




Implementation of Directive 2010/32/EU on prevention of sharps injuries in the hospital and health care sector

Presentation to Regional Seminar, 31st January 2013, Dublin


Significance of issue of sharps injuries (source: GHK survey , 2011)

How significant is the issue of sharps injuries in your country?



Is there data on number of sharps injuries (source: GHK survey , 2011)

Is there any data about the number of sharps injuries in your country?



Responses received to survey

**8 Trade union
(CY, ES, NL, SE,
SF, UK, Belarus)**

**6 Employer (DK,
LV, NL, SE, SF,
UK)**

**14 Total
responses to date
(31 January 2013)**

Status of transposition

Progress towards transposition of legislation (deadline May 2013)...

Transposition completed: 3 countries (NL, SE, (Belarus))


Transposition prior to May 2013: DK, LV

Transposition likely by deadline: SF, UK

No clear date given: CY, EE, ES


Is new legislation required to transpose Directive in your country? (source: GHK survey , 2011)

Is any new legislation/agreement etc required in your country to implement the Directive?



How will the legislation be implemented? (source: GHK survey , 2011)

How will the Directive be implemented in your country?



Nature of transposition

**Directive
likely to be
transposed
as...**

**Legislation only: CY, DK, ES,
SE, SF, UK**

**Legislation and collective
agreement: Belarus, Latvia**

Collective agreement

**Other method of transposition: NL
(Incorporated in existing Guideline)**

Level of change required to existing legislation

None	Low	Moderate	Significant
Denmark	Netherlands Finland (employers) Belarus Estonia	Latvia Spain Sweden UK (trade unions, nurses)	Finland (trade unions) UK (trade unions)

Challenges for implementation

Do you foresee any challenges for implementation?

Yes (LV, SF, UK)
Fear of cost of implementation in combination with existing budgetary pressures
Insufficient commitment to full transposition by legislator/other stakeholders

No (CY, EE, ES, DK, NL. Belarus)

Who was responsible – who was involved?

Responsible	Involved	No involved
Ministry of Health Ministry of Employment and Social Affairs Agency of Government	Ministry of Health Ministry of Labour Social partners (cross-industry) Social partners (sectoral)	Ministry of Health (UK) Nursing organisation (Latvia) Healthcare branches other than hospitals (NL)

Existence of current guidance/tools

**Yes: Belarus,
ES, NL
(employer), SE,
SF (employer)
UK**

**No:
CY, LV, NL (trade
union), SF (trade
union)**

**All that answered
no have plans to
develop such
guidance, with
exception of CY**

Questions?

Agenda

Overview of new
phase of MLP

Questions

Main lessons
2012

Dealing with
LTU

Questions



Thank you

tina.weber@ghkint.com