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Previous talks

• Professional responsibility
• Duty of candour
• Increased transparency
• Quality dashboards
• Attitudes to EQA
UP and PUP

100+ points = unsatisfactory performance (UP)

One ABO or D error
One false negative antibody screen
Two missed incompatibilities (non-ABO)
Three false positive screens
Two totally incorrect antibody interpretations

UP in > one exercise in 12 months
= persistent unsatisfactory performance (PUP)

Reportable to NQAAP
Current traffic light system for reporting to NQAAP

- Report newly identified PUP to NQAAP as RED
- PUP continues Unresolved BLACK
- Monitoring but no further errors AMBER
- No further errors - no longer monitoring GREEN

Outcome of CAPA and engagement with scheme are reflected in NQAAP report
Technical errors

13R9 anti-Jk\(^b\) showing dosage

- 9 participants missed the antibody in the crossmatch against Jk(a+b+) cells
- 7 of 9 used BioVue with a 3-5% validated BLISS addition technique which appeared to be slightly less sensitive than the 0.8% addition technique
- 60 penalty points

14R1 anti-E+Fy\(^a\)

- One lab misinterpreted the ID panel and reported anti-E+S
- Retrospective review showed that anti-Fy\(^a\) could not be excluded
- There was a positive reaction with an E-S- cell which was overlooked
- 80 penalty points
If your laboratory was one of these, would you be happy to publish your results for external viewing

This poll is currently stopped

- Happy to publish externally regardless of cause
- Only happy to publish sensitivity error
- Only happy to publish interpretation error
- Not happy to publish either
Procedural errors

14R1 P2 - O D positive
14R1 P3 - B D negative

• One lab reported these the wrong way round
• Transposition of samples at the labelling stage
• Did not ‘book them in’ to the LIMS
• Usual checks for clinical samples were bypassed
• >100 penalty points for both ABO and D grouping - UP

13R9 anti-Jk^b

• Three participants missed the antibody against both Jk(a+b+) and Jk(a-b+) cells
• One was likely to be due to data entry error on the website
  – positive reactions were recorded by IAT but the ‘compatible’ box had been ticked
• > 100 penalty points for crossmatching - UP
If your laboratory was one of these, would you be happy to publish your results for external viewing?

- This poll is currently stopped
- Happy to publish externally regardless of cause
- Unhappy as they don't reflect clinical practice
- Would be happy if CAPA was also published
If your lab makes a genuine error in an EQA exercise, what is your response?

SMS your vote to 0750 733 2660 or visit m.smsspoll.net

- 'Free lesson'- a positive way to improve practice: 12532
- Concerned about the fallout from the consultant: 12533
- OMG, how will this impact on CPA/UKAS visit: 12534
- Not worried as don't see EQA as very relevant: 12535
Food for thought: how should EQA errors be classified

- All BTLP EQA errors are treated as potentially clinically significant and the penalty points reflect this *potential*
- Suggested that EQA schemes should not give penalty scores for ‘EQA’ induced errors with no clinical implications
- But who classifies the error as clinical or EQA?
- The CAPA form is a good mechanism for mutual understanding and could be used to classify the error - but who makes this decision?
- Professional responsibility of all parties to use EQA to improve laboratory practice and patient care