keeping meant different things to different clinicians. Explicit documentation criteria make communication clearer for follow-up as well as risk management. Taking into account the World Health Organization (WHO) eligibility criteria, the Cochrane Database, the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RCOG) recommendations and known frequency and seriousness of complications, we agreed a standard of documentation for an IUD insertion in our service. A balance needed to be struck between recording sufficient information to adequately reflect the consultation but not so much that it was unmanageable. The agreed documentation included three main areas – pre-insertion, procedure and post-insertion – see Table 1.

The agreed recommendations for standards of documentation were incorporated into the IUD clinical protocols and distributed to all clinicians in the service. The individual, confidential comparative feedback allowed staff to reflect on their strengths and areas for improvement in a non-threatening manner. We plan to re-audit to ensure standards are being maintained.

Conclusion
This audit clarifies what we should do, why we should do it, and how we should record it to enhance communication and reduce risk. We were able to agree a minimum standard for practice to enhance adequate counselling, safe insertion, communication with colleagues and risk management.
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The doctor needs to discuss the sexual relationship or proposed relationship with the young person to help the young person to decide whether they are comfortable and are in no way being pressurised or abused. The young woman is asked if she intends to continue her present relationship and the doctor assesses her need for contraception and whether her physical or mental health would be damaged by lack of advice or prescription. When the decision is made to prescribe for the young person the doctor must feel confident that the patient is mature enough to understand the decision she is making. The doctor should explain the method in detail and allow the young person to ask any questions.

The decision is then made by the doctor whether it is in the best interests of the under 16-year-old to prescribe for her in order to protect her against unintended pregnancy or sexually transmitted infections (STIs). Previously the assessment of the young person’s maturity was called ‘Gillick competence’; the current terminology is ‘Fraser ruling competence’, after Lord Fraser who was one of the Law Lords who ruled in the test case.

GP practices and community clinics should put in their practice/clinic leaflets, and any other relevant information materials, that they offer a confidential service for those under 16. It is particularly important to display this information in reception areas, so that young people are made aware of this. This should encourage more young people to consult doctors and nurses, so that they can be given accurate information on sexual health in an open and non-judgmental way.
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