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1. Summary of the questions

Q1: Do you agree that the PSA should take on the role of advising the UK governments on which groups of healthcare professionals should be regulated?

**Response:**

Q2: What are your views on the criteria suggested by the PSA to assess the appropriate level of regulatory oversight required of various professional groups?

**Response:**

Q3: Do you agree that the current statutorily regulated professions should be subject to a reassessment to determine the most appropriate level of statutory oversight? Which groups should be reassessed as a priority? Why?

**Response:**

Q4: What are your views on the use of prohibition orders as an alternative to statutory regulation for some groups of professionals?

**Response:**

Q5: Do you agree that there should be fewer regulatory bodies?

**Response:**

Q6: What do you think would be the advantages and disadvantages of having fewer professional regulators?

**Response:**

Q7: Do you have views on how the regulators could be configured if they are reduced in number?

**Response:**

Q8: Do you agree that all regulatory bodies should be given a full range of powers for resolving fitness to practise cases?

**Response:**

Q9: What are your views on the role of mediation in the fitness to practise process?

**Response:**

Q10: Do you agree that the PSA's standards should place less emphasis on the fitness to practise performance?

**Response:**

Q11: Do you agree that the PSA should retain its powers to appeal regulators' fitness to practise decisions to the relevant court, where it is considered the original decision is not adequate to protect the public?

**Response:**

Q12: Do you think the regulators have a role in supporting professionalism and if so how can regulators better support registrants to meet and retain professional standards?

**Response:**

Q13: Do you agree that the regulators should work more closely together? Why?

**Response:**

Q14: Do you think the areas suggested above are the right ones to encourage joint working? How would those contribute to improve patient protection? Are there any other areas where joint working would be beneficial?

**Response:**

Q15: Do you agree that data sharing between healthcare regulators including systems regulators could help identify potential harm earlier?

**Response:**

Q16: Do you agree that the regulatory bodies should be given greater flexibility to set their own operating procedures?

**Response:**

Q17: Do you agree that the regulatory bodies should be more accountable to the Scottish Parliament, the National Assembly for Wales and the Northern Irish Assembly, in addition to the UK Parliament?

**Response:**

Q18: Do you agree that the councils of the regulatory bodies should be changed so that they comprise of both non-executive and executive members?

**Response:**

Q19: Do you think that the views of employers should be better reflected on the councils of the regulatory bodies, and how might this be achieved?

**Response:**

Q20: Should each regulatory body be asked to set out proposals about how they will ensure they produce and sustain fit to practise and fit for purpose professionals?

**Response:**

Q21: Should potential savings generated through the reforms be passed back as fee reductions, be invested upstream to support professionalism, or both? Are there other areas where potential savings should be reinvested?

**Response:**

Q22: How will the proposed changes affect the costs or benefits for your organisation or those you represent?

- an increase

- a decrease

- stay the same

Please explain your answer and provide an estimate of impact if possible.

**Response:**

Q23: How will the proposed changes contribute to improved public protection and patient safety (health benefits) and how could this be measured?

**Response:**

Q24: Do you think that any of the proposals would help achieve any of the following aims:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010 and Section 75(1) and (2) of the Northern Ireland Act 1998?

- Advancing equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?

- Fostering good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it?

If yes, could the proposals be changed so that they are more effective?

**Response:**

If not, please explain what effect you think the proposals will have and whether you think the proposals should be changed so that they would help achieve those aims?

**Response:**