

DUTY OF CANDOUR & BEING OPEN - DRAFT POLICY PROPOSALS FOR CONSULTATION

Summary

In January 2018, Justice John O'Hara published his report on the Inquiry into Hyponatraemia-Related Deaths (IHRD). His first recommendation was that a statutory Duty of Candour should be enacted in Northern Ireland and that it should apply to Healthcare Organisations and everyone working for them. Justice O'Hara also recommended that criminal liability should attach to breach of this duty and to obstruction of another in the performance of this duty. He made further recommendations about the guidance, support and protection that should be provided for staff in order to create a more open culture.

In response, the Department of Health (DoH) established an Implementation Programme to take forward the recommendations arising from the Inquiry and the Duty of Candour Workstream, and its Being Open subgroup, have been responsible for developing the proposal options to address the recommendations on candour.

Through a co-production process, the Worksream and Subgroup have developed policy options for the statutory Duty of Candour and the policy framework for Being Open guidance, taking account of: research commissioned and evidence submitted; feedback from staff and service users; and input from other key stakeholders.

The DoH is now seeking your views on the following proposals developed by the Workstream and Subgroup:

- a. Policy options for the statutory organisational Duty of Candour; and
- b. Policy options for the statutory individual Duty of Candour; and
- c. The policy framework for Being Open guidance.

A detailed summary of these proposals is available <u>here</u> on the DoH website.



Ways to respond

The consultation opened on 12 April 2021 and will close on 2 August 2021. Stakeholders can respond by completing this questionnaire, or by submitting their own written response, to the policy proposals to:

E-mail: lHRD.implementation@health-ni.gov.uk

Written: IHRD Implementation

Department of Health

Room D1

Castle Buildings

Stormont Estate, BELFAST

BT4 3SQ

In addition, an online questionnaire is available on the Citizen Space website <u>here</u>, which allows stakeholders the opportunity to respond to the consultation questions online.

If, for any reason, you are unable to access the electronic versions of the documents you can request a paper copy by e-mailing lHRD.implementation@health-ni.gov.uk or by writing to the address below. The consultation documents, including the questionnaire, may also be requested in an alternative format by also contacting this address.



Terminology (paragraphs 2.25 – 2.27)

in respect of "openness" and "candour"? If yes, please provide any additional information and / or insights.
Yes. However I believe Duty of Candour should be used in all cases. I believe the public are well aware of what it means.
2. If not, do you suggest a preferred terminology that should be used to describe this policy and the statutory duty? Please provide evidence to support any alternative proposal.

Do you agree with the terminology and definitions adopted by the Workstream



Statutory Organisational Duty of Candour (Section 3)

Scope (paragraph 3.8 - 3.9)

3. Do you agree with the proposed scope of the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? If yes, please provide any additional information.
Yes, however private/charity ambulance companies should be included as well.
4. If not, do you have a preferred approach for the scope of the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? For example, should the scope be limited to regulated organisations that directly provide health and social care services? Please provide evidence to support any alternative proposal.
Routine Requirements (paragraphs 3.10 – 3.11)
5. Do you agree with the routine requirements of the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? If yes, please provide any additional information.
Yes



6. If not, do you have a preferred approach for the routine requirements of the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? Please provide evidence to support any alternative proposal.
Requirements – When Care Goes Wrong (paragraphs 3.12 – 3.18)
7. Do you agree with the proposed definition for the significant harm threshold for the Duty of Candour procedure? If yes, please provide any additional information.
Yes
8. If not, do you have a preferred definition for the significant harm threshold for the Duty of Candour procedure? Please provide evidence to support any alternative proposal.



Statutory Duty of Candour Procedure (paragraphs 3.19 – 3.23)

9. Do you agree with the proposed requirements under the statutory organisational Duty of Candour when things go wrong? If yes, please provide any additional information or insights.
Yes
10. If not, do you have a preferred approach for the requirements under the statutory organisational Duty of Candour when things go wrong? Please provide evidence to support any alternative proposal.
Apologies (paragraphs 3.24 – 3.26)
11. Do you agree with the proposed legislative requirement to provide an apology as part of the Duty of Candour procedure? If yes, please provide any additional information or insights.
Yes



12. If not, do you have a preferred policy approach in respect of apologies in circumstances where the threshold for the Duty of Candour procedure has been met? Please provide any evidence to support any alternative proposal.
13. Do you agree with the proposals in respect of apologies under the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? If yes, please provide any additional information or insights.
Yes
14. If not, do you have a preferred approach for the proposals in respect of apologies under the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? Please provide evidence to support any alternative proposal.



15.

Support and protection for staff (paragraphs 3.27 – 3.28)

organisational Duty of Candour? If yes, please provide any additional information or insights.
Yes. However Whether there will enough good leaders to ensure an open and honest culture remains to be seen.
16. If not, do you have a preferred approach for the support for staff under the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? Please provide evidence to support any alternative proposal.
Reporting and monitoring (paragraphs 3.29 – 3.32)
17. Do you agree with the proposed reporting and monitoring requirements under the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? If yes, please provide any additional information.
Yes

Do you agree with the proposals for support for staff under the statutory



18. If not, do you have a preferred approach for the reporting and monitoring requirements under the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? Please provide evidence to support any alternative proposal.
Criminal sanctions for breach (paragraphs 3.33 – 3.40)
19. Do you agree with the proposed criminal sanctions for breach of the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? If yes, please provide any additional information.
Yes
20. If not, do you have a preferred approach for the criminal sanctions for breach of the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? Please provide evidence to support any alternative proposal.



Obstruction offence (paragraphs 3.41 – 3.42)

21. Do you agree with the proposed obstruction offence under the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? If yes, please provide any additional information.
Yes
22. If not, do you have a preferred approach for the obstruction offence under the statutory organisational Duty of Candour? Please provide evidence to support any alternative proposal.
Additional feedback
23. Is there any additional evidence, or observations that you wish to provide in respect of the policy proposals for the statutory organisational Duty of Candour?
No



Statutory Individual Duty of Candour (Section 4)

<u>Policy Proposal – Statutory Individual Duty of Candour with criminal sanction for breach (paragraphs 4.13 – 4.22)</u>

24. Please provide comments on the policy proposal for the statutory individual Duty of Candour.

Unfortunately there is still a god like attitude that exists within the Doctor profession. Professional bodies have not been able to quell this. I am not convinced that these bodies could deal effectively with any breach of the duty of candour. Therefore Justice O'Hara's recommendations should be implemented in full. Deviation should only occur if the professional bodies can show that their procedures to deal with breaches are robust. Consideration should be given to compelling these organisations to have independent individuals as part of any investigation into alleged breaches.

Alternative Policy Proposals (paragraphs 4.23 – 4.35)

25. Please provide comments on the alternative policy proposals for the statutory individual Duty of Candour.

Ethical duty has failed specifically within the Doctor grades. The god like attitude that exists has probably contributed to this. The professional bodies would appear not to have robust procedures in place to deal with dishonesty. Independent individuals need to be appointed to ensure that the public can have confidence in any investigation by these bodies.



26. If you do not agree with any of the three high-level policy proposals, do you have a preferred alternative policy approach for implementation of the recommendations relating to the statutory individual Duty of Candour? Please provide evidence to support an alternative proposal.
Scope (paragraphs 4.36 – 4.38)
27. What is your preferred policy approach in respect of the scope of the statutory individual Duty of Candour? Please outline the reasons for your preference, and provide evidence to support your reasoning.
The duty should apply to everyone.
Routine Requirements & Requirements When Care Goes Wrong (paragraphs 4.39 – 4.43)
28. Do you agree with the proposals in relation to the requirements under the statutory individual Duty of Candour? If yes, please provide reasons for your agreement.
Yes, Justice O'Haras recommendations are necessary due to the possible dishonesty of some individuals.



29. If not, do you have a preferred approach for the requirements under the statutory individual Duty of Candour? Please provide evidence to support any alternative proposal.
Exemptions (4.44)
30. Do you have any comments to make on the case for exemptions from the requirements under the statutory individual Duty of Candour? Please provide evidence to support your position.
No
Additional Feedback
31. Is there any additional feedback that you wish to provide in respect of the policy proposals for the statutory individual Duty of Candour? If so, please provide evidence to support alternative proposals, if possible.
No



Being Open Framework (Section 5)

Policy Proposals (paragraphs 5.1 – 5.8)

Framework? If yes, please outline your reasoning.
Yes
33. If not, do you have a preferred policy approach in respect of openness and candour in health and social care? Please provide evidence to support alternative policy proposals.
Level 1 – Service Users and Carers (paragraphs 5.9 – 5.11)
34. Do you agree with the policy proposals at Level 1 of the Being Open Framework for Service Users and Carers? If yes, please outline your reasoning.
Yes I do agree.



35. If not, do you have a preferred policy approach in respect of Level 1 of the Being Open Framework for Service Users and Carers? Please provide evidence to support alternative policy proposals.
Level 1 – Staff (paragraphs 5.12 – 5.13)
36. Do you agree with the policy proposals at Level 1 of the Being Open Framework for Staff? If yes, please outline your reasoning.
Yes I do agree.
37. If not, do you have a preferred policy approach in respect of Level 1 of the Being Open Framework for Staff? Please provide evidence to support alternative policy proposals.



<u>Level 1 – Organisations (paragraphs 5.14 – 5.15)</u>

Framework for Organisations? If yes, please outline your reasoning.
Yes I do agree.
39. If not, do you have a preferred policy approach in respect of Level 1 of the Being Open Framework for Organisations? Please provide evidence to support alternative policy proposals.
Level 2 – Service Users and Carers (paragraphs 5.18 – 5.19)
40. Do you agree with the policy proposals at Level 2 of the Being Open
Framework for Service Users and Carers? If yes, please outline your reasoning.
Yes I do agree.



41. If not, do you have a preferred policy approach in respect of Level 2 of the Being Open Framework for Service Users and Carers? Please provide evidence to support alternative policy proposals.
Level 2 – Staff (paragraphs 5.20 – 5.21)
42. Do you agree with the policy proposals at Level 2 of the Being Open Framework for Staff? If yes, please outline your reasoning.
Yes I do agree.
43. If not, do you have a preferred policy approach in respect of Level 2 of the Being Open Framework for Staff? Please provide evidence to support alternative policy proposals.



Level 2 – Organisations (paragraphs 5.22 – 5.23)

44. Do you agree with the policy proposals at Level 2 of the Being Open Framework for Organisations? If yes, please outline your reasoning.
Yes I do agree.
45. If not, do you have a preferred policy approach in respect of Level 2 of the Being Open Framework for Organisations? Please provide evidence to support alternative policy proposals.
<u>Level 3 – Service Users and Carers (paragraphs 5.26 – 5.29)</u>
46. Do you agree with the policy proposals at Level 3 of the Being Open Framework for Service Users and Carers? If yes, please outline your reasoning.
Yes I do agree.



Being Open Framework for Service Users and Carers? Please provide evidence to support alternative policy proposals.
Level 3 – Staff (paragraphs 5.30 – 5.31)
48. Do you agree with the policy proposals at Level 3 of the Being Open Framework for Staff? If yes, please outline your reasoning.
Yes I do agree.
49. If not, do you have a preferred policy approach in respect of Level 3 of the Being Open Framework for Staff? Please provide evidence to support alternative policy proposals.



<u>Level 3 – Organisations (paragraphs 5.32 – 5.33)</u>

Framework for Organisations? If yes, please outline your reasoning.
Yes I do agree.
51. If not, do you have a preferred policy approach in respect of Level 3 of the Being Open Framework for Organisations? Please provide evidence to support alternative policy proposals.
Additional Feedback
52. Is there any additional feedback that you wish to provide in respect of the policy proposals for the Being Open Framework? If so, please provide evidence to support alternative proposals, if possible.
No



53.

Consultation & Impact Screening (Section 6)

whether or not this policy is useful?
No
54. Do you have any feedback or suggestions about how we can engage and involve stakeholders to develop this policy and put it in place?
Ensure patient advocates are included in the process.

Do you have any feedback about the possible ways we could measure