

Grays Inn Road Medical Practice

Quality Report

77 Gray's Inn Road Holborn London WC1X 8TS Tel: 0208 616 0445 Website: www.graysinnmedical.co.uk

Date of inspection visit: 7 June 2016 Date of publication: 04/08/2016

This report describes our judgement of the quality of care at this service. It is based on a combination of what we found when we inspected, information from our ongoing monitoring of data about services and information given to us from the provider, patients, the public and other organisations.

Jati	nac
хаш	
VOI CII	-
Katii	HZS

Overall rating for this service	Good	
Are services safe?	Good	

Summary of findings

Contents

Cummany of this inspaction	Page
Summary of this inspection	rage
Overall summary	2
The five questions we ask and what we found	3
The six population groups and what we found	4
Detailed findings from this inspection	
Our inspection team	5
Why we carried out this inspection	5
How we carried out this inspection	5
Detailed findings	6

Overall summary

Letter from the Chief Inspector of General Practice

We carried out an announced focussed inspection on 7 June 2016. This was to follow up our comprehensive inspection of the practice on 29 September 2015, when we found a breach of legal requirements, relating to the safe management of vaccines. We served a requirement notice relating to the breach. The practice's overall rating had been good; the individual rating for providing safe services was requires improvement.

Following the inspection, the practice wrote to us to say what it would do to meet the legal requirements in relation to the breach of regulations 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014, relating to Safe care and treatment.

We undertook this focussed inspection on 7 June 2016 to check that it had implemented its action plan and to confirm that it now met the legal requirements. This report covers our findings in relation to those requirements and to the improvements needed to provide a responsive service. We found that the practice had taken appropriate action to meet the requirements of the notice and have amended the practice's rating for providing safe services to good.

You can read the report from our last comprehensive inspection by selecting the 'all reports' link for Gray's Inn Road Medical Practice on our website at www.cqc.org.uk.

Professor Steve Field CBE FRCP FFPH FRCGP

Chief Inspector of General Practice

Summary of findings

The five questions we ask and what we found

We always ask the following five questions of services.

Are services safe?

The practice is rated as good for providing safe services.

- The practice had revised its fridge monitoring and cold chain policy. Staff had been instructed in the procedures to take when the vaccines fridge temperatures were found to be outside their recommended ranges.
- We saw that an occasion when the fridge temperature range had been exceeded had been dealt with by the practice as a significant event and appropriate action had been taken to ensure patients' safety was maintained.

Good



Summary of findings

The six population groups and what we found

We always inspect the quality of care for these six population groups.

The always more extense quality of early of these six population groups.	
Older people The practice was found to be providing good care for safe services for all the population groups we inspect against.	Good
People with long term conditions The practice was found to be providing good care for safe services for all the population groups we inspect against.	Good
Families, children and young people The practice was found to be providing good care for safe services for all the population groups we inspect against.	Good
Working age people (including those recently retired and students) The practice was found to be providing good care for safe services for all the population groups we inspect against.	Good
People whose circumstances may make them vulnerable The practice was found to be providing good care for safe services for all the population groups we inspect against.	Good
People experiencing poor mental health (including people with dementia) The practice was found to be providing good care for safe services for all the population groups we inspect against.	Good



Grays Inn Road Medical Practice

Detailed findings

Our inspection team

Our inspection team was led by:

The inspection was carried out by a CQC Inspector.

Why we carried out this inspection

We had previously carried out a comprehensive inspection of the practice on 29 September 2015 and found that it was not meeting some of the legal requirements associated with the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and regulations made under that act. From April 2015, all health care providers were required to meet certain Fundamental Standards, which are set out in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. Regulation 12 relates to the fundamental standard of Safe care and treatment.

At the comprehensive inspection, we had found that the practice was failing to meet the requirements of regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. We served a notice requiring the provider to take action, as follows –

The registered person had not protected people against the risk associated with a failure to properly and safely manage medicines.

This was in breach of regulation 12 of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014. Regulation 12 (2) (g)

How we carried out this inspection

We carried out an announced visit on 7 June 2016.

During our visit we:

- Spoke with the two partner GPs, the practice manager and members of the administrative team.
- Looked at documentation and records relating to fridge temperature monitoring.

Following our visit, the practice sent us further relevant documentation which we considered as part of the review.



Are services safe?

Our findings

Overview of safety systems and processes

At our comprehensive inspection in September 2015, we had reviewed the practice's medicines management procedures. We checked how medicines and vaccines were stored. We saw records that confirmed that the vaccines fridge temperature was monitored and recorded. However, we noted from the records that on two dates the vaccines fridge temperatures had been one degree lower than the recommended minimum of 2 degrees centigrade. There was no record of the matter being reported to managers or of any investigation or action being taken. We discussed this with staff, but they could offer no explanation. The practice agreed to ensure staff were aware of the procedures to follow in such circumstances in the future, treating the matter as a significant event, as appropriate.

At our follow up inspection in June 2016, we looked at the practice's fridge monitoring and cold chain policy. This had been revised in December 2015, following the publication of our comprehensive inspection report. The policy set out what action should be taken by staff if they found the vaccines fridge temperatures to be outside the required range of +2 to +8 degrees centigrade. We were shown minutes of a staff meeting confirming that the policy had

been discussed in detail, including procedures to be followed when the temperatures were out of range. Staff we spoke with were able to confirm their understanding of the procedure.

We saw the incident record form relating to a recent occasion when the fridge temperatures had been checked and noted to be one degree above the recommended range. Incidents of fridges being above the recommended range are less significant than when the temperatures are below it, as the viability of the vaccines is less likely to be compromised. Following the thermometers being reset, in accordance with procedure, the temperatures were found to be within the required range.

The matter had been reported appropriately by staff. The manufacturers of the vaccines had been contacted for guidance, with the vaccines quarantined in the meantime. In one case, a vaccine was considered to still be viable and was retained. In another, the manufacturer did not provide detailed advice and left it to the practice to make a clinical decision on the matter. The practice opted to dispose of the vaccine concerned. The incident was reported to the Department of Health and NHS England. It led to an action plan being drawn up, which included the purchasing of new thermometers, monitoring being done twice daily and the fridges being serviced by a qualified engineer.

We concluded that the practice had taken appropriate action since our comprehensive inspection to comply with the requirements of the regulations.