

Accountability for AI-Assisted Care

Policy | AI-POL-002

Document type	Policy
Title	Accountability for AI-Assisted Care
Document ID	{{facility.code}}-AI-POL-002
Version and status	1.1 Approved by the ASF Expert Committee
Prepared by	{{roles.quality_lead.name}}, Quality lead
Reviewed by	{{roles.clinical_director.name}}, Clinical director Date: _____
Approver and signature	{{roles.clinical_director.name}}, Clinical director Signature: _____ Date: _____
Effective date	{{document.effective_date}}
Next review	{{document.review_date}} (12 months, or sooner after any incident or change)
Replaces	None (new document)
Standards and criteria supported	Standard 2D, criterion 2D.7
Evidence basis	E-011, E-009
Status of this document	Recommended best-practice model. A hospital may adopt, adapt or replace it with an equivalent that meets the same criteria.

At a glance: what to do

1. The clinician who makes the final decision remains accountable for it.
2. Write the accountability arrangement for each AI system, approved by the governing body.
3. Review accountability after any AI-related safety incident.
4. Make the arrangement known to every clinical user.

Stop and get help straight away if: an AI-assisted decision is made where accountability is not written down for that system.

1. Purpose

To define, in writing and in advance, who is accountable when an AI-assisted care decision is wrong, so that the question is answered before it matters [E-011, EC].

2. Scope

Applies to	Clinicians, clinical leads, chief executive, governing body, legal adviser
Locations	All clinical areas using AI systems at {{facility.legal_name}}
When	Before each AI system is introduced; reviewed yearly and after incidents
Does not apply to	Accountability for decisions made without AI, covered by existing clinical governance

3. Definitions and abbreviations

Term	Meaning in this SOP
Accountability	The duty to answer for a decision, and to put right harm caused by it
Final decision	The clinical decision that is communicated to the patient and recorded

4. Background and rationale

When an AI-supported decision goes wrong, the question "who is responsible" is often left open, which harms patients and staff. Criterion 2D.7 asks for it to be defined in advance and approved [E-011].

5. Responsibilities

Role	Duties in this SOP	Competence needed
Governing body	Approves the arrangement	Governance
Chief executive	Keeps the arrangement current; leads reviews	Executive
Clinicians	Accept accountability for their final decision and understand the system limits	Clinical
Legal adviser	Advises on the legal position (EC)	Legal

6. Equipment, materials and resources

Item	Specification or standard	Check before use
Accountability arrangement per AI system	Written, approved by governing body	Current
Staff briefing on accountability	Plain language	Given at induction and when a system is introduced

7. Safety and infection prevention

- The arrangement must never discourage clinicians from overriding an AI output.

8. Before you start

- Confirm the arrangement for the system is approved.

9. Procedure

Follow the steps in order. Where a step says "If", take the action for the case that applies. Do not skip a step. If a step cannot be done, use section 11 and section 12.

Step	Action	How to do it	Key point
1	Write the arrangement.	- For each AI system, write who makes the final decision, who is accountable for it, and how the system's limits are communicated. - Include the process for patient harm and redress.	Write it before use, not after the first incident.
2	Approve.	The governing body approves the arrangement before the system is used.	Approval makes the arrangement binding on leaders as well as staff.
3	Brief clinicians.	- Brief each clinical user on their accountability and on the limits of the system. - Record the briefing.	Clinicians must understand their duty before they use the tool.
4	Review after incidents.	- After any AI-related incident, review whether the arrangement was clear and worked. - Update it and record the change.	Each incident tests the arrangement.
5	Review yearly.	Review each arrangement yearly, and after any change of system or law.	Law and systems change.

Decision points

- If accountability is unclear in an incident, the chief executive decides and records the reasons, then updates the arrangement.

10. Special situations

Situation	What to do
Clinician overrides an AI output and harm follows	Review the decision under the incident process, not automatically as an AI fault.

11. Problems and escalation

- AI-related incidents go to the chief executive and INC-POL-001 at once.

12. Monitoring and compliance

What is checked	Target	How often	Who	If the target is missed
AI systems with approved arrangement	100%	Yearly	Chief executive	Stop use until approved
Clinicians briefed	100%	Yearly	Clinical leads	Brief within 30 days
Incidents reviewed against arrangement	100%	Each event	Chief executive	Escalate to governing body

13. Records

Record	Where it is kept	Kept for
AI accountability arrangement and briefing records	Governance file	{{facility.records_retention_years}} years

14. Training and competence

- Clinicians are briefed at induction and when a system is introduced (EC).

15. Related documents

ID	Title	Relationship
AI-POL-001	Responsible Use of AI in Care Policy	Parent policy
INC-POL-001	Incident Reporting and Management	Incident route
INC-SOP-001	Root Cause Analysis of Serious Incidents	Review of serious incidents

16. Evidence

ID	Source and status
E-011	WHO (2021), Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health. Used as the basis for AI governance. Link and wording to verify before publication.
E-009	ASF Expert Committee consensus. Legal position set by the ASF Expert Committee.

EC = ASF Expert Committee consensus. Items marked EC are reviewed by the Committee each year.

17. Change history

Version	Date	What changed	Approver and signature
1.0	{{document.effective_date}}	First version	Approved by the ASF Expert Committee
1.1	{{document.effective_date}}	Internal quality review: corrected cross-references, status wording and document control	Approved by the ASF Expert Committee