 mmHg; PaCO<sub>2</sub> < 45 mmHg). Those criteria applies in case of intoxication or hypothermia
- In the absence of univocal criteria, the interruption of CPR will be considered when the aetiology of the cardiac arrest is classical (unrelated to intoxication or hypothermia), with the absence of return to any cardiac rhythm since more than 20 minutes, and with an end-tidal expired CO<sub>2</sub> of less than 10 mmHg
- The definition of a “**refractory cardiac arrest**” must be well known and taken into consideration by the physician, since a patient answering its definition will be a candidate for an extracorporeal circulation rather than organ donation. A refractory cardiac arrest concerns a cardiac arrest of more than 30 minutes in normothermia. In this case, if the “no-flow period” which is the time before the start of CPR is less than 5 minutes, and if the “low-flow period” which is the time of the CPR is lower than 100 minutes, and if EtCO<sub>2</sub> remains higher than 10 mmHg, then the placement of an extra-corporeal membrane oxygenator (ECMO) must be discussed instead of any organ donation. Those recommendation have been proposed in 2010 by a French expert consensus

#### 5.10. Reasons for unsuccessful procedures

The success of a Maastricht category 1 or 2 DCD procedure depends on a well-structured organisation with an appropriate collaboration between the pre-hospital team, the emergency department, the transplant coordinators and the transplant surgeons. Moreover, the family refusal rate is around 50% in our experience, due to the dramatic and unattended situation they are just facing. But this refusal rate is inferior to the absence of consideration for a potential DCD procedure due to any reluctance by the medical team. Finally, the cannulation procedure may be unsuccessful.

#### 5.11. The future of Maastricht category 1 and 2 DCD procedure in Belgium

Expanding the procedure in more emergency departments and pre-hospital teams. The Belgian scientific society of Emergency Medicine is currently busy in informing its physicians about this procedure.

Expanding the technical procedure so that livers and lungs may be part of the organ donation. Informing the population about this procedure.

### 6. Identification of potential controlled DCD donors - category 3

*D. Monbaliu, J. Joris, F. Lois, A. Neyrinck, A. De Weerd, P. Ferdinande, D. Ledoux, J. Berré, E. Hoste, P. Hantson, P. Evrard*

## 6.1. Definition

Every potential DCD donor is a patient with a catastrophic (=non-recoverable) injury or illness who is dependent on life-sustaining therapy. These conditions include severe brain injury of diverse etiology, end-stage musculoskeletal disease, and end-stage organ failure.

In these patients, criteria for brain death are not likely to be met *and* an evolution towards brain death with maintenance of circulatory function is not likely to take place.

Consequently, there is an intention in these patients to withdraw life-sustaining therapy because no meaningful recovery or survival is anticipated and therefore continuing medical care may be considered futile. After withdrawal of life-sustaining therapy, imminent death is anticipated.

The decision to withdraw life-sustaining therapy is first taken in consensus by the patient's treating medical team and other caregivers, followed by informing and discussion with the patient which is rarely possible (e.g. end stage neuromuscular disease, euthanasia) or with his legal representative(s) the patient's relatives.

It is mandatory that the decision to withdraw life-sustaining therapy is taken *prior to* and *completely independent* from the option of organ donation.

The decision to stop life support therapies is the responsibility of treating intensive care physician(s). They are responsible for their patient's care; hence it is their duty to create a consensus between doctors, nurses and relatives. They may ask other physicians' opinion to help them making the most appropriate decision.

Similarly to the DBD procedure, no written consent is required. However there must be a written motivation of withdrawal decision (WD) in the patient's record and information has to be communicated to trusted person(s), if any.

It is reported that DCD donors did not express hastened withdrawal decision (time from ICU admission to WD) nor shortened end-of-life (time from WD to death).

For successful DCD donation, cardio-circulatory arrest should occur within an expected time frame to limit the damage during the agonal phase that donor organs are exposed to (e.g. ~30 min for the liver and ~60 for the kidneys/lungs). Currently, there is only one clinical tool available that established a correlation between a numerical score (from 7 to 21) score and the time to expire after extubation, the so-called University of Wisconsin scoring tool<sup>10</sup> (table 5). The higher this score, the less time it takes for the patient to expire. The criteria utilized in this evaluation tool are derived from weaning protocols and evaluate patients who have been disconnected from the ventilator for a period of up to 10 minutes. After this 10 min period, ventilatory rate, tidal volume, negative inspiratory force and oxygen saturation are measured. During this assessment patients may become rapidly unstable (systolic blood pressure <80mmHg or oxygen saturation <70%) intrinsically indicating to be a suitable candidate for DCD. This tool assumes that respiratory tidal volume and airway pressure can be measured bedside. This score was developed for adults, has not yet been validated prospectively and does not take into account the potential effect of comfort therapy given during or before the withdrawal of life-sustaining therapy.

**Table 5.** Criteria of the UW DCD evaluation tool. The final score reflects an assessment of the patient's eligibility as a potential DCD donor.

<i>CRITERIA</i>	<i>Assigned Points</i>
<b>Spontaneous respirations 10 min after disconnection from ventilator</b>	
<i>Rate &gt;12</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Rate &lt;12</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Tidal volume &gt;200 cc</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Tidal volume &lt;200 cc</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Negative inspiratory force (NIF) &lt; -20 cm H<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Negative inspiratory force (NIF) &gt;-20 cm H<sub>2</sub>O</i>	<i>1</i>
<b>No spontaneous respirations</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Vasopressors/inotropes</b>	
<i>No vasopressors/inotropes</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Single vasopressors/inotropes</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Multiple vasopressors/inotropes</i>	<i>9</i>
<b>Patient age</b>	
<i>0-30</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>31-50</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>51+</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>Intubation</b>	
<i>Endotracheal tube</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Tracheostomy</i>	<i>1</i>
<b>Oxygenation after 10 minutes</b>	
<i>O<sub>2</sub> sat &gt; 90%</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>O<sub>2</sub> sat 80- 89 %</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>O<sub>2</sub> sat &lt;79 %</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>FINAL SCORE</b>	

## 6.2. Medical management

Every potential DCD donor is a patient awaiting withdrawal of futile life sustaining therapy and thereafter death has been declared using cardiopulmonary or cardio-circulatory criteria. Consequently any intervention that aims at optimizing perfusion and oxygenation will therefore be beneficial for the patient, the potential donor and donor organs. However prior to withdrawal support, drugs that aim to improve or preserve donor organ function may be administered (e.g. heparin). Of primary importance is to assure maximal patient comfort during the agonal phase. The administration of such drugs (sedatives, analgesics) is ethically acceptable as long as administration does not hasten death intentionally. Comfort therapy may however shorten the agonal phase referred as the “act with double consequence” (doing good=comfort for the patient with unintended negative side effects= shorter agonal phase).

### Recommendations

- *A clear and transparent DNR (do not resuscitate) protocol is instituted in every center participating in DCD donation*

- *The decision to withdrawal life-sustaining therapy is the responsibility of treating intensive care physician(s) and is the result of a consensus between doctors, nurses and relatives.*
- *The organ transplant team is not involved in the decision making of withdrawal of life-sustaining therapies and later in the withdrawal itself*
- *Drugs administered to improve outcome after DCD organ transplantation are ethically accepted when not administered with the only aim to hasten death (also see comfort therapy)*
- *All caregivers involved in the procedure should be fully informed and volunteering to be part of the procedure .*
- *All maneuvers that may maintain or restore cerebral circulation after declaration of death should be forbidden as they may interfere with the natural process of progressive irreversible brain death .*


### 6.3. Sequential stages during controlled DCD procedures

Different consequent stages should be respected during every DCD procedure in a stringent way (figure 4).

Most importantly, the first step is always the independent decision making process to withdraw life sustaining therapy in the light of an irreversible catastrophic illness without any means of recovery for the patient. This decision has to be taken completely independently from the “organ donation option”. This independency should be transparent and its implementation can be facilitated by the development of a clear and written “end of life care” or DNR (“do not resuscitate”) protocol in every unit willing to participate in DCD organ donation.

After the decision to withdrawal life sustaining therapy has been made the following steps should be taken:

- Care for the potential donor and donor family
- Notification of a transplant center and planning of the procedure
- The phase of withdrawal of life sustaining support, followed by the declaration of death and stand-off or no-touch procedure
- Surgical procedure or procurement



**Figure 4.** Every DCD procedure should follow and respect a stringent order of stages

### Recommendations

*A stringent stepwise approach is followed during an uncontrolled DCD procedure:*

- *Step 1: decision to withdraw life sustaining therapy in the light of an irreversible catastrophic illness without any means of recovery for the patient. This decision is always taken completely independent from the “organ donation option”*
- *Step 2: discussion withdrawal life sustaining therapy with family*
- *Step 3: eligibility for organ donation discussed with transplant center prior to offer opportunity to donate*
- *Step 4: option organ donation discussed and agreement with family. Implications should be discussed: where, what time scheduled , place to say goodbye, organ and/or tissue retrieval, end of life procedure, pain and comfort therapy during agonal phase, preferences, possible abortion of donation and consequences.*
- *Step 5: planning of withdrawal of life sustaining therapy*
- *Step 6: withdrawal of life sustaining therapy, determination of death on circulatory criteria followed by organ donation and procurement.*

#### 6.4. Communication aspects

##### **6.4.1. Communication with family**

First the decision to withdraw life sustaining support is discussed with the family in the light of the hopeless prognosis in the absence of further therapeutic options. Secondly, and ideally in a separate communication, the opportunity to donate after death as diagnosed by cardio circulatory criteria and not by brain death criteria are discussed. An informed consent may or may not have to be signed by the family members depending on the local protocol.

## Recommendation

- *Similarly to the DBD procedure, no written consent is required*

### 6.4.2. Communication with all teams involved

The nature of a DCD procedure remains very different from a DBD procedure (where the patient has been declared dead before arrival in the OR) and should therefore be clearly and thoroughly discussed with all members of the transplantation team as well as all members of the local hospital staff (including all medical and nursing staff, patient's treating physicians, social workers and anyone who might be involved in this procedure). Importantly a detailed and hospital approved protocol should be available and thoroughly be discussed prior to the procedures.

It is recommended to document the decision to withdraw therapy as well as the informed consent/ response of the patient/representative in the patient's file.

## 6.5. Eligibility criteria for DCD

In general, eligibility criteria for DCD are similar as for organ donation after brain death depending on age, comorbid disease states, organ function. The final decision for DCD eligibility should always be determined by individual transplant centers.

Briefly, patients with a history of intravenous drug abuse, active sepsis or systemic infection, active malignancies and high-grade brain tumors are usually excluded. In contrast, patients with e.g. non-melanoma skin malignancies and some primary non-metastatic brain tumors may be eligible and hepatic B or C, HIV positive organs can be transplanted in recipients already infected with these viruses. Other rare contra-indications include prion-related diseases, some systemic viral infections (e.g. rabies) or infection with HTLV.

However, in contrast to DBD, criteria for DCD tend to be more stringent compared to DBD. One example is age which does seem to have a largely negative impact on longer-term DCD allograft survival. Because organs from DCD donors have higher delayed graft function rates, the combination of older age and DCD may jeopardize outcome in terms as incidence of delayed graft function and allograft survival. This has been consistently reported in larger registry data analyses<sup>11</sup>. However, excellent outcomes (similar to DBD) have been reported by dedicated single center. Interestingly some of these centers reporting excellent outcome apply *very* strict criteria for DCD organ transplantation (e.g. very brief donor warm ischemia and cold ischemia times for liver transplantation<sup>12</sup>).

Eligibility criteria should be determined by the individual transplant programs (which might differ amongst each other depending on the individual experience and the potential transplant benefit the recipient candidates might have).

Whether recipient candidates should be informed on the possibility that they receive a potentially inferior DCD graft is left to the discretion of the transplanting center.

## 6.6. Withdrawal of life-sustaining therapy

### 6.6.1. Planning

Withdrawal of life-sustaining therapy ideally takes place in the operating room. Most importantly all aspects of withdrawal of life-sustaining therapy need to be discussed in detail with all healthcare takers involved in the procedure and with the donor's family. The opportunity should be offered to the family to spend time with the patient or to be present prior to or during the withdrawal of life support. Clear agreements should be made in advance

with the family and the medical team on all aspects of the donation including the possibility in case a patient does not expire within a well-defined time frame of acceptable warm ischemia time which might preclude acceptable graft function post-transplant. Another important issue of the withdrawal of support phase is to ensure that adequate “comfort” therapy will be given during the dying process by the patient’s treating physicians.

#### *6.6.2. Comfort therapy*

During withdrawal of life sustaining therapy, adequate comfort therapy should be given to minimize all discomfort that may occur during the phase of dying and there is some evidence of such discomfort in DCD donors<sup>13</sup>. This comfort therapy should basically not differ from comfort therapy without organ donation. Comfort therapy should be provided according to local institutional and/or personal standards. The family should be informed that the procedure does not include or will not lead to any enhanced discomfort during the dying process. The transplant team should not participate in any of the decisions regarding comfort therapy during the withdrawal of the support phase.

#### *Recommendations*

- *Comfort therapy should be offered to all patients in whom life sustaining therapy is withdrawn*
- *Type and dose of comfort therapy is left at the discretion of the patient’s treating physicians*
- *No participation of transplant team is allowed regarding comfort therapy*

### 6.7. End of life care management in the operating room

#### *6.7.1. Involvement of anesthesiologists*

The involvement of intensivists, not familiar with material and personnel of the operating room (OR), to provide the end of life care in the OR is not always optimal and welcome to create a required climate of confidence and serenity in the OR due to ethical issues. In these conditions, involvement of anaesthesiologists familiar with the local OR may be recommended.

Since anesthesiologists of the OR do not know the donor medical history and do not participate to the decision of treatment withdrawal, they should not be obliged to manage the end of life care of the patient for donation after circulatory death (DCD). Their involvement should nevertheless be favored and be considered on a voluntary basis. In this case, the presence of the intensivist until the death of patient remains welcome.

The willing anesthesiologists should solicit information about donor’s medical history and provide these information to OR personnel. They are not supposed to question the decision of treatment withdrawal taken by intensivists. They are also responsible for maintenance of respectful and serene atmosphere in the OR.

To meet all these prerequisites DCD organs procurements should be ideally scheduled during daytime with personnel familiar to this procedure.

#### *6.7.2. Analgo-sedation*

When the decisions of no further benefit of therapy and treatment withdrawal is taken, the need for analgo-sedation is acknowledged, and the patient is transferred to the OR where the procedure leading to organs/tissues recovery is started. The comfort therapy should not be interrupted and the patient should not be returned to the ICU for further care. In case of no organ procurement took place within the preset time limit a room may be accessible for the dying process. Nevertheless the intensivists must provide the family with sufficient time to mourn the end of life of the patient. When the patient is in the OR, the duration of the terminal phase may become irrelevant for the donor. In contrast keeping warm ischemia as short as

possible is important for the receiver(s). Accordingly the donor is draped and the surgeons are ready for organs retrieval before the declaration of death. The need and the choice of analgo-sedation are left to the medical judgment of physicians but should be maintained until the death declaration.

#### *6.7.3. Other medication*

It is considered as ethically acceptable to give medications and use interventions such as heparine, glucocorticoids, pharmacologic preconditioning that will not benefit the patient, but will protect the viability of the organs and benefit the recipient(s).

#### *6.7.4. Circulatory arrest*

The circulatory arrest will be defined as a persistent lack of arterial pulsation determined with an artery catheter. To better define "Warm Ischemia Time (WIT)" it is recommended to equip patient with a femoral line since radial artery pressure monitoring underestimates central arterial pressure in critically ill patients. Residual electrical cardiac activity is not taken into account for circulatory death and electrocardiogram should not be monitored to avoid any confusion and misinterpretation by OR personnel.

#### *6.7.5. No-touch period*

The period of no-touch starts when the criteria for circulatory arrest are met. The period of no-touch lasts at least 2 minutes and no more than 5 minutes. This interval is sufficient since we use the femoral artery pressure, because DCD donors are already brain damaged, and then this circulatory arrest is preceded by a prolonged period of brain hypoperfusion and hypoxia.

#### *6.7.6. Diagnosis of death*

At the end of this no-touch period and in respect for the Belgian law on organ donation, the death of the donor is diagnosed by three physicians independent from the procurement/transplant team.

### *Recommendations*

- *Circulatory arrest is defined as a persistent lack of arterial pulsation determined with an artery catheter.*
- *A no touch period of at least 2 minutes but no more than 5 minutes will always be respected.*
- *Death is certified at the end of the no-touch period that begins at the moment of the circulatory arrest.*
- *Death is diagnosed by three physicians independent from the procurement/transplant team.*

## **7. Identification of potential controlled DCD donors - category 4**

Includes patients who suffer a cardiac arrest in the process of the determination of death by neurologic criteria or after such determination has been performed (DBD), but before the transfer to the operating theater or during the procurement procedure. It is likely that restoration of cardiac activity is first attempted, with a switch to the surgical protocol of donation, if this fails.

## 8. Euthanasia

*D. Monbaliu, D. Ysebaert, P. Evrard.*

With the legal acceptance of euthanasia as a suitable end of life pathway in Belgium and the Netherlands, it is becoming evident that euthanasia can be followed by successful organ donation<sup>14</sup>. This process involves the establishment of irreversible circulatory arrest as in a controlled DCD which is then followed by laparotomy, perfusion and organ donation. Such an approach is perhaps the ultimate DCD donor as the potential donor gives full consent himself rather than being the responsibility of a relative.

Needless to say and similar to other DCD types, the decision of end of life is taken independently of a possible organ donation. Teams in charge of performing the euthanasia are independent of transplant teams and the determination of death must be established by three physicians, excluding the physicians who are treating the recipient or who will perform the recovery or the transplantation.

In addition their blood group and tissue type can be established before death and the potential recipients admitted before death. Such an approach - though strange to the extent of making the donor surgeon very uncomfortable - is the logical sequence after the legalisation of euthanasia.

Eurotransplant recommendation 01.08.

Following the Belgian experience Eurotransplant (ET) established (2008) and implemented (2010) recommendation on organ donation after euthanasia:

Euthanasia has to be an accepted procedure in the legal framework of the donor country.

The euthanasia procedure and the determination of death after the euthanasia procedure have to be in line with national law and national practices.

The euthanasia procedure itself and the explantation should follow a clear protocol.

The euthanasia procedure and the organ recovery as well as the organ allocation should be kept as separate as possible.

All donors have to be reported to ET, the allocation should follow the NHBD allocation rules in the donor resp. recipient country.

Organs from donors after a euthanasia procedure shall only be allocated to patients registered on the waiting list for organ transplantation in ET, and within ET, in countries that accept the transplantation of this type of donor organ. In addition the possibility to indicate the acceptance of organs from donors after a euthanasia procedure should be added to the center- and patient-specific donor profiles in ENIS (Eurotransplant database).

### *Recommendations*

- *Euthanasia decision is taken independently of a possible organ donation*
- *Blood group and tissue type are established before death and the potential recipients admitted before death*
- *Teams in charge of performing the euthanasia are independent of transplant teams*
- *The euthanasia procedure and the organ recovery as well as the organ allocation should be kept as separate as possible.*

## 9. Procurement

*D. Monbaliu, O. Detry*

After declaration of irreversible circulatory arrest, the transplantation team ideally reenters the operating room. They preferably may have prepared and draped the donor-patient prior to the

withdrawal of life sustaining therapy, and set-up all necessary instruments, preservation solutions, inflow tubing and outflow tubing.

Ideally heparin is administered IV before withdrawal of life sustaining therapy. To avoid any every (potential) conflict of interest and “external” pressure, members of the procurement may leave the operating theatre prior to the withdrawal of therapy and reenter after the cardio circulatory arrest has occurred or at the end of the no touch period just before declaration of death. However if not required by the local ethical committee, the procurement teams can be present during the withdrawal of life sustaining therapy.

The aim of organ procurement in DCD donation is to stop as rapidly as possible the ongoing progressive organ damage occurring during the donor warm ischemia. Until now there are no other techniques than those similar to the DBD procurement. Nevertheless, there are some clear and distinctive differences. Most importantly there is no blood flow (unless ECMO is installed, see below). Dissection takes thus place under hypothermic asystolic conditions. There is a particular concern about the possibility of aberrant arterial vasculature.

### 9.1. For the abdominal organs


Three procurement techniques have been described:

1. super rapid technique
2. hypothermic in situ preservation with the double-balloon triple-lumen catheter
3. normothermic in situ perfusion

#### **9.1.1. Super rapid laparotomy**

Worldwide the most often used technique is the modified super-rapid technique as described by the Pittsburgh group<sup>15</sup>. This consists of a midline laparotomy followed by a rapid cannulation of the aorta to start the cold flush (figure 5). Some centers advocate to first perform a caval venting to reverse venous congestion invariably present in the abdominal / thoracic organs prior to the start of inflow. For the abdominal organs, venous venting can be easily achieved by opening the inferior caval vein in the pericardium. After installing the aortic flush and venous outflow, an additional portal vein flush can be installed with topical cooling of the abdominal organs. This topical cooling is facilitated using abundant volumes of sludged ice and is mandatory followed by decompression and flushing of the common bile duct and gall bladder.

The importance of the intraoperative flushing of the bile duct besides the gall bladder is increasingly recognized as a crucial step in particularly for DCD liver procurement. To avoid any damage of hepatic hilar structures (bile duct, artery, capsular tears...), extensive dissection at the liver hilum and cholecystectomy is avoided. To minimize the aortic cannulation to perfusion time, different techniques have been described to quickly secure the aorta before the inflush e.g. using a babcock clamp<sup>16</sup> or a strap b<sup>17</sup> although this might cause a narrowing of the inflow tube as observed by Ray et al<sup>18</sup>.




**Figure 5.** Super rapid laparotomy.

First the infra renal abdominal aorta is cannulated (left), then a clamp is placed on the thoracic aorta through the pericard (middle) and finally, additional portal flush is installed via the vena mesenterica superior or inferior.

*9.1.2. Hypothermic in situ preservation with the double-balloon triple-lumen catheter*

**9.1.2.1. Post-mortem in situ preservation for uncontrolled DCD donors**

Hypothermic in situ preservation with a double-balloon triple-lumen catheter (figure 6) is in many centers the method of choice for uncontrolled DCD donors. This catheter is placed into the aorta through the femoral artery. After partial inflation of the distal, abdominal balloon, the catheter is pulled back onto the aorto-iliac bifurcation. Blood is then taken for screening (e.g. blood, HLA typing). Thereafter, the proximal or thoracic balloon is inflated at the level of the diaphragm, well above the level of the renal arteries. Next a large sized catheter (e.g. Foley catheter) is placed in the femoral vein allowing the outflow of the cold (4°C) preservation solution which is infused via the double-balloon triple-lumen catheter to cool the kidneys. Usually, heparine and streptokinase are administered through the catheter before starting the cold flush. In situ preservation preserves organ viability and gives opportunities to meet the legal and logistical requirements of the organ donation that ensues. Donor nephrectomy is performed as soon as possible, usually within 2 hrs after in situ preservation has started. Post-mortem placement of this double-balloon triple-lumen catheter can be done in the emergency room after failed resuscitation and declaration of death.



**Figure 6.** In situ preservation technique with the double-balloon triple-lumen catheter<sup>19</sup>

### **9.1.2.2. Pre mortem in situ preservation for controlled DCD donors**

An alternative to the super rapid laparotomy for controlled DCD donors is the pre mortem cannulation of the femoral artery using a double balloon triple lumen catheter and insertion of a catheter in the femoral vein for venous decompression. This can be done prior to withdrawal of life-sustaining support as described by the Wisconsin group<sup>20</sup>.

After declaration of death immediate flushing the abdominal organs with cold preservation solution can be initiated prior to transport the donor to the theatre where organ procurement takes place.

### **9.1.3. Normothermic in situ preservation**

A third possibility for in situ preservation –albeit only done in very few centers and currently not in Belgium- is normothermic preservation by means of extra-corporeal membrane oxygenation allowing to control the temperature of the organ and to add oxygen.

Extra-corporeal membrane oxygenation can be done in DCD donors following pre-mortem cannulation prior to or after withdrawal of life-sustaining therapy in controlled and declaration of death in uncontrolled DCD donors, respectively. Cannulas are introduced into the femoral vessels and connected to the circuit. Importantly, recirculation of blood to the brain should be avoided by means of a balloon inserted via the contralateral femoral artery and inflated at the level of the diaphragm. This also excludes the perfusion of the thoracic organs. ECMO is initiated and normothermic preservation installed; some groups maintain temperatures a~37°C, others leave the temperature to decrease around 32°C. During normothermic perfusion, biochemical adjustments regarding ph, acid-base and hematological parameters can be done

For controlled DCD donors, this approach increases the family's access to the donor during the withdrawal therapy. It consequently allows much more flexible timing. ECMO allows preservation of 78 min in a range of 66 versus 99 min. Following ECMO the donor is wheeled to the theatre where a conventional laparotomy organ procurement and cold storage are initiated<sup>21,22</sup>.

In uncontrolled DCD donors, normothermic in situ preservation has been shown to successfully recover and transplant kidneys and livers from such donors. Preliminary reports – albeit in small cohorts - suggest better kidney function of uncontrolled DCD kidney grafts compared to hypothermic in situ preservation besides the feasibility as well as feasibility for liver transplantation with acceptable outcome<sup>23,24</sup>.

## **9.2. Rapid laparotomy or pre-mortem cannulation?**

The Maastricht-group observed that rapid laparotomy published data from that direct aortic perfusion through a rapid laparotomy leads to less kidney discard rate, decreased warm ischemia time, decreased cold ischemia time and finally improved kidney graft survival at 1 year compared to the double balloon triple lumen catheter approach<sup>25</sup>. Moreover only 42 % of procedures where DBTL perfusion was used were successful<sup>26</sup>. In addition, prolonged double-balloon triple-lumen catheter insertion time is an independent predictor of graft failure<sup>26, 27</sup>.

Importantly, DCD transplantation procurement has been a risk factor to damage organs during procurement and in the UK it was observed that more kidneys were injured during the procurement from DCD donors versus DBD donors (11.4% for DCD versus 6.8% for DBD donors). These injuries include capsular tears, ureteric injuries and vascular injuries resulting in a higher discard because of kidney injury. Therefore DCD procurement should ideally be done by experienced surgeons<sup>28</sup>.

### 9.3. Lung procurement from DCD donors

Since DCD are considered multiple organ donors, lung procurement from these donors should not be forgotten. After confirmation of death the sternum is opened and the pulmonary artery is identified, cannulated and flushed. Venous venting is done through the left atrial appendage. Meanwhile the both pleura are opened and the topical cooling of the lungs is achieved by redundant amounts of melting ice water. After the flushing has been completed the lungs are on bloc removed with the heart leaving the lungs moderately inflated. After removal of the heart on the back table the right and left lung are separated from each other and the retrograde flush through pulmonary veins is performed to remove possible blood clots<sup>29</sup>.

## 10. Definitions of warm ischemia time

### *D. Monbaliu*

During the whole transplantation process, organs are exposed to normothermic or near-to-normothermic ischemia in the donor or during the implantation in the recipient, respectively. During implantation in the recipient, warm ischemia is well defined: the period between the removal of the organ from the ice water until the reperfusion with warm blood in the recipient, also referred to as anastomosis time. In the donor and during procurement, organs can be exposed to “pure” warm ischemia (e.g. during cardiac arrest) prior to the organ procurement and cold perfusion, after applying a clamp to the artery during live donor retrieval or inevitably during DCD organ procurement.

During the whole transplantation process, organs are exposed to normothermic or near-to-normothermic ischemia in the donor or during the implantation in the recipient, respectively.

During implantation in the recipient, warm ischemia is well defined: the period between the removal of the organ from the ice water until the reperfusion with warm blood in the recipient, also referred to as anastomosis time.

In the donor and during the procurement, organs can be exposed to “pure” warm ischemia (e.g. during cardiac arrest) prior to the organ procurement and cold perfusion, after applying a clamp to the artery during live donor retrieval or inevitably during DCD organ procurement. Currently, there is no accurate nor uniform definition on warm ischemia for DCD organs. Different definitions have been suggested and mostly vary from the time when the warm ischemia is thought to start (figure 7, new figure to be made!).

In controlled DCD, the start of warm ischemia may include at the moment of withdrawal, a systolic or mean arterial pressure below a certain value (referred to as onset of hemodynamic instability or organ hypoperfusion), or cardio circulatory arrest and ends with the start of cold perfusion (figure 7). Also in controlled DCD donors, there is also variable period of hypotension and hypoxia between withdrawal of life-sustaining therapy and circulatory arrest, known as the agonal phase. Moreover, the method utilized to determine cardio circulatory arrest may or may not substantially prolong the warm ischemia (e.g. absence of blood circulation or complete electrical standstill on ecg may result in a largely different length of warm ischemia). Interestingly experimental models have shown that e.g. splanchnic hypoperfusion began at the moment of withdrawal<sup>30</sup>. Others demonstrated an association between the incidence of ischemic cholangiopathy in DCD liver transplantation and the time between arterial pulseness to aortic cross clamping<sup>31</sup>. Therefore, an accurate definition of donor warm ischemia in DCD is important because the injury associated is known to be deleterious to subsequent graft function. In order to estimate the length of DCD warm ischemic times as accurate as possible, a transplantation coordinator is preferably present during the withdrawal of life sustaining therapy to observe and meticulously record the


decrease of blood pressure and saturation over time and to provide this detailed information to the recipient centers. Whether to accept or discard a DCD organ for transplantation, taking into account the length of warm ischemia, should always be left to the discretion of the transplantation team in charge of the recipient.

Therefore, for controlled DCD, a more accurate definition of warm ischemia is proposed as follows (table 6)<sup>32</sup> :

- total warm ischemic time: interval between the withdrawal of life sustaining therapy and start of in-situ cold perfusion
- functional warm ischemic time: interval between inadequate organ perfusion and start of in-situ cold perfusion
- withdrawal (agonal) period: interval between withdrawal of life sustaining therapy and circulatory arrest
- asystolic warm ischemic time: interval between circulatory arrest and start of in-situ cold perfusion.

Of note, evidence of a specific blood pressure or oxygen saturation levels is poor at which functional warm ischemia begins and different countries and transplant organizations have chosen different values (e.g. MAP < 60 mmHg or SAP < 35 mmHg...).

\*other references <sup>33-36</sup>



**Figure 7.** Different definitions of warm ischemia during DCD are possible, starting from the moment of withdrawal of life sustaining therapy or a systolic/mean arterial pressure under a certain value or circulatory arrest and ends with the start of cold perfusion.

## Warm Ischemia definitions can apply for uncontrolled/controlled DCD:

	uncontrolled DCD	Controlled DCD
Time to death	Start moment of cardiac arrest until declaration of death	Start withdrawal until declaration of death
Total (donor) warm ischemia time	Start moment of cardiac arrest until cold flush	Start withdrawal until cold flush
<i>absolute</i> (donor) warm ischemia time	Start CPR until cold flush	MAP < 60 mmHg during agonal phase until cold flush (~ASTS)
<i>A-circulatory</i> (donor) warm ischemia time	Certification circulatory death until cold flush	Certification circulatory death until cold flush

**Table 6**

### 11. Allocation procedure within Eurotransplant

*Coordinators, L. Colenbie*

The organs procured from DCD donors are only allocated to countries where retrieval of organ from DCD is allowed. DCD donors are only made in Belgium, the Netherlands, Austria and Luxembourg (patients in Germany, Slovenia and Croatia can't be transplanted with organs from DCD donors).

#### 11.1. Kidneys

Kidneys DCD donors are allocated to the same allocation algorithm as for post-mortem heart-beating kidney donors.

Point Scoring system:

- HLA-typing : Number of HLA-A, -B, -DR mismatches Number of points
  - 0 MM = 400.00
  - 1 MM = 333.33
  - 2 MM = 266.67
  - 3 MM = 200.00
  - 4 MM = 133.33
  - 5 MM = 66.67
  - 6 MM = 0.00
- Pediatric Bonus 1. dialysis started before the 16<sup>th</sup> birthday
- registration on the waiting list was before the 16<sup>th</sup> birthday and dialysis started before the 17<sup>th</sup> birthday or recipient is proven to be in maturation
- Each pediatric transplant candidate is assigned a pediatric bonus of 100 points: for pediatric transplant candidates the points for HLA-antigen MM are doubled.
- Mismatch Probability (MMP): frequency of HLA- antigen x 100
- Waiting time: upon registration on the kidney waiting list, the recipient's date of onset of maintenance dialysis or date of re-institution of maintenance dialysis after previous kidney transplantation is counted as first day for the calculation of the waiting time. The points for waiting time 0,091 points per day (33,3 per year)

- Distance between donor center and transplant center:

	BELGIUM
LOCAL	200 POINTS
REGIONAL	
NATIONAL	100 POINTS

- National Kidney Exchange Balance: Once every day, for the period of the immediate previous 365 days, the difference between the number of kidneys procured, exchanged between each ET country and transplanted, is calculated.

Export, i.e. a negative balance, is defined as: kidneys procured in a country > kidneys transplanted in that country.

Import, i.e. a positive balance, is defined as: kidneys procured in a country < kidneys transplanted in that country.

National Balance Points = (highest import balance - recipient country balance) x 10

- (ESP/ESDP) The Eurotransplant Senior Program (ESP) allocates kidneys from post-mortem donors ≥ 65 years old to recipients ≥ 65 years without the use of a donor HLA typing. The ESP aims at a cold ischaemic period (CIP) that is as short as possible. Kidneys from ESP donors are allocated to ESP recipients from the reporting center's local waiting list.

## 11.2. Liver, lungs and pancreas

Liver, lungs or pancreas from a DCD are regarded as an extended criteria donation (ECD). They are offered in a center-based fashion, allowing the center to choose a suitable recipient from its own waiting list. In case of any suitable recipients are found, the organs are offered to the other Belgian transplant centers before the international allocation following the Eurotransplant rules.

## 12. Outcome after DCD organ transplantation

*D. Monbaliu, P. Ferdinande*

### 12.1. Outcome after DCD kidney transplantation

In general, DCD grafts undergo higher rates of DGF and PNF however for functioning grafts, long term graft and patient survival are similar compared to grafts from brain dead donors<sup>37</sup>.

### 12.2. Outcome after DCD liver transplantation

Initially, in the early 2000's, there was a concern about an increased incident of primary graft non-function which was mainly contributed to prolonged cold ischemia time<sup>38</sup>. Nowadays, primary graft non-function is no longer a big issue but inferior graft survival is related to the higher incidents of ischemic biliary types strictures. Indeed most databases, including the Belgian liver database and registers show inferior graft survival after liver transplantation from DCD donors<sup>39-40</sup>. Nevertheless, excellent outcome, similar to DBD liver transplantation has been reported by single center studies<sup>41</sup>. After DCD liver transplantation the risk on biliary complications is 2.4 times higher than compared to DBD liver transplantation and the risk of ischemic cholangiopathy or ischemic biliary strictures is 10.8 times as high as compared to DBD donors. In addition to the higher graft loss and retransplantation rates an important but

often untold story of DCD liver transplantation is the increased number of endoscopic and surgical interventions to treat ischemic type biliary strictures together with the increased morbidity these recipients suffer. Indeed these patients experience more biliary sepsis and growth of multi-resistant organisms, generally experiencing a deteriorated health status. In case of the need for a retransplantation, no priority - based on lab MELD allocation - can be given because of the well-maintained liver function.

Overall, DCD transplantation is leading to increased utilization of resources due to repeated and prolonged hospital admissions, more endoscopic interventions such as ERCP and PTC and more erosion of DBD donors in the donor pool. One possible intervention to reduce the incidence of the ischemic cholangiopathy may be the use of Heparin or tissue plasminogen activator but so far conflicting data have been generated. Different phases can be distinguished after the withdrawal of life sustaining therapy usually followed by an agonal phase during which the blood pressure and also the organ perfusion decreases and finally stops. This is then followed by a circulatory arrest which precedes the electrical standstill of the heart. After circulatory arrest or a no-touch period is installed and at the end of the no-touch period the patient can be declared death after which the aorta can be cannulated. Finally the hypothermic flush-out takes place. We propose the following definitions for warm ischemia time.

It is important to realize that depending on the way cardiac arrest or cardiac death is being used, different warm ischemia times will result<sup>42</sup>. After stop of the life sustaining therapy hepatic and renal flow ceases before circulatory arrest and when using circulatory versus electrical standstill as definition of death imposes a significantly different additional ischemia time on the organs of interest. Some authors reported that a prolonged hypotension below SBP of 50 mmHg is leading to increase the number of adverse effects on ischemia cholangiopathy and an unfavorable graft and recipient survival<sup>43</sup>. In general warm ischemia in DCD liver transplantation is found a risk factor for inferior graft survival and therefore the warm ischemia time is recommended to be less than 30 minutes<sup>35</sup> in accordance with previous preclinical data<sup>44</sup>.

### 12.3. Outcome after DCD lung transplantation

So far similar patient survival and freedom of BOS have been equal comparing DCD vs DBD lung transplantation. In addition there were no differences in acute rejection rates, inflammatory markers and immediate (post)operative outcome<sup>45, 46</sup>.

### 12.4. Heart transplantation

It should not be forgotten that the first heart transplantation was done from a DCD donor<sup>47</sup>. Recently 3 pediatric hearts have been transplanted with hearts from DCD donors with good results. The warm ischemia time was limited to a real minimum and this included the minimization of the no-touch time<sup>48</sup>.

## 13. Expansion or erosion into DBD donor pool by the use of DCD donors

Over the last decennia it has been clear that in some countries with rapidly growing number of DCD donors the number of DBD donors has been decreasing suggesting that the DCD donor pool is not an additional pool but in fact eroding into the DBD donor pool. This leads to less heart transplantations, less pancreas transplantations and more use of resources for liver transplantations. Finally DCD transplantation procurement has been a risk factor to damage organs during procurement and in the UK it was observed that more kidneys were injured during the procurement from DCD donors versus DBD donors (11.4% for DCD versus 6.8% for

DBD donors). These injuries include capsular tears, ureteric injuries and vascular injuries resulting in a higher discard because of kidney injury. Therefore the DCD procurement should ideally be done by experienced surgeons<sup>28</sup>.

#### 14. Conclusion

It is important to realize that DCD is only one of the strategies to expand the donor pool and each transplant program should focus on expanding all potential donor pools including living donors deceased donation after brain death and expanded criteria donors and not DCD donors alone.

DCD organ transplantation should not be viewed as an equally acceptable alternative to DBD because it yields fewer organs and therefore if brain death is eminent, it might be better to pursue DBD instead of DCD.

Moreover using DCD donors to expand the donor pool has challenged the transplant community on several grounds. First of all the definition of circulatory death is lacking and is not routinely used in daily practice for clinicians. The circulatory death is defined as the permanent lack of arterial pulsation. Organ transplantation from DCD donors has challenged the current way of preservation techniques. The use of DCD donors has challenged the ethical discussion on the end of life treatment and death. DCD donation has also demonstrated the different legal frameworks between different countries since DCD donation is not accepted in every country. And some countries are not even allowed to accept DCD donor organs for transplantation that are recovered elsewhere.

Centre	Téléphone	Fax	Adresse mail
Antwerp Wilrijkstraat, 10 2650 EDEGEM	03/821 30 00	03/821 34 70	<a href="mailto:walter.van.donink@uza.be">walter.van.donink@uza.be</a>
GENT De Pintelaan, 185 9000 GENT	09/332 21 11	09/332 30 54	<a href="mailto:transplantatiecentrum@uzgent.be">transplantatiecentrum@uzgent.be</a>
KUL Gasthuisberg 3000 LEUVEN	016/34 29 01	016/34 87 43	<a href="mailto:transplantatiecoördinatie@uzleuven.be">transplantatiecoördinatie@uzleuven.be</a>
UCL - Saint-Luc Avenue Hippocrate, 10 1200 BRUXELLES	02/764 22 06	02/770 78 58	
ULB - Erasme Route de Lennik, 808 1070 BRUXELLES	02/555 38 11	02/555 69 92	<a href="mailto:coord-transplant@erasme.ulb.ac.be">coord-transplant@erasme.ulb.ac.be</a>
ULG Domaine du Sart- Tilman, B35 4000 LIEGE	04/366 72 06	04/366 75 17	<a href="mailto:transplantation@chu.ulg.ac.be">transplantation@chu.ulg.ac.be</a>
VUB Laarbeeklaan, 101 1090 BRUXELLES	02/477 60 99	02/47 62 30	<a href="mailto:secretariaat.nefrologie@uzbrussel.be">secretariaat.nefrologie@uzbrussel.be</a>

<b>DCD- Report</b>		<i>Label</i>	
Centre : Coordinator : Hospital : .....  ET Donor #:.....  Date: ..../.../.....  DCD Category I <input type="checkbox"/> II <input type="checkbox"/> III <input type="checkbox"/> IV <input type="checkbox"/> V (Euthanasia) <input type="checkbox"/>		Technique: <input type="checkbox"/> DBTL catheter   Time : ... h ... <input type="checkbox"/> rapid sterno-laparotomy + direct canulation	
Start resuscitation procedure <small>(only for NHBD I and II)</small>	... h ...		
Stop resuscitation procedure <small>(only for NHBD I and II)</small>	... h ...		
Stop ventilation and supportive therapy Extubation: YES /NO Time : Ré-intubation : YES/NO Time :	... h ...	<p><b>Acirculatory</b> (donor) WIT</p> <p>= ET</p> <p>= ..... min</p> <p><b>Absolute</b> (donor) WIT</p> <p>= .....min</p> <p><b>Total</b> (donor) WIT</p> <p>=...min</p>	
Mean Arterial Pressure < 60 mmHg	... h ...		
Asystoly or circulatory arrest (= start "no touch")	... h ...		
Incision time (= end "no touch")	... h ...		
Start of aortic flush	... h ...		

Time of RIGHT pneumectomy : ... h ...  
 Time of hepatectomy : ... h ...  
 Time of RIGHT nephrectomy : ... h ...

Time of LEFT pneumectomy : ... h ...  
 Time of pancreatectomy : ... h ...  
 Time of LEFT nephrectomy : ... h ...

Remarks :



## **Bibliography**

1. Kootstra G, Daemen JHC, Oomen APA. Categories of Non-Heart-Beating Donors. *Transplantation Proc* 1995; 27 : 2893-2894.
2. Donation after circulatory death in Spain: Current situation and recommendations. National Consensus Document. 2012.  
<http://www.ont.es/infesp/Paginas/DocumentosdeConsenso.aspx>
3. Detry O, Le Dinh H, Noterdaemer T et al. Categories of Donation after Cardiocirculatory Death. *Transplantation Proc* 2012; 44 : 1189-1195.
4. Third WHO global consultation on organ donation and transplantation: striving to achieve self-sufficiency. WHO, The Transplantation Society and Organización Nacional de Trasplantes. *Transplantation* 2011; 91 (Suppl 11) : S27-28.
5. Dominguez-Gil B, Delmonico FL, Shaheen FA et al. The critical pathway for deceased donation: reportable uniformity in the approach to deceased donation. *Transpl Int* 2011; 24 : 373-378.
6. Congrégation pour la Doctrine de la Foi. Déclaration sur l'euthanasie. In: *Documentation Catholique*, 20 juillet 1980, n° 1790, pp. 697-700.
7. Comité Consultatif Belge de Bioéthique. Avis n° 1 du 12 mai 1997 concernant l'opportunité d'un règlement légal de l'euthanasie, p. 1.
8. Boles J-M. Les prélèvements d'organes à coeur arrêté. In: *Etudes*, décembre 2008, n° 4096, pp. 619-630.
9. Articles 95, 96, 97, 98 du Code de Déontologie médicale, version de mars 2008.
10. Lewis J et al. Development of the University of Wisconsin DCD evaluation tool, *Prog Transpl* 2003.
11. ???
12. King's College
13. Auyong et al. Processed electroencephalogram during donation after cardiac death. *Anesth Analg* 2010.
14. Ysebaert D et al. Organ procurement after euthanasia : Belgian experience. *Transplant Proc* 2009; 41 : 585-586.
15. Casavilla et al. *Transplantation* 1995.
16. Nguyen et al. *Transplant Int* 2008.
17. Mateo et al. *Transplant Int* 2008.

18. Ray et al, Transplant Int 2009.
19. Kootstra et al. In situ preservation of kidneys of “non-heart-beating” donors : a possible way to offset the shortage of donor kidneys. Ned Tijdschr Geneesk 1998.
20. D’Alessandro et al. Transplantation 1995.
21. Rohas-Pena. AJT 2010.
22. Punch J. OUP 2009.
23. Barrou et al. The use of extracorporeal membranous oxygenation in donors after cardiac death. Curr Opin Organ Transplant 2013.
24. Fondevilla et al. Applicability and results of Maastricht type 2 donation after cardiac death liver transplantation. AJT 2012.
25. Wind van Heurn. BJS 2011.
26. Snoeijs et al. Ann Surg 2007.
27. Gok et al. The effect of inadequate in situ perfusion in the non-heart-beating donor. Transplant Int 2005.
28. Ausania et al. AJT 2012.
29. ???
30. Rhee et al. Characterization of the withdrawal phase in a porcine donation after cardiac death model. AJT 2011.
31. Taner et al. Agonal period in donation after cardiac death donors. Transplant Int 2013.
32. Bradley JA et al. Time to death after withdrawal of treatment in DCD donors. Curr Opin Organ Transplant 2013.
33. Neyrinck et al. Donation after circulatory death. Curr Opin Anesthesiol 2013.
34. Levvey et al. Definitions of warm ischemic time when using controlled donation after cardiac death lung donors. Transplantation 2008.
35. Bernat JL et al. Report of a national conference on donation after cardiac death. AJT 2006.
36. Reich et al. ASTS recommended practice guidelines for controlled donation after cardiac death organ procurement and transplantation.
37. Snoeijs, van Heurn, Transpl 2010.

38. Abt et al. Ann Surg 2004.
39. Detry et al. Transplant Int 2010.
40. ELTR registry, UNOS database 1998-2004 Doshi, Hunsicker, AJT 2007.
41. ???
42. Rhee J et al. AJT 2011.
43. Ho et al. Transplantation 2008.
44. Monbaliu et al. Transplantation 2005.
45. De Vleeschauwer, Van Raemdonck, JHLT 2011, 2012.
46. Wigfield, Love COOT 2011.
47. Barnard ??
48. Boucek. NEJM 2008.

More references:

Malaise J, Van Deynse D, Dumont V, Lecomte C, Mourad M, Dufrane D, Squifflet JP, Van Ophem D, Verschuren F, Meert P, Thys F, El Gariani A, Wittebole X, Laterre PF, Hantson P. Non-heart-beating donor, 10-year experience in a Belgian transplant center. Transplant Proc. 2007 Oct;39(8):2578-9.

Van Deynse D, Dumont V, Lecomte C, Squifflet JP, Mourad M, Verschuren F, Dufrane D, Hantson P, Malaise J. Non-heart-beating donor, renewal of an old procedure: a Belgian experience. Transplant Proc. 2005 Jul-Aug;37(6):2821-2.

Verschuren F, Vandebussche M, Rozencweig S, Stroobant D, Bernard D, Mitri S, Seront B, Nosaradan S, Rougui I, Clause AL, Thys F. Les stagiaires en médecine participent à l'optimisation du recours au don d'organe et de tissus suite à un décès survenu au service des urgences. Louvain Médical 2010.

Bernat JL, D'Alessandro AM, Port FK, Bleck TP, Heard SO, Medina J et al. Report of a national conference on donation after cardiac death. Am J Transpl 2006; 6: 281-291.

Meert Ph. Interrompre la réanimation cardio-pulmonaire. Conférence BRC 2008.

Riou B et al. Recommandations sur les indications de l'assistance circulatoire dans le traitement des arrêts cardiaques réfractaires. Novembre 2008, reference missing.

Steinbrook R. Organ donation after cardiac death. N Engl J Med 2007;357(3):209-13.

Bernat JL. The boundaries of organ donation after circulatory death. N Engl J Med 2008; Aug 14;359(7):669-71.

Fondevila C, Hessheimer AJ, Ruiz A, Calatayud D, Ferrer J, Charco R, Fuster J, Navasa M, Rimola A, Taurá P, Ginés P, Manyalich M, García-Valdecasas JC. Liver transplant using donors after unexpected cardiac death: novel preservation protocol and acceptance criteria. *Am J Transplant* 2007 ; Jul;7(7):1849-55.

Sánchez-Fructuoso AI, Marques M, Prats D, Conesa J, Calvo N, Pérez-Contín MJ, Blazquez J, Fernández C, Corral E, Del Río F, Núñez JR, Barrientos A. Victims of cardiac arrest occurring outside the hospital: a source of transplantable kidneys. Reference missing.

Another matter of life and death. *Anesthesiology* 2003; 98 (3).

Recommendations for nonheartbeating organ donation. *Crit Care Med* 2001; 29 (9).

The potential benefits of the pediatric nonheartbeating organ donor. *Pediatrics* 1998; 101 (6).

Non-Heart-Beating Donors: one response to the organ shortage. *Transplantation Reviews* 1995; 9 (45): 168-176.

Transplantation of kidneys from donors whose hearts have stopped beating. *N Engl J Med* 1998; 338 (4).

Controlled Non-Heart-Beating donor liver transplantation. *Transplantation* 2000; 70 (8), October 27.

Kidney transplantation from donors without a heartbeat. *N Engl J Med* 2002; 347, July 26.

Non-Heart-Beating Organ Donation: Process and Review. *AACN Clinical Issues* 1999; 10 (2) : 293-300.

Ten year experience with human lung transplantation from non-heart beating donors. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2003;22(S1):S87.

Adviezen van de Nationale Raad over "Non-Heart-Beating" donoren. *Tijdschrift van de Nationale Raad Orde Van Geneesheren*, Vol. XIV, Sept. 2006, p. 7.

Report of a National Conference on Donation after Cardiac Death. *Am J Transplant* 2006; 6: 281-291.

Development of the University of Wisconsin, donation after cardiac death evaluation tool. *Progress in Transplantation* 2003; 13 (4), December.

Defining death in non heart beating organ donors. *J Med Ethics* 2003; 29 : 182-185.

Care of the potential organ donor. *N Engl J Med* 2004; 351 : 2730-9.

Non Heart beating organ donation : issues and ethics for the critical care nurse. *Journal of Vascular Nursing*, vol XXIV, No 1 : 17.

Ethical and legal issues in Non Heart Beating organ donation. *Transplantation Proceedings* 2005; 37 : 574-576.

The ethics of heparin administration to the potential non heart beating organ donor. *Journal of Professional Nursing* 2005; 21 (2) : 97-102.

## Working group composition

Patrick Evrard	Bruno Desschans	
An Viverman	Annick de weerd	Arne Neyrinck
Bart Troubleyn	Benoit Rondelet	Bennie Amerijckx
Bolle Frédéric	Leen Coene	Olivier Detry
Didier Ledoux	Didier Desruelles	Diethard Monbaliu
Dirk Ysebaert	Dominique Jacquemin	Dominique Van Deynse
Eric Hoste	Fernande Lois	Franck Verschuren
Guy Verfaillie	Hans Van Vlierberghe	Hervé Lebbinck
Ivo Haentjens	Ilse Kerremans	Jacques Berre
Jean Joris	Luc Depauw	Marie Helene Delbouille
Patrick Ferdinande	Paul Schotsmans	Philippe Hantson
Tom Darius	Walter Van Donink	Xavier Rogiers
Michael Bos (NL)		