

BY E-MAIL

Professor Alexis Jay  
Chair  
Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse  
PO Box 72289  
London  
SW1P 9LF

31<sup>st</sup> January 2018

Dear Professor Jay,

### **Correction to evidence submitted to the Inquiry**

The Authority submitted evidence to the Independent Inquiry on Child Sexual Abuse on 18<sup>th</sup> August 2017 as part of the call for views to examine whether current arrangements to prevent child sexual abuse in healthcare settings are effective.

In our evidence, in response to question 2, we outlined some of the challenges faced within the current framework for regulating health and care professionals in relation to tackling abuse of children. One of our concerns about gaps in the current legislation is in connection to inconsistency between the regulators around the power to impose an interim order of conditions. An interim order is a tool that can be used by regulators to temporarily restrict the practice of a registrant where serious concerns have been raised about their fitness to practise and the regulator's investigation is ongoing. Such restrictions are either by way of an interim suspension where the registrant is prevented from practising or by way of interim conditions, where the registrant is able to practise but under restrictions, such as a requirement to use a chaperone when examining a patient.

At paragraph 3.9, we highlighted that not all regulators have the power to impose interim conditions of practice. However, we then incorrectly stated that not all regulators are able to impose interim suspension orders. We apologise for the confusion we may have caused.

The correct position is as follows. Each of the nine statutory professional regulators that we oversee has the power to impose an interim suspension order. The General Chiropractic Council and the General Osteopathic Council do not have the power to impose an interim order of conditions; however, the other seven statutory regulators do have such a power. Furthermore, where an interim suspension order is imposed by the investigating committee of the General Chiropractic Council and the General Osteopathic Council, that suspension order can only be imposed for 2 months. For the other regulators, their legislation specifies that the order will be no longer than 18 months and must be reviewed every 6 months. Where an investigation takes longer than 18 months,

they are able to seek an extension of the interim suspension order by applying to the High Court.

I hope that this correction can be taken into account when considering our evidence to the inquiry and we apologise for any inconvenience caused. We will also publish an amended version of our evidence on our website and I would be very happy to provide any further information required.

Yours sincerely,



Christine Braithwaite  
**Director of Standards and Policy**