

Date: Thursday, May 2 2019 09:40 AM
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] has been assigned to you
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>;

It does feel like cherry picking to an extent, and unless the issue represent a threat to patient safety or to the fairness of allocation, I don't think we need to see all of it.

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2019 9:36 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] has been assigned to you

So, we'll just hold on to this from now?

Here's a new twist to this. The TXGC HR/LU allocation case that I met with PCR and the OC about last week is in limbo regarding whether or not we look into to. One of the reasons AML is reluctant to say "yes, we take it" is that the OC doesn't refer every potential violation they see over to us, so if we took this one there's the possibility of unfairness or the perception of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] So, unless Data Services starts sending every change they see over to us, this feel like kind of the same thing, right? Just something to marinate on before the meeting about this...

[REDACTED]
Safety Analyst

[REDACTED]unos.org
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2019 9:27 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>
Subject: RE: CS0103053 has been assigned to you

word

[REDACTED]
Safety Analyst

[REDACTED]unos.org
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2019 9:27 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>
Subject: RE: CS0103053 has been assigned to you

It got postponed

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2019 9:27 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]unos.org>
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] has been assigned to you

Wasn't there a meeting to discuss this last week? What was the outcome of that?

[REDACTED]
Safety Analyst

[REDACTED]@unos.org

From: [REDACTED] S. [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@unos.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2019 9:22 AM
To: [REDACTED]@unos.org; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@unos.org>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@unos.org>
Subject: FW: [REDACTED] has been assigned to you

Received this from Research. CADN requested that they change 5 DonorNet records in which they used the wrong donor hospital; all from 2018. Do with these what you wish...

From: [REDACTED]@unos.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 4:25 PM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@unos.org>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@unos.org>; [REDACTED]@unos.org>
Cc: [REDACTED]@unos.org>
Subject: FW: [REDACTED] has been assigned to you

Hi [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

I wanted to share the below request I received from [REDACTED] at CADN. I will update this information in DonorNet and follow up with [REDACTED] to see how many others he has identified. Looks like these are all 2018 donors, what are the implications in updating this information, for some a year later?

Thanks!

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 1:06 PM
To: [REDACTED]@unos.org>
Subject: [REDACTED] has been assigned to you

Click here to view your Request: [CS0 \[REDACTED\]](#)

Opened: 04/30/2019 04:35.11 PM EDT
Opened by: [REDACTED]

Short Description: During a review of our bi-annual SRTR data, I found donors being credited to incorrect donor hospitals

Description: [REDACTED] Kaiser doesn't accomodate DCD; transferred to CPMC Van Ness; [REDACTED] Kaiser doesn't accomodate DCD; transferred to CPMC Van Ness; [REDACTED] Mercy doesn't accomodate DCD; transferred to CPMC Van Ness; [REDACTED] St Mary's doesn't accomodate DCD; transferred to CPMC Van Ness; [REDACTED] Twin Cities couldn't accomodate; transferred to CPMC Van Ness; There may be older cases with similar incorrectly crediting donor hospitals, but we'd like to submit a change request for these. Thank you.

Ref: [REDACTED]