|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Department/Location/Project: CoaguChek XS & ProII | SOP Document Reference Number: **SOP/POCT/43** |
| Risk Assessor(s): N. Hodges | Highest Risk Rating Identified\*: 6 |
| Date of assessment: 11/03/2022 | Informed QM of any Risk Score >9: NA |

**\* Any identified risk which has a rating >9 must be communicated with the Quality Manager**

| **Description of risk** | **Existing control/ safe****System of work** | **Initial Risk** **Rating****(S X L= RR)** | **What further action is required** | **Responsible person** **and target date for completion** | **Final Risk** **Rating****(S X L= RR)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electrical hazard with use of the Coagucheck to staff. | Battery operated – handheld when in use. Docking unit is mains powered – covered by local pat testing. | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biohazard from patient blood collection and analysis to staff using the meter.Patients with highly infectious disease (ie COVID-19) could pose a risk of spread and infection to staff collecting / analysing samples.  | Gloves are worn. Capillary blood only used, minimum volumes used. Equipment wiped after useLances are single use and sharp contained inside the lance and disposed in sharps bin.Minimal risk of transmission via blood of COVID-19 | 1 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Insufficient blood applied to strip could give erroneous results. | Staff trained to obtain blood sample and continue to apply blood until the blood droplet sign disappears.Training includes procedure for unexpected INR results to be confirmed by laboratory on a venous sampleUn expected results should be confirmed with a venous sample to the lab. | 3 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transcribing of patient INR to notes/anticoagulant team to dose, incorrect transcription could lead to incorrect dosing. | Minismised issue by reducing number of patients tested in this way. Only those with very bad veins who cannot have a venous sample taken will be bleed /tested in this way.  | **2** | **3** | **6** | Connection of meters to a data manager and then directly into the patient notes electronically would remove the risk from transcription. | Nicola Hodges – Poccelerator can be used to connect all meters to the electronic patient record. Will be pursued during 2022 | **0** | **0** | **0** |

**Risk assessment matrix**

**Acceptable Risk**

Risk is tolerable as long as it is well managed and controlled. In addition to identified hazards, all incidents claims and complaints will be risk assessed according to the following process and investigated according to the severity or the consequence and likelihood of (re)occurrence.

**All Risk Assessments within the Trust will identify:**

1. The hazards within the Task/ area being assessed inherent in the work undertaken
2. who and how many people would be affected
3. how often specific events are likely to happen (may be based on frequency of previous occurrence):
4. how severe the effect or consequence would be
5. how controllable the hazards are.

Acceptable risk will be determined using the following traffic light system:

**Severity/consequence**

Given the (in) adequacy of the control measures, how serious the consequences are likely to be for the group, patient or Trust if the risk does occur (using the matrix).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Consequence score (severity levels) and examples of descriptors**  |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Domains** | **Negligible** | **Minor** | **Moderate** | **Major** | **Catastrophic** |
| **Impact on the safety of patients, staff or public (physical/****psychological harm)**  | Minimal injury requiring no/minimal intervention or treatment. No time off work | Minor injury or illness, requiring minor intervention Requiring time off work for ≤3 days Increase in length of hospital stay by 1-3 days  | Moderate injury requiring professional intervention Requiring time off work for 4-14 days Increase in length of hospital stay by 4-15 days RIDDOR/agency reportable incident An event which impacts on a small number of patients | Major injury leading to long-term incapacity/ disability Requiring time off work for >14 days Increase in length of hospital stay by >15 days Mismanagement of patient care with long-term effects  | Incident leading to death Multiple permanent injuries or irreversible health effectsAn event which impacts on a large number of patients  |
| **Quality/complaints/****audit**  | Peripheral element of treatment or service suboptimal Informal complaint/inquiry  | Overall treatment or service suboptimal Formal complaint (stage 1) Local resolution Single failure to meet internal standards Minor implications for patient safety if unresolved Reduced performance rating if unresolved  | Treatment or service has significantly reduced effectiveness Formal complaint (stage 2) complaint Local resolution (with potential to go to independent review) Repeated failure to meet internal standards Major patient safety implications if findings are not acted on  | Non-compliance with national standards with significant risk to patients if unresolved Multiple complaints/ independent review Low performance rating Critical report  | Totally unacceptable level or quality of treatment/service Gross failure of patient safety if findings not acted on Inquest/ombudsman inquiry Gross failure to meet national standards  |
| **Human resources/ organisational development/ staffing/ competence**  | Short-term low staffing level that temporarily reduces service quality (< 1 day)  | Low staffing level that reduces the service quality  | Late delivery of key objective/ service due to lack of staff Unsafe staffing level or competence (>1 day) Low staff morale Poor staff attendance for mandatory/key training  | Uncertain delivery of key objective/service due to lack of staff Unsafe staffing level or competence (>5 days) Loss of key staff Very low staff morale No staff attending mandatory/ key training  | Non-delivery of key objective/service due to lack of staff Ongoing unsafe staffing levels or competence Loss of several key staff No staff attending mandatory training /key training on an ongoing basis  |
| **Statutory duty/ inspections**  | No or minimal impact or breech of guidance/ statutory duty  | Breach of statutory legislation Reduced performance rating if unresolved  | Single breech in statutory duty Challenging external recommendations/ improvement notice  | Enforcement action Multiple breeches in statutory duty Improvement notices Low performance rating Critical report  | Multiple breeches in statutory duty Prosecution Complete systems change required Zero performance rating Severely critical report  |
| **Adverse publicity/ reputation**  | Rumours Potential for public concern  | Local media coverage – short-term reduction in public confidence Elements of public expectation not being met  | Local media coverage –long-term reduction in public confidence  | National media coverage with <3 days service well below reasonable public expectation  | National media coverage with >3 days service well below reasonable public expectation. MP concerned (questions in the House) Total loss of public confidence  |
| **Business objectives/ projects**  | Insignificant cost increase/ schedule slippage  | <5 per cent over project budget Schedule slippage  | 5–10 per cent over project budget Schedule slippage  | 10–25 per cent over project budget Schedule slippage Key objectives not met  | Incident leading >25 per cent over project budget Schedule slippage Key objectives not met  |
| **Finance including claims**  | Small loss Risk of claim remote  | Loss of 0.1–0.25 per cent of budget Claim less than £10,000  | Loss of 0.25–0.5 per cent of budget Claim(s) between £10,000 and £100,000  | Uncertain delivery of key objective/Loss of 0.5–1.0 per cent of budget Claim(s) between £100,000 and £1 millionPurchasers failing to pay on time  | Non-delivery of key objective/ Loss of >1 per cent of budget Failure to meet specification/ slippage Loss of contract / payment by results Claim(s) >£1 million  |
| **Service/business interruption Environmental impact**  | Loss/interruption of >1 hour Minimal or no impact on the environment  | Loss/interruption of >8 hours Minor impact on environment  | Loss/interruption of >1 day Moderate impact on environment  | Loss/interruption of >1 week Major impact on environment  | Permanent loss of service or facility Catastrophic impact on environment  |

**Likelihood**

Given the (in) adequacy of the control measures for each risk, decide how likely the risk is to happen according to the following guide. Scores range from 1 for rare to 5 for very likely.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Descriptor** | **Description** |
| **1** | **Rare** | Extremely unlikely to happen/recur – may occur only in exceptional circumstances – has never happened before and don’t think it will happen (again) |
| **2** | **Unlikely** | Unlikely to occur/reoccur but possible. Rarely occurred before, less than once per year. Could happen at some time |
| **3** | **Possible** | May occur/reoccur. But not definitely. Happened before but only occasionally - once or twice a year |
| **4** | **Likely** | Will probably occur/reoccur. Has happened before but not regularly – several times a month. Will occur at some time. |
| **5** | **Very Likely** | Continuous exposure to risk. Has happened before regularly and frequently – is expected to happen in most circumstances. Occurs on a daily basis |

**Risk Score is determined by Severity x Likelihood**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Consequence** |
| **Likelihood** | **1****Insignificant** | **2****Minor** | **3****Moderate** | **4****Major** | **5****Catastrophic** |
| **5 – Almost certain** | **5** | **10** | **15** | **20** | **25** |
| **4 - Likely** | **4** | **8** | **12** | **16** | **20** |
| **3 – Possible** | **3** | **6** | **9** | **12** | **15** |
| **2 – Unlikely** | **2** | **4** | **6** | **8** | **10** |
| **1 - Rare** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |

