

Date: Tuesday, April 30 2019 12:23 PM
Subject: Chatwith [REDACTED]
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@unos.org>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@unos.org>;

30 April 2019

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Thought you might be interested in reading the 3rd and final reviewer's comments for TXGC's HR/LU allocation policy violation. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] both said NON (with no additional comments, unfortunately). Here's Alex Glazier's:

needing lungs requested the OPO rescind the prior lung offer? This seems like an inappropriate request by the ctr. Will that behavior be addressed by the MPSC? My question for the OPO is, in these circumstances where heart allocation has to resume after lungs have been placed, why is the OPO offering a heart to a candidate listed as needing heart/lungs? If the lungs are no longer available, those candidates should be screened off to avoid this type of frustrating [REDACTED] I think this case should be closed with no action and I think there should be correspondence back to the Ctr about making requests for OPOs to rescind offers. "

Wait let's try that again:

Glazier: "I am not clear why this is a policy violation at all? The sequence of allocation appears to be that the OPO appropriately allocated lungs and then later in the allocation process the ctr with a heart candidate needing lungs requested the OPO rescind the prior lung offer? This seems like an inappropriate request by the ctr. Will that behavior be addressed by the MPSC? My question for the OPO is, in these circumstances where heart allocation has to resume after lungs have been placed, why is the OPO offering a heart to a candidate listed as needing heart/lungs? If the lungs are no longer available, those candidates should be screened off to avoid this type of frustrating [REDACTED] I think this case should be closed with no action and I think there should be correspondence back to the Ctr about making requests for OPOs to rescind offers. "

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

ok, so by that logic, the next time I am allocating a kidney and the candidate needs a heart, go ahead and give it to them. And when the lung people start asking about a heart, I should just tell them, "tough toenails!! Already placed that!

This is goddamn bananas

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

How does an attorney not read that policy and see a violation of it?

Oh and after you don't have lungs anymore, just totally bypass the HR/LU candidates b/c even though policy says they get the LU, that's too bad.

so then don't even offer them a HR either.

oh and they want a possible LOW for TXSA b/c they've had a lot of labeling issues...but still just a NON for TXGC.

For the red top tubes--obviously for this one, one of the reviewers would close and then call FLTG to not complain [REDACTED]