























For each test system, the laboratory must test, at a minimum, two levels of external QC materials each day it performs a nonwaived test.	
However, the regulations now allow the laboratory to reduce the frequency of testing external QC materials (equivalent QC procedure for certain test systems.	a)
CLLA CMS: Equivalent Quality Control Procedures Brochure #4	

EQC Eva	luation		
	Evaluation	n Process	External QC checks
Option 1 System monitors all analytic components	Daily testing with internal monitoring systems	10 consecutive days of passing external QC	At least once per month
Option 2 System monitors some analytic components	Daily testing with internal monitoring systems	30 consecutive days of passing external QC	At least once per week
Option 3 System monitors no analytic components	NA	60 consecutive days of passing external QC	At least once per week
CMS: Equivalent	Quality Control Procedures Broo	chure #4	













































Think	in terms	of the fiv	e eleme	nts of a
People: Training, Experience, Attitude	Materials (Reagents and consumables): Integrity, Storage, Reconstitution , Preparation (mixing), Use	Equipment (Hardware and Software): Use, Maintenance, Reliability	Methods: Calibration, Capability, Sensitivity, Specificity, Accuracy, Precision	Environment: Temperature, Humidity, Air flow, Power supply, Water quality
3. Cooper. BioRad. 2007 A	ACC QC Webinar	BTW: T	his is com	mittee work!





, Risl	< Accepta	bility I	Matrix		
	Severity of Harm				
Probability of harm	Negligible	Minor	Serious	Critical	Catastrophic
Frequent	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
Probable	OK	Х	Х	X	Х
Occasional	OK	OK	OK	Х	Х
Remote	OK	OK	OK	OK	Х
Improbable	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
ISO 14971					

Effect	Severity of effect	Ranking
Hazardous, without warning	May endanger patient. Involves non-compliance with gov't, regulation without warning.	10
Hazardous, with warning	Same as above only with warning	9
Very High	Major injury to patient requiring emergency intervention	8
High	Minor injury to patient; patient dissatisfied	7
Moderate	Results acceptable; not cosmetically satisfactory	6
Low	100% of results may have to be retested; some patient dissatisfaction	5
Very Low	Timing/efficiency defects noticed by most users	4
Minor	Same as above, but, defect noticed by average	3
Very Minor	Same as above, but, defect noticed only by the discriminating user	2
None	No effect	1

Process	Severity	Evaluation	Criteria	

	Process Oc	currence Eva	aluatio	n Criteria
[Probability of	Possible Failure	С.,	Rankings

Failure	Rates		
Very high, failure is	⇒ 1 in 2	< 0.33	10
almost inevitable	1 in 3	<u>></u> 0.33	9
High, repeated failures	1 in 8	<u>≥</u> 0.51	8
	1 in 20	≥ 0.67	7
Moderate, occasional failures	1 in 80	≥ 0.83	6
	1 in 400	≥ 1.00	5
	1 in 2000	> 1.17	4
Low, relatively few	1 in 15,000	≥ 1.33	3
failures	1 in 150,000	≥ 1.50	2
Remote, unlikely	≤ 1 in 1,500,000	≥ 1.67	1

Adapted from Quality Support Group, Inc

		liona
Qualitative probability	Quantitative probability of not detecting	Ranking
Remote likelihood that erroneous results		
would be undetected	1/10.000	1
 detection reliability at least 99.99% 	1/5 000	2
United that arrange is a second to be a second	2,5,000	~
would be undetected		
 detection reliability at least 99.5% 	1/2,000	3
 detection reliability at least 99% 	1/1,000	4
Moderate likelihood of detection		_
 detection reliability at least 98% 	1/500	5
 detection reliability at least 95% 	1/200	6
 detection reliability at least 90% 	1/100	/
High likelihood that that erroneous		
detection reliability at least 95%	1/50	8
detection reliability at least 80%	1/20	9
Extreme likelihood that erroneous		
results would be undetected	1/10 +	10

































