

Human Tissue Authority
151 Buckingham Palace Road
London
SW1W 9SZ

Tel 020 7269 1900
Web www.hta.gov.uk
Email [REDACTED]
Date 26 February 2015

[REDACTED]
By email to [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

Freedom of Information request

Thank you for your request for information under the Freedom of Information Act (FOI Act), which was received by the Human Tissue Authority (HTA) on 28 January 2015. Your email outlined the following request:

“Please accept this as a request for information under the FOI Act.

Could you please provide:

- i) The number of SAEARs in the human application sector reported to the HTA during 2013 and 2014;
- ii) The number of SAEARs in the organ donation and transplantation sector reported to the HTA during 2013 and 2014;
- iii) Please also provide a description of each incident and the classification given to each incident.

I look forward to receiving a response within 20 working days.”

Response

We can confirm we have treated your email as a request under the Freedom of Information Act.

i) Serious adverse events and reactions (SAEARs) in the Human Application sector reported to the HTA during 2013 and 2014

The European Union Tissue and Cells Directive (EUTCD) states that the HTA must set up a system for tissue establishments to report serious adverse events and reactions. The EUTCD sets out definitions of serious adverse events and reactions as follows:

- a) a 'serious adverse event' (SAE) is any untoward occurrence associated with the procurement, testing, processing, storage and distribution of tissues and cells that might lead to the transmission of a communicable disease, to death or life-threatening, disabling or incapacitating conditions for patients or which might result in, or prolong, hospitalisation or morbidity;
- b) 'serious adverse reaction' (SAR) is an unintended response, including a communicable disease, in the donor or in the recipient associated with the procurement or human application of tissues and cells that is fatal, life threatening, disabling, incapacitating or which results in, or prolongs, hospitalisation or morbidity.

Serious adverse events (SAEs) are reported against the process they are linked to, such as 'storage' in the case of freezer failure. Serious adverse reactions (SARs) are reported as donor or recipient reactions, depending on whom the reaction has occurred in.

We have performed a search of our licensing system and 181 SAEARs were reported to the HTA by licensed establishments in the Human Application sector during 2013 and 2014.

The classification and description of each of the SAEs in the Human Application sector is in the table below:

| Ref no | Process event linked to | Description of Human Application SAE |
|--------|-------------------------|---|
| 1 | Distribution | Bone labelled with incorrect barcode label. Was recalled and disposed of. |
| 2 | Procurement | Failure of a stem cell collection set led to loss of some cells. |
| 3 | Storage | One bag of autologous stem cells disposed of in error. |
| 4 | Procurement | Contamination of peripheral blood stem cell product with microorganism usually found on skin. |
| 5 | Processing | Bacterial contaminant detected on gloves of technician who packaged chondral tissue for distribution. |
| 6 | Procurement | A midwife procured cord blood as the trained procurer who was working under a third party agreement was delayed and unable to be present at the birth. |
| 7 | Distribution | Eye bank staff issued cornea which was not suitable for endothelial keratoplasty (EK) procedure and surgeon had to cancel operation. |
| 8 | Materials | Leak in cord blood cryobag, small quantity of cells lost. |
| 9 | Other | Donor issued with out of date medication (Lenograstim) used to mobilise stem cells; did not affect collection of cells. |
| 10 | Storage | Two overwrap bags surrounding inner bags which contained cryopreserved cells were damaged; inner bags undamaged. |
| 11 | Procurement | Procurer of cord blood did not have a Third Party Agreement, but was collecting under the supervision of a trained person who was acting under Third Party Agreement. |
| 12 | Other | Cells infused one hour beyond supplier's indicated expiry time of 48 hours. Decision made to infuse as cells showed 99% viability. |

| Ref no | Process event linked to | Description of Human Application SAE |
|--------|-------------------------|---|
| 13 | Processing | A low volume harvest was partially frozen instead of cooled as the procedure applied to larger volumes. |
| 14 | Procurement | Failure of a collection set led to cell spillage in machine during apheresis. Sufficient amount of cells collected. |
| 15 | Preservation | Incorrect controlled rate freezing protocol used to cryopreserve autologous stem cell donation. |
| 16 | Procurement | One laboratory detected microbial contamination in stem cell harvest, but this could not be verified. |
| 17 | Procurement | Tissue bank disposed of femoral head as consent for human application was not in place. |
| 18 | Procurement | Retrieved femoral head was discarded as it was placed in fridge rather than in freezer. |
| 19 | Procurement | Patient was given alternative stem cell mobilising agent instead of the prescribed one, but collection was successful. |
| 20 | Other | Incorrect weight used to calculate cell dose for infusion. |
| 21 | Procurement | Retrieval of heart valves undertaken without training or any agreements being in place. |
| 22 | Distribution | Wrong type of heart valve issued in error to end user. Suitable valve sourced at short notice. |
| 23 | Other | One bag of stem cells dropped and damaged. Sufficient dose of cells in other bags. |
| 24 | Processing | Delayed cryopreservation of cells resulted in lower than expected cell viability. |
| 25 | Storage | Several cell harvests labelled with incomplete patient details. |
| 26 | Other | Leak in one bag of stem cells Sufficient dose of cells in other bags. |
| 27 | Storage | Vessels for liver transplantation sent by tissue bank were too short. Consultant decided to use out of date (2 days) vessels instead. |
| 28 | Procurement | A potentially high risk donor was not identified. Additional staff training to ensure more rigorous checks take place implemented. |
| 29 | Procurement | Donor did not commence injections of mobilization agent on the correct day which led to delays in apheresis collection and infusion into the recipient. |
| 30 | Storage | Bag containing cryopreserved stem cells was damaged. Bag placed in overwrap bag and stored. |
| 31 | Processing | Labelling errors detected on several stem cell bags stored for transplantation. |
| 32 | Procurement | Contamination was detected in a bone marrow harvest. |
| 33 | Procurement | A trained procurer who was working under a third party agreement was delayed and a lower than expected volume of cord blood collected. |
| 34 | Preservation | Incorrect controlled rate freezing protocol used to cryopreserve cord blood donation. Cells were banked, and error clearly highlighted in records. |
| 35 | Transportation | Unexplained interruption in data collected by temperature logging device during transportation of cryopreserved cord blood to end user. |

| Ref no | Process event linked to | Description of Human Application SAE |
|--------|-------------------------|--|
| 36 | Storage | Lack of communication between maintenance staff and stem cell laboratory resulted in power outage for four hours during maintenance. No impact on stem cell harvests stored in liquid nitrogen as temperature was maintained. |
| 37 | Procurement | Trained midwife who was not working under a third party agreement, procured cord blood, following emergency Caesarean section. Phlebotomist attended shortly after the birth and procured cord tissue, reviewed and was satisfied with procedures followed by midwife. |
| 38 | Processing | Concentration of white blood cells in imported stem cell harvest exceeded the internationally recognised limit. Patient engrafted but suffered a late graft failure. |
| 39 | Storage | Human error resulted in kits used to procure cartilage being placed in fridge rather than being stored at recommended temperature. |
| 40 | Procurement | Unexpected clotting during bone marrow collection due to using non-heparinized syringe. Collection stopped and cells discarded. |
| 41 | Materials | Stem cell bag damaged when dropped in cryo-cart. Contents of bag compromised. |
| 42 | Preservation | The use of a substitute for the starch solution used when freezing stem cells resulted in clots forming when the product was thawed. A new cryopreservation method was validated. |
| 43 | Transportation | Four corneas delivered at wrong hospital. Had to be re-routed to the correct hospital. |
| 44 | Testing | Computer error when creating reports for bacteriology test results. |
| 45 | Storage | Inner packaging containing heart valve was damaged when outer cardboard package was opened. Alternative heart valve obtained and operation proceeded. |
| 46 | Processing | Air flow failure in clean room compromised air quality in area where tissues are processed area. No tissue was being processed at the time. |
| 47 | Preservation | Evidence of bacterial contamination in stem cell harvest. The patient's central line was the source of contamination. Cells discarded. |
| 48 | Procurement | Leak in apheresis kit noted during collection. Cause identified and rectified. |
| 49 | Procurement | Clots formed during collection/processing of PBSCs. Harvest discarded as a precaution. |
| 50 | Testing | Bacterial contamination detected in corneal transplant. |
| 51 | Storage | Faulty controlled rate freezer resulted in required temperature not being achieved, but did not appear to compromise quality of stem cells. |
| 52 | Preservation | Staff forgot to remove frozen cells from the controlled rate freezer and place them in storage. |
| 53 | Preservation | Control rate freezer failed during cryopreservation. Product assessed as suitable for transplantation. |
| 54 | Storage | Failure of heat-sealer compromised the seal of stem cell storage bag. |

| Ref no | Process event linked to | Description of Human Application SAE |
|--------|-------------------------|--|
| 55 | Materials | Leak in stem cell cryobag and cells transferred to another bag. |
| 56 | Other | Stem cell stimulating factor administered to donor was not the one which was prescribed. |
| 57 | Procurement | One of three bags of bone marrow discarded due to contamination, possibly caused during collection. |
| 58 | Procurement | Microbial contamination detected in stem cells collected using a contaminated apheresis line. |
| 59 | Materials | Microbial contamination identified in two batches of media. None of the recipients reported any problems but as a precaution, all recalled early for review by consultant. |
| 60 | Procurement | Contamination of bone marrow harvest, thought to have arisen from poor aseptic technique during procurement. |
| 61 | Procurement | Microbial contamination in bone marrow harvest, probably occurred during procurement. |
| 62 | Preservation | Liquid nitrogen ran out during cryopreservation of stem cells, Cells deemed unsuitable. |
| 63 | Materials | Leak noted in cryobag containing stem cells and small amount of cells lost. |
| 64 | Other | Loss of traceability of acellular materials delivered to end user as ineffective systems in place. |
| 65 | Procurement | Infection from central line resulted in contamination and loss of autologous stem cells. |
| 66 | Storage | Due to failure of freezer, stored femoral heads were disposed and freezer replaced. |
| 67 | Preservation | Increase in delay to engraftment where cryopreserved cells prompted investigation and change in cryopreservation process. |
| 68 | Distribution | Delay in delivery of urgent allograft, resulted in surgeon using autograft as well as allograft. |
| 69 | Procurement | Contamination of bone marrow harvest. Likely cause skin contamination from donor. |
| 70 | Procurement | Contamination of bone marrow harvest. |
| 71 | Other | End-user did not follow documented procedure- swabbing bone strut before implantation to identify contamination. |
| 72 | Transportation | Cord blood for transplant irradiated at airport; cell viability did not appear to be affected and patient successfully engrafted. |
| 73 | Procurement | Faulty assembly in apheresis machine resulted in harvest with high red blood cell levels. |
| 74 | Processing | Contamination detected in two cell cultures from thymus which were discarded. |
| 75 | Distribution | Sub-optimal cell count and viability in cord blood units supplied via a registry. |
| 76 | Processing | Leak observed in port on one bag of stem cells; cells discarded. |
| 77 | Testing | Sign off procedures to ensure donor testing for HTLV 1 was in place for tissue imported from the US was not followed. |

| Ref no | Process event linked to | Description of Human Application SAE |
|--------|-------------------------|---|
| 78 | Processing | Errors in initial count lead to overloading of columns resulting in unsuccessful T cell depletion; product not infused. |
| 79 | Procurement | Bacterial contamination detected in bone marrow harvest, received via a registry. |
| 80 | Procurement | Contamination detected in bone marrow harvest, most probably occurred during procurement. |
| 81 | Procurement | High level of incompatible red cells in stem cell product received through a registry. |
| 82 | Other | Post mortem identified high likelihood of sporadic CJD in donor of femoral head donor 8 years after donation. |
| 83 | Processing | Microbial growth observed in medium used to de-swell cornea. |
| 84 | Procurement | Three contaminated bone marrow procurements detected. |
| 85 | Testing | Swab of bone taken just before bone was implanted was not labelled and so not tested for microbial contamination. |
| 86 | Transportation | Traceability of cord blood unit en-route from overseas was lost for short period of time and arrived late. |
| 87 | Procurement | Clotting during apheresis collection, not due to equipment failure; cells could not be used. |
| 88 | Other | Cells clotted during infusion into recipient. |
| 89 | Procurement | Bacterial contamination of bone marrow harvest detected- by skin commensals. |
| 90 | Distribution | Quality checks on epithelial surface of cornea prior to release for end use failed to detect evidence of previous surgery. |
| 91 | Distribution | Two corneas which did not meet release criteria were released for distribution and transplanted. |
| 92 | Storage | Cord blood cells leaked from cryobag during transport to end; caused by defective heat sealer. |
| 93 | Preservation | Fault in controlled rate freezer affected freezing protocol for ovarian tissue. Tissues will be issued under concessionary release. |
| 94 | Preservation | Controlled rate freezer failure resulted in loss of cell viability. Collection repeated and successful transplant and engraftment took place. |
| 95 | Materials | Cryobag leaked during thawing, however transplant proceeded and patient engrafted with no adverse effects. |
| 96 | Procurement | Bacterial contamination of a bone marrow harvest, attributed to a skin commensal. |
| 97 | Distribution | Cornea incorrectly released, as it did not meet the specifications required by surgeon. |
| 98 | Other | Clumps of white cells observed during infusion of stem cells. |
| 99 | Storage | Cells were in contact with cryo-preserved for extended period of time as heat sealer was not used correctly; stem cell quality compromised. |
| 100 | Other | End user mistakenly transplanted Rh+ femoral head into patient. |
| 101 | Materials | Damaged seal on cryobag; leaking of cells observed during infusion of stem cells into recipient. |

| Ref no | Process event linked to | Description of Human Application SAE |
|--------|-------------------------|--|
| 102 | Materials | Inlet seal of cryobag snapped after cryopreservation exposing cells to atmosphere. |
| 103 | Procurement | End user detected microbial contamination (skin commensal) in bone marrow collection. |
| 104 | Materials | Cryobag leaked when thawed before infusing into recipient. Small amount of stem cells lost but infusion continued successfully. |
| 105 | Procurement | Contamination of bone marrow harvests detected at the end user site, but not at the procurement site. |
| 106 | Distribution | Incorrect weight used to calculate dosage of stem cells sourced using a registry. |
| 107 | Distribution | Stem cell collection was stored in insulated box left in laboratory overnight and not placed in fridge. |
| 108 | Procurement | Bacterial contamination of one bag of stem cells, probably due to a skin commensal from the donor. |
| 109 | Processing | Faulty incubator used to process cells for patient treatment. |
| 110 | Storage | Bag of stem cells dropped when it was from a liquid nitrogen storage tank. |
| 111 | Procurement | Faulty assembly in apheresis machine resulted in harvest with high level of red cells. |
| 112 | Storage | Power failure resulted in the failure of the bone bank freezer and data logger. |
| 113 | Distribution | Borderline cornea released for transplantation; should not have been released |
| 114 | Procurement | Stem cells were procured through contaminated line attached to donor. |
| 115 | Storage | Heat seal failure resulted in cells leaking from cryobags. |
| 116 | Other | Clumping observed in bag of stem cells during infusion. |
| 117 | Testing | Low levels of Hepatitis B viral DNA detected in stem cell donor after donation. Pre donation result was negative. Probably due to rare reactivation of dormant virus during mobilisation. |
| 118 | Procurement | Fibrin type clots/clumps observed during apheresis (stem cell collection). |
| 119 | Procurement | Staff inexperience led to some loss of stem cells during collection. |
| 120 | Procurement | Untrained nurse procured cord blood after following phlebotomist's instructions over the phone. Phlebotomist worked under a third party agreement, but could not attend the labour ward in time. |
| 121 | Distribution | Stem cell collections from two donors reserved for one patient. Clinician requested collection from one donor, but tissue bank release collection from the other donor. |
| 122 | Storage | Cryo-storage tank left open and room left unsecure and unsupervised by engineers during routine maintenance. |
| 123 | Testing | Incorrect parameters used to calculate cell collection and patient received unnecessary pre-collection component support. |
| 124 | Transportation | Battery failure in data logger during transportation; no reason to believe the cord unit has been affected. |

| Ref no | Process event linked to | Description of Human Application SAE |
|--------|-------------------------|---|
| 125 | Procurement | 'Break seal' failure of inline tubing resulted in product loss during collection of stem cells. |
| 126 | Preservation | Poor quality of donor lymphocytes obtained following cryopreservation; cells discarded. |
| 127 | Transportation | Damage caused to three cryobags most probably due to mishandling during transport. |
| 128 | Other | The donor was incorrectly (verbally) identified as a match for their sibling; was followed up and corrected. |
| 129 | Testing | Microbiology department detected bacteria on swabs from several femoral heads; most likely due to cross contamination in the microbiology laboratory. |
| 130 | Procurement | Procurement of cord tissue using staff who were not working under a third party agreement. |
| 131 | Procurement | Yeast contamination of stem cells collected by apheresis using haemodialysis line. Cells discarded and patient successfully remobilised. |
| 132 | Transportation | Cord blood thawed during transportation. Cells unusable for transplant. |
| 133 | Transportation | Stem cells accidentally passed through airport x-ray machine. Follow up testing indicated no impact on cells, or recipient. |
| 134 | Materials | Leak in cryobag containing stem cells observed during thawing of cells. |
| 135 | Distribution | Incorrect cord blood unit handed to courier for distribution. |
| 136 | Processing | Media used when processing skin found to be contaminated. |
| 137 | Other | During preparation of a cornea the graft tore and could not be used. |
| 138 | Storage | Hepatitis C positive stem cells harvested in 1997 were not being stored high risk quarantine tank. |
| 139 | Processing | Clean room failure; No processing was taking place in the clean room suite at the time and none was planned. |
| 140 | Transportation | Discrepancies observed between temperature unit and manual temperature checks when monitoring temperature of stem cell units during transport. |
| 141 | Procurement | Contamination (microbial skin contaminant) detected in stem cells collected by apheresis. |
| 142 | Materials | Outer packaging did not meet acceptable quality to act as an effective sterile barrier. Product recall carried out. |
| 143 | Preservation | Programmable freezer failure during cryopreservation of therapeutic T cells. |
| 144 | Testing | Sibling donor assessment did not detect borderline neutropenia. |
| 145 | Storage | During retrieval from cryo-storage one cryobag containing stem cells was dropped and damaged. |
| 146 | Procurement | Microbial contamination detected in stem cells collected using a contaminated line. |
| 147 | Storage | Control valve failure during filling of liquid nitrogen storage tank resulted in cryobags being immersed in liquid nitrogen. |

| Ref no | Process event linked to | Description of Human Application SAE |
|--------|-------------------------|---|
| 148 | Procurement | Apheresis machine failed during harvesting. |
| 149 | Storage | Incorrect stem cells retrieved from storage. Patient infusion delayed until correct bag of stem cells located. Incident due to transcription error. Processes being reviewed. |
| 150 | Procurement | Contamination of stem cells harvest detected. |
| 151 | Procurement | Bone marrow collected from sibling donor found to be contaminated. |
| 152 | Storage | Out of date strut graft issued to end user; not used. |

The classification and description of each of the SARs in Human Application sector is in the table below:

| Ref No | Patient reaction occurred in | Description of Human Application SAR |
|--------|------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Recipient | Neurological symptoms following reinfusion of stem cells collected by apheresis. |
| 2 | Donor | Donor had an allergic reaction, probably to citrate, during apheresis. |
| 3 | Recipient | Reaction due to the large volume of stem cells infused into paediatric patient. |
| 4 | Recipient | Recipient reaction due to high Anti-A in the bone marrow transfusion product following clinical decision to infuse an unwashed ABO incompatible bone marrow product. |
| 5 | Recipient | Mild reaction following allogeneic bone marrow transplant in recipient. |
| 6 | Recipient | Reaction following infusion of cord blood into recipient. Decision made to wash any further donations before infusion into patient. |
| 7 | Recipient | Reaction in recipient following cord blood infusion most probably due to the presence of red blood cells. |
| 8 | Recipient | Recipient suffered from endophthalmitis and loss of vision, caused by slow growing Mycobacterium species. Contamination could be of donor origin, but no evidence to confirm. |
| 9 | Donor | Donor reaction, during apheresis due to citrate toxicity. |
| 10 | Recipient | Low cell viability and cell counts in cryopreserved cord blood unit used for infusion into recipient. |
| 11 | Donor | Donor reaction during apheresis, due to citrate toxicity. |
| 12 | Recipient | Haematuria following infusion of cord blood obtained via a registry; most probably due to the presence of red blood cells. |
| 13 | Recipient | Infection following implantation of irradiated tendons. Not able to link reaction to the implant. |
| 14 | Recipient | Recipient received and reacted to contaminated bone marrow donation. |
| 15 | Recipient | Recipient developed reaction to cryopreservative used to preserve stem cells. |

| Ref No | Patient reaction occurred in | Description of Human Application SAR |
|--------|------------------------------|---|
| 16 | Recipient | Recipient developed Endophthalmitis following corneal transplant. Two eye banks were involved but so far no clear evidence to implicate cornea, as tests were negative. |
| 17 | Recipient | Transplant recipient undergoing double red cell depleted cord transplant developed; may be due to lysed red cells in cord blood. |
| 18 | Recipient | Clinical decision made to infuse E.coli positive autologous cord blood resulted in infection in recipient. |
| 19 | Recipient | Primary graft failure due to an infection. Cornea released in accordance with eye bank's quality procedures, unable to confirm if the infection was transmitted from the donor or related to the quality of the cornea. |
| 20 | Recipient | Failure of stem cell engraftment. Patient died shortly afterwards. Unable to confirm that it was related to quality and safety of cells. |
| 21 | Recipient | The recipient had a bacterial infection following use of pericardium during eye surgery. Surgeon stated that it is unlikely that the reaction was linked to the quality of the graft. |
| 22 | Donor | Donor fainted after donating stem cells. |
| 23 | Donor | Donor reaction could be due to citrate toxicity; however donor has a history of palpitations. |
| 24 | Recipient | Post-operative dilation of transplanted pulmonary valve; graft removed. |
| 25 | Donor | Patient fainted after donating stem cells. |
| 26 | Donor | Donor reaction possibly to medications used to prime donor for stem cell collection by apheresis. |
| 27 | Donor | Cardiac event in an anxious patient at time of attempted stem cell collection. |
| 28 | Donor | Sibling stem cell donor was hospitalized following administration of stem cell mobilising agent which resulted in side effects. |
| 29 | Recipient | Following cord blood transfusion, patient had reduced pulse rate. Possible reaction to preservation component in cord blood. Patient recovered. |

ii) SAEARs in the organ donation and transplantation (ODT) sector reported to the HTA during 2013 and 2014

SAEARs in the ODT sector must be reported under the Quality and Safety of Organs Intended for Transplantation Regulations 2012 (the 2012 Regulations).

The 2012 Regulations define SAEARs in the ODT sector as follows:

- a) a serious adverse event (SAE) is 'any undesired and unexpected occurrence associated with any stage of the chain from donation to transplantation that might lead to the transmission of a communicable disease, to death or life-threatening, disabling or incapacitating conditions for patients or which results in, or prolongs, hospitalisation or morbidity'.

SAEs that may influence the quality and safety of an organ and that may be attributed to the testing, characterisation, procurement, preservation and transport of organs must be reported and investigated.

The HTA also requires that any SAEs which occur at a transplant centre which may influence the quality and safety of an organ must be reported and investigated.

- b) A serious adverse reaction (SAR) is ‘an unintended response, including a communicable disease, in the living donor or in the recipient that might be associated with any stage of the chain from donation to transplantation that is fatal, life-threatening, disabling, incapacitating, or which results in, or prolongs, hospitalisation or morbidity’.

SARs observed during or after transplantation which may be connected to the testing, characterisation, procurement, preservation and transport of organs must be reported and investigated.

NHS Blood and Transplant (NHSBT) manage the system for reporting and managing ODT SAEARs on behalf of the HTA as one of a series of assisted functions. Reports of ODT SAEs and SARs are made to NHSBT as part of their wider clinical incident reporting system, which is a continuation of the practice NHS establishments undertook prior to the introduction of the 2012 Regulations.

NHSBT investigate the reports they receive and report incidents which meet the definition of a SAE or SAR under the 2012 Regulations to the HTA. NHSBT notify the HTA of the steps being taken to manage the SAEAR and provide confirmation that all actions associated with the SAEAR have been concluded.

We have performed a search of our licensing system and 77 ODT SAEARs were reported to the HTA, via NHSBT, by licensed establishments in the ODT sector during 2013 and 2014.

The classification and description of each of the ODT SAEARs is in the table below:

| Ref no | ODT SAE or SAR | Patient reaction occurred in | Brief Description |
|--------|----------------|------------------------------|---|
| 1 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 2 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 3 | ODT SAE | N/A | Malignancy in donor organ; lesion removed. |
| 4 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Incorrect packaging/ preservation fluid. |
| 5 | ODT SAE | N/A | Incorrect virology recorded - organs accepted for transplant and recipient centre immediately informed. |
| 6 | ODT SAE | N/A | Tumour in organ identified post transplantation. |
| 7 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 8 | ODT SAE | N/A | Potential tumour in organ detected post-transplant. |

| Ref no | ODT SAE or SAR | Patient reaction occurred in | Brief Description |
|--------|----------------|------------------------------|---|
| 9 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval – organ had been accepted for transplant but was later deemed to be unsuitable. |
| 10 | ODT SAE | N/A | Blood group error - identified when potential organ transplant recipient was admitted for transplant. |
| 11 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Poorly packaged organ. |
| 12 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Organ recipient acquired metabolic disease from donor. |
| 13 | ODT SAE | N/A | Retrieval damage to organ during operation on live donor. |
| 14 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 15 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 16 | ODT SAR | Donor | Retrieval damage to organ during operation on live donor. |
| 17 | ODT SAE | N/A | Loss of organs - not appropriately perfused at retrieval. |
| 18 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted |
| 19 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 20 | ODT SAE | N/A | Discrepancy in virology results- laboratory transcription error. |
| 21 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 22 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Incorrect perfusion fluid used by transplant centre. Organ transplanted and subsequently removed. |
| 23 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Damage during retrieval, organ transplanted, and subsequently removed. |
| 24 | ODT SAE | N/A | Incorrect type of perfusion fluid used to perfuse organ – organ not transplantable. |
| 25 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 26 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Incorrect Donor HLA reported for organ recipient. |
| 27 | ODT SAE | N/A | Following transplantation of an organ, a non-malignant tumour was detected in another organ. |
| 28 | ODT SAE | N/A | Loss of organ for transplant due to considerable blood loss during retrieval. |
| 29 | ODT SAE | N/A | Donor malignancy discovered during post mortem - after organs were transplanted. |
| 30 | ODT SAE | N/A | Super urgent patient (recipient) removed from waiting list in error. |
| 31 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Damage during retrieval; organ transplanted and subsequently removed. |
| 32 | ODT SAE | N/A | Donor infection detected after organs were transplanted. |
| 33 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Infection in recipient; most likely donor derived infection. |
| 34 | ODT SAE | N/A | Unlabelled organ box caused delay and contributed to organs not transplanted |
| 35 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |

| Ref no | ODT SAE or SAR | Patient reaction occurred in | Brief Description |
|--------|----------------|------------------------------|--|
| 36 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 37 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Transmission of infection from donor to recipient, transcription error. |
| 38 | ODT SAE | N/A | Malignancy discovered during post mortem on donor. |
| 39 | ODT SAE | N/A | Delay in test results; incorrect processing of sample in laboratory. |
| 40 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Possible transmission of infection from donor to organ recipient. |
| 41* | ODT SAR | Recipient | Aborted transplantation procedure - potential donor malignancy identified at time of transplantation. |
| 42* | ODT SAE | N/A | Potential donor malignancy not recorded on EOS (Electronic Offering System) at time of offer – organ transplanted. |
| 43 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 44 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 45 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Recipient underwent unnecessary general anaesthetic; donor malignancy discovered and organ not transplanted. |
| 46 | ODT SAE | N/A | Potential for transmission of infection from donor to organ recipient. |
| 47 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Transmission of infection from donor to two organ recipients. |
| 48 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 49 | ODT SAE | N/A | Delays in transport of organs – one organ not transplanted. |
| 50 | ODT SAE | N/A | Recipient centre detected malignancy in one organ; other organ already transplanted. |
| 51* | ODT SAE | N/A | Donor malignancy discovered after one organ was transplanted. Other organ transplanted based on clinical risk assessment. |
| 52* | ODT SAR | Recipient | Donor malignancy discovered during retrieval. Two organs were transplanted, but one potential recipient for another organ was anaesthetized unnecessarily as transplant of that organ was aborted. |
| 53 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Organ found unsuitable for transplant at back bench at recipient centre - recipient had already been anaesthetized. |
| 54 | ODT SAE | N/A | Poor perfusion of organs. Organs not transplanted. |
| 55 | ODT SAE | N/A | Biopsy not taken appropriately; organ disposed of. |
| 56 | ODT SAE | N/A | Organ not retrieved as the amount of perfusion fluid available in the theatre was not sufficient. |
| 57 | ODT SAE | N/A | Organ found unsuitable for transplant due to damage - recipient already anaesthetized. |

| Ref no | ODT SAE or SAR | Patient reaction occurred in | Brief Description |
|--------|----------------|------------------------------|---|
| 58 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during retrieval of organ; damage repaired and organ transplanted. |
| 59 | ODT SAE | N/A | Laboratory tissue typing transcription error; impact on organ allocation. |
| 60 | ODT SAE | N/A | Organ incorrectly packaged; not transplanted. |
| 61 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 62 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 63 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Recipient anaesthetized unnecessarily; organ could not be transplanted. |
| 64 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 65 | ODT SAR | Donor | Living donor was hospitalized for a prolonged period following donation. |
| 66 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 67 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Post-transplant complication in organ recipient. |
| 68 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Transmission of viral infection from donor to recipient five years post-transplant. |
| 69 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Transmission of infection from donor to recipient. |
| 70 | ODT SAE | N/A | Recipient centre detected a thrombus in organ. Organ not transplanted. |
| 71 | ODT SAE | N/A | Damage during organ retrieval - organ not transplanted. |
| 72 | ODT SAE | N/A | Malignancy detected in organ, post transplantation. |
| 73** | ODT SAE | N/A | Perfusion protocol not followed. |
| 74** | ODT SAR | Recipient | Post-transplant complications in recipient. Recipient required re-graft. |
| 75 | ODT SAR | Recipient | Organ size not communicated, also poor perfusion and packaging - organ transplanted, recipient suffered early graft dysfunction and died. |
| 76 | ODT SAE | N/A | Organ inadequately perfused and sent to the wrong destination - organ not transplanted. |
| 77 | ODT SAE | N/A | Miscommunication of information from retrieval centre to implanting centre – organ could not be used as recipient not ready for transplant. |

* same incident resulted in SAE and SAR

** same incident resulted in SAE and SAR

Further information

If you are unhappy with the way the HTA has handled your request for information in this case, you may in the first instance ask us for an internal review by writing to us at the above postal or email address.

If you remain dissatisfied with the handling of your request or complaint, you have the right to appeal directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision, at the address below. There is no charge for making an appeal.

Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire SK9 5AF

Telephone: 08456 30 60 60 or 01625 54 57 45
Website: www.ico.gov.uk

There is no charge for making an appeal.

Yours sincerely

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.A short black horizontal redaction bar.A long black horizontal redaction bar.