

Mushkil Aasaan Limited

# Mushkil Aasaan

## Inspection report

1st Floor, 220-222 Upper Tooting Road  
Wandsworth  
London  
SW17 7EW

Tel: 02086726581

Date of inspection visit:  
29 March 2017

Date of publication:  
27 April 2017

### Ratings

Overall rating for this service

Good ●

Is the service well-led?

Good ●

# Summary of findings

## Overall summary

This inspection took place on 29 March 2017 and was announced.

At our previous inspection on 4 May 2016 a breach of legal requirements were found. After the inspection, the provider wrote to us to say what they would do to meet the legal requirements in relation to notifications.

We undertook this focussed inspection to check that they had followed their plan and to confirm that they now met the legal requirements in relation to the breach found.

Mushkil Aasaan is a domiciliary care service providing care and support to people in their own homes. At the time of the inspection there were approximately 120 people using the service.

There was a registered manager at the service. A registered manager is a person who has registered with the Care Quality Commission to manage the service. Like registered providers, they are 'registered persons'. Registered persons have legal responsibility for meeting the requirements in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and associated Regulations about how the service is run.

At our previous inspection we found that the provider did not always notify the CQC of notifiable incidents.

At this inspection, we found that improvements had been made.

The provider was aware of the type of incidents that they were required to notify the Care Quality Commission (CQC) of and kept a record of the events that had been reported to CQC and the local authority.

## The five questions we ask about services and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

### Is the service well-led?

Good ●

We found that action had been taken to improve how well-led the service was.

The provider had submitted statutory notifications of notifiable incidents that had taken place.

# Mushkil Aasaan

## **Detailed findings**

### Background to this inspection

We carried out this inspection under Section 60 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 as part of our regulatory functions. This inspection checked whether the provider is meeting the legal requirements and regulations associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008, to look at the overall quality of the service, and to provide a rating for the service under the Care Act 2014.

We undertook this focussed inspection on 29 March 2017. The inspection was announced, the provider was given 48 hours' notice because the location provides a domiciliary care service; we needed to be sure that someone would be in.

This inspection was carried out to check that improvements to meet legal requirements planned by the provider after our inspection on 4 May 2016 had been made.

The inspection was carried out by one inspector.

Before we visited the service we checked the information that we held about it, including notifications sent to us informing us of significant events that occurred at the service. We also contacted the safeguarding adults team at the local authority.

During the inspection, we spoke with the director and a care coordinator. We looked at the records of incidents and complaints at the service since the previous inspection.

## Is the service well-led?

### Our findings

At our previous inspection which took place on 4 May 2016, we found the provider had failed to send in statutory notifications to the Care Quality Commission (CQC) as required.

At this inspection we found that improvements had been made. The provider was now meeting the regulation.

We reviewed a record of incidents and complaints that had taken place or been received since the previous inspection. The provider kept a log of these along with supporting documents such as any correspondence with relevant authorities. The provider had submitted notifications to the CQC for any relevant incidents. The provider was aware and knew under what circumstances to submit a notification to CQC.