## LIMS Failure September 2016

Alexandra Liversidge

Advanced BMS,

Leeds Teaching Hospitals Trust.

### IT Failures

- Northern Lincolnshire and Goole NHS Foundation Trust October 2016
  - Computer network & phones affected from Sunday to Wednesday.
  - Planned operations, outpatient appointments and diagnostic procedures were cancelled.
  - Major trauma cases diverted to neighbouring hospitals, together with high-risk women in labour.

### IT Failures

- Global cyber attack May 2017
  - Networked analysers affected



## IT Failures

- BA computer IT crash May 2017
  - Loss of income, damage to reputation

## Background

- LIMS at LTH trust (inc BRI at the time) is Telepath
  - In use for 35 years
  - Maintained by CSC
- Approx I2:30pm on Friday I6<sup>th</sup> Sept 2016
   Telepath crashed for all Pathology depts across all sites: SJH, LGI, BRI.

### What to do?

- At BRI, we had a 'contingency plan' that lists the clinical areas/people to inform if Telepath is going/goes down for >30 mins
  - ICU, theatres, Haem Consultant, A&E etc
- Resort to manual methods, El suspended, could still use BloodTrack for cold chain
- SOP written with a short downtime in mind, not days/weeks

## What had happened?

- A number of hard drives containing
   Telepath information had failed over time
- 16<sup>th</sup> Sept 2016 the final hard drive failed
- CSC took longer than expected to deliver a replacement
- 'Silver Command' meetings took place between managers, trust board & representatives from BRI

## What had happened?

- CSC worked all weekend to fit a new hard drive
- Tried to restore databases from back ups of Telepath data.
- Back ups not complete!
  - Over time the amount of data being backed up had increased massively
  - A second back up had been established at some point, but this did not capture all data

### Meanwhile...

- Weekend was horrendous
- Harrogate agreed to take Antenatal samples
- Monday & Tuesday were pretty bad
- Wednesday was fine!
- Thursday all hell broke loose:
  - Anaesthetists given document based on National Transfusion Committee Guideline for triage of red cell transfusion:

## National Transfusion Committee Guideline for triage of red cell transfusion

Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	
These patients will remain highest priority of transfusion	These patients will be transfused in the Amber but not the Red phase	These patients will not be transfused in the Amber phase	
Resuscitation Resuscitation of life- threatening /on-going blood loss including trauma.			
Surgical support Emergency surgery* including cardiac and vascular surgery**, and organ transplantation. Cancer surgery with the intention of cure.	Surgery/Obstetrics Cancer surgery (palliative). Symptomatic but not life- threatening post-operative or post-partum anaemia. Urgent*** (but not emergency) surgery.	Surgery Elective surgery which is likely to require donor blood support (Patients with > 20% chance of needing 2 or more units of blood during or after surgery).	
Non-surgical anaemias Life-threatening anaemia including patients requiring in-utero support and high dependency care/SCBU. Stem cell transplantation	Non-surgical anaemias Symptomatic but not life- threatening anaemia.		

## National Transfusion Committee Guideline for triage of red cell transfusion

- Only Category I & 2 patients taken to theatre.
- 'Patients with a >20% chance of needing 2 or more units during or after surgery' = anyone going under the knife
- Every single patient going to theatre was crossmatched for at least 2 units.
- Labs hadn't enough space/staff for that level of manual work
- Blood stocks depleted rapidly

## The end in sight?

- On Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> September, Blood Transfusion database was rebuilt & went live.
- Validation required so not in full use until Saturday.
- Blood Transfusion lost 36 hours of data.
- Worked backwards from Bloodtrack to update Telepath for the missing 36 hours.

## The end in sight?

- We used photocopies of the components to retrospectively update Telepath.
- We did not enter the G&S results into Telepath unless components had been reserved (too numerous).
- We entered a comment to explain that El was not available on these samples.
- We had access to a back up spreadsheet of Telepath & Sp-ICE, however, we still had SHOT/SABRE events:

## **Errors**:

Blood Bank Incidents associated with the Telepath Failure 16/9/2016 to 23/9/2016

Error	All errors	LGI	SJH		Error cause
Selection (Irradiated)	2	0	2		Request error failure to indicate special requierments
Selection (HEV Neg)	4	2	2		Request error failure to indicate special requierments
Selection (HEV- and Irradiated)	4	2	2		Request error failure to indicate special requierments
Phenotyped not matched patient no antibodies	2	- 0	1 2		Lack of LIMS
Phenotyped not matched patient with antibodies	1	0	1	* enzyme only anti-C not clinically significant	Lack of LIMS, antibody not indicated on form by clinical area
Antibodies not detectable, blood selected compatible by chance	3	0	3	2x anti-K, one anti-C	Lack of LIMS, antibody not indicated on form by clinical area
Manual interpretation of group results incorrect, wrong blood group transfused	1	0	,	A Pos given to A Neg male patient; if had been ABO error XM should have detected	Transcription error by individual
Blood transfused on expired sample (due to recent transfusion)	1	0	1		Workload meant blood being left in fridge too long
Wrong hospital number and date of birth on platelets issued (transcribed from other patient); transfused to correct patient but error not noticed	1	0	1		Transcription error by individual, previous patient details left in labelling program
Blood issued when only short group performed	1	- 0	1	Blood issued was crossmatched	Testing error not significant
Failure of crossmatch /El process post return of Telepath	8	0	8	4 had blood transfused, retrospectively checked all OK	<ul> <li>Training, communication and workload pressure</li> </ul>
Multiple errors: Testing incomplete; blood issued by EI when should have been crossmatched; names spelt incorrectly on labels	1	0	1		Training, communication and workload pressure
Total errors	29	4	25		
Total potentially avoidable	23	4	19		

### What's in a name?

- Be careful what you name your dept
  - Blood Bank? Blood Transfusion?
- Blood Bank backed up first
- Blood Sciences backed up second
- Microbiology backed up last
  - Last complete back up 2010
  - Lost 6 years of data
  - Rebuild not completely recovered until end of 2016 – no LIMS until then (!)

#### Conclusions

- An independent report was published at the end of January 2017
- It concluded that the cause of the failure was a mix of hardware/technical failure and human error.
- Cost to Pathology £700k
- Cost to Trust £5m
- http://www.leedsth.nhs.uk/assets/Board-Meetings

# Independent review – findings & learning

- Response to date:
  - Improved back up processes
  - Responsibility for monitoring hardware transferred
  - Hardware upgrades in progress
  - Trust wide risk assessments of critical systems
  - Revised disaster recovery plans
  - Updating of business continuity plans

#### What went well?

- Great team working staff pulled together
- Focus on the patient despite difficulties
- Volunteers going 'over & above'
- Team working between Trust & Path IT
- Staff cancelling AL to support colleagues
- Teams coming up with innovative solutions
- Volunteers from other CSUs & labs
- Blood Transfusion/Pathology now have much better recognition in the Trust

#### What could we have done better?

- Communication:
  - Clarity of messages/inaccurate reporting
  - Didn't include regional/national users
  - Which systems down, which weren't
  - Internal comms, limited access to email in lab
  - Inaccurate lists of GP contacts by CCGs
  - Confusion around criteria for requesting, impacting BT
  - Comms around where samples being sent/phone calls regarding results

#### What could we have done better?

- Business Continuity Plan:
  - Lack of clarity on how to practically enact
  - Capacity & support from other Trust labs not immediately clear
  - Phone cascade arrangements for letting colleagues know help is required
  - Paper forms having to be developed 'on the hoof'
  - IT links with surrounding Trusts problematic

#### What could we have done better?

#### Other:

- A&E not sending results with pts to wards contributed to inc phone calls
- Staff not always able to look for solutions as not clear what the problems were
- Resilience in the IT system & infrastructure
- Reprinting of the sample report multiple times for the same patient

## How have we/are we acting on this learning?

- Comms strategy development, including cascade from Silver command & messages to all stakeholders with a structured template
- Business Continuity Planning lots already now in place. Desktop exercise end of Feb
- IT resilience & networking across region (WYAAT)