From: Robert Thompson
To: Sandra Barnes
Date: Mon, May 21, 2007 1:24 PM
Subject: Fw: Slightly revised questions.

FYI

Sent via Blackberry
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador

From: Robert Thompson
To: Crawley, Brian
Date: Mon, May 21, 2007 11:58 AM
Subject: Slightly revised questions.

Robert Thompson
Clerk of the Executive Council and Secretary to Cabinet
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
709-729-2853 (ph)
709-729-5218 (fax)

	Draft Questions May 18	Draft Questions May 21	
Systemic Review	1. What went wrong with the estrogen and progesterone testing that resulted in a high rate of errors?	1. What went wrong with the ER/PR Tests that resulted in a high rate of conversions when re-tested?	
	2. Why was the problem not detected until 2005?	2. Why was the problem not detected until 2005? Could it have been detected at an earlier date? Were the testing protocols during that period reasonable and appropriate?	
	3. Once detected, were appropriate, effective and timely actions implemented to ensure the best possible treatment for people who needed re-tests and for people who were being tested for the first time?		
	4. Once detected, did the responsible authorities communicate in an appropriate and timely manner with all categories of people who needed re-tests?		
	5. Once detected, did the responsible authorities communicate in an appropriate and timely manner with the general public about the issues and circumstances surrounding the testing errors and the new testing procedures?		
	6. Are the testing systems and processes currently in place reflective of "best practice"?		
	7. Does Eastern Health currently employ an effective quality assurance system to provide maximum probability that the testing problems will not reoccur?		
	8. Provide recommendations as necessary and appropriate to address the aforementioned issues and provide a system in which testing errors will not reoccur.		
Clinical Review – Part One	(Note: It is recognized that the following questions will require the use of probabilistic estimates based on existing medical research and standards.) 9. Given that certain people who would have required re-testing died before the errors were detected, can it be determined whether, and to what extent, accurate testing would have resulted in treatment that would have prolonged their lives? 10. Given that certain people required new treatment protocols after re-testing, can it be determined whether, and to	9. Given that certain people who would have required re-testing died before the errors were detected, can it be determined, on an individual or group basis, whether and to what extent accurate testing would have resulted in treatment that would have prolonged their lives? 10. Given that certain people required new treatment protocols after re-testing, can it be determined, on an individual or group basis, whether and to what extent the delay in appropriate treatment has had a negative effect on the quality of their lives and their life expectancy?	

	what extent, the delay in appropriate treatment has had a negative effect on the quality of their lives and their life expectancy?		
Clinical Review – Part Two	(Note: The following question will only be addressed by the Review only if the answers to questions 9 and 10 are affirmative with a reasonable degree of confidence.) 11. Given that certain people who would have required re-testing died before the errors were detected, determine whether, and to what extent, accurate testing would have resulted in treatment that would have prolonged their lives? 12. Given that certain people required new treatment protocols after re-testing, determine whether, and to what extent, the delay in appropriate treatment has had a negative effect on the quality of their lives and their life expectancy?	11. Given that certain people who would have required re-testing died before the errors were detected, the [review panel is asked to] determine, on an individual or group basis, whether and to what extent accurate testing would have resulted in treatment that would have prolonged their lives. 12. Given that certain people required new treatment protocols after re-testing, the [review panel is asked to] determine, on an individual or group basis, whether and to what extent the delay in appropriate treatment has had a negative effect on the quality of their lives and their life expectancy.	