GDP Information Day 2012 - Quality Risk Management Case Study

Example of a Poorly Executed Risk Assessment, using an FMEA-type tool

| Severity 1-10 | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| No Patient impact | | | | | | | | |
| Minor Patient Impact | | | | | | | | |
| Significant Patient Impact | | | | | | | | |
| Life threatening | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| Probability of Occurrence 1-10 | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | Extremely unlikely to occur | | | | | | | |
| 3 | May occur, but not often | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Likely to occur sometimes | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Very likely to occur everytime | | | | | | | |

| Detection 1-10 | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Detected every time | | | | | | | | |
| Detected sometimes, often | | | | | | | | |
| May be detected, but unlikely | | | | | | | | |
| No detection mechanism | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Note: All RPNs > 100 require Risk Mitigation. RPNs < 100 are considered low risks and do not require Risk Mitigation.

| | Function or Process Step | | Potential Impact | II | Potential Causes | осс | Detection Mode | DET | | Recomm ended Actions | Respon sibility | Target Date | SEV | осс | DET | RPN |
|---|-----------------------------|---|--|----|--|-----|---|-----|----|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1 | | goods are put back into saleable stock | Packs of unknown quality might reach patients | | Goods are not adequately checked after receipt | | RP checks all returns and personally releases them to saleable stock | 1 | 6 | N/A | N/A | N/A | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | | inadvertently processed as returns | Patients may receive defective medicines | | Recall SOP not adequately followed | 2 | Internal Audits Training on recall SOP | | 60 | N/A | N/A | N/A | - | - | - | - |