

Accreditation Renewal Report

Joint Council for Cosmetic Practitioners (JCCP)

July 2026

Contents

About accreditation	3
The Outcome	4
About the Register.....	7
Assessment against the Standards.....	10
Share your experience.....	26
Impact assessment (including Equalities impact).....	28

About accreditation

The Professional Standards Authority (the PSA) accredits registers of people working in a variety of health and social care occupations that are not regulated by law. To become an Accredited Register, organisations holding registers of unregulated health and social care roles must prove that they meet our *Standards for Accredited Registers* (the Standards).

Initial accreditation decisions are made by an Accreditation Panel following an assessment of the organisation against the Standards by the Accreditation team. The Panel decides whether to accredit an organisation or not. The Panel can also decide to accredit with Conditions and provide Recommendations to the organisation.

- **Condition** – Issued when a Panel has determined that a Standard has not been met. A Condition sets out the requirements needed for the Accredited Register to meet the Standards, within a set timeframe. It may also reduce the period of accreditation subject to a review or the Condition being met.
- **Recommendation** – Actions that would improve practice and benefit the operation of the Register, but which is not a current requirement for accreditation to be maintained.

This assessment was carried out against our Standards for Accredited Registers¹ (“the Standards”) and our minimum requirements for the Standards as set out in our Evidence framework². More about how we assess against Standard One can be found in our Supplementary Guidance for Standard One³.

We used the following in our assessment of the JCCP:

- Documentary review of evidence supplied by the JCCP and gathered from public sources such as its website
- Due diligence checks
- Share your experience responses
- Assessment of JCCP’s complaints procedures.

¹ https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/standards/standards-for-accredited-registers.pdf?sfvrsn=e2577e20_8

² https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/accredited-registers/standards-for-accredited-registers/accredited-registers-evidence-framework-for-standards.pdf?sfvrsn=55f4920_9

³ https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/accredited-registers/standards-for-accredited-registers/accredited-registers-supplementary-guidance-for-standard-one.pdf?sfvrsn=3e5f4920_6

2. The Outcome

- 2.1 The Accreditation Panel met on 19 May 2026 to consider the Joint Council for Cosmetic Practitioners (JCCP). The Panel was satisfied that the JCCP met or could meet with Conditions all the Standards for Accredited Registers.

We therefore decided to accredit the JCCP with Conditions.

We noted the following positive findings:

- The JCCP continues to demonstrate a commitment to raising awareness of the risks associated with cosmetic procedures, enabling the public to make informed decisions.
- The JCCP works collaboratively with stakeholders to promote and maintain standards within the non-surgical cosmetics sector, supporting public safety.
- The JCCP has in place appropriate routes for concerns or complaints about registrants to be raised, including making available advice and support to complainants and witnesses.
- The JCCP acted promptly to address concerns identified as part of this assessment.

We issued the following Conditions to be implemented by the deadline given:

Conditions	Deadline
Standard 1 C-JCCP-FR-25/26-1: The JCCP must undertake a review of registrant websites and take appropriate action to address breaches of law and standards, particularly in relation to advertising Prescription Only Medicine and prescriber requirements.	3 Months
Standard 1 C-JCCP-FR-25/26-2: The JCCP must develop a sustainable approach to managing accessibility of registrant website links and misleading or inappropriate advertising practices.	9 Months
Standard 2 C-JCCP-FR-25/26-3: The JCCP must consider how it can make clearer, the differentiation between non cosmetic qualifications and cosmetic procedural levels, including how this information is displayed on its register.	6 Months
Standard 2 C-JCCP-FR-25/26-4: The JCCP must review the circumstances pertaining to a delay in information being shared by a PSRB and consider if further measures are needed to mitigate re-occurrence.	3 Months
Standard 5 C-JCCP-FR-25/26-5: The JCCP must make clear in its complaints process that appeals will be considered by individuals not previously involved in the matter.	9 Months

We issued the following Recommendations to be considered by the next review:

Recommendations

- Standard 2** **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-1:** The JCCP should more clearly set out its two routes for application by publishing information on its arrangements with the BAAPS & BCAM on its website and other relevant supporting documentation.
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-2:** The JCCP should review published Approved Routes documentation to ensure it is consistent.
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-3:** The JCCP should consider making its 'Regulated Professions' webpage more accessible, for example by linking it to the 'Join Now' webpage.
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-4:** The JCCP should review its Memorandum of Understanding with the BAAPS and assure itself that information is complete and up to date.
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-5:** The JCCP should take steps to ensure conflicts of interests are appropriately managed in relation to its registration appeals process.
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-6:** The JCCP should ensure any restrictions to practices made by other ARs or PSRBs are annotated in line with its own policy and explore the possibility of embedding a link that navigates to relevant practitioner information on the AR / PSRB register.
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-7:** The JCCP should review its Practitioner Register Annual Sampling Procedure document to more accurately reflect the 2026 Standards for accredited registers.
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-8:** The JCCP should review its documents relating to CPPD requirements to ensure consistency of expectations and requirements.
-
- Standard 3** **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-9:** The JCCP should review its guidance and information to make it more accessible for its different audiences, including members of the public.
-
- Standard 4** **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-10:** The JCCP should ensure its JCCP Education and Training Provider Registration Process infographic document is more readily accessible on its website.
-

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-11: The JCCP should ensure details pertaining to the frequency of annual reviews and re-approval processes for ETPs are consistent across relevant webpages and documentation.

Standard 5 **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-12:** The JCCP should review and consider how it can consolidate published information relating to its complaints process.

Standard 6 **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-13:** The JCCP should include in its complaints material, possible outcomes available in response to complaints or concerns raised in relation to the JCCP.

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-14: The JCCP should formally document its process for setting annual budgets and reserves.

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-15: The JCCP should review its Terms of Reference and other relevant documents to ensure that the expectations set out are aligned with its Articles of Association filed with the Charity Commission and Companies House.

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-16: The JCCP should take steps to assure itself that the Charity Commission is satisfied with the current tenures in place.

Standard 8 **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-17:** The JCCP should conduct regular checks of its website(s) and resolve broken links, duplication and inconsistent information.

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-18: The JCCP should document its approach to understanding and using the experiences of service users and stakeholders.

Standard 9 **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-19:** The JCCP should continue to consider how it can use its registrant demographic data to identify and address potential barriers and unfairness.

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-20: The JCCP should develop a proactive and planned approach to understanding the demographics of service users, identifying barriers and putting in place support and guidance where appropriate.

3. About the Register

This section provides an overview of the JCCP and its register.

Name of Organisation	Joint Council for Cosmetic Practitioners
Website	https://www.jccp.org.uk/
Type of Organisation	The JCCP is a Private Limited Company by guarantee without share capital use of 'Limited' exemption' (Companies House no. 10287079 and a Registered Charity no.1177540)
Role(s) covered	The JCCP registers non-surgical cosmetic practitioners, for the following five modalities: Botulinum Toxins (BT), Dermal Fillers (DFs), Chemical Peels and Skin Rejuvenation (CPSR), Laser, Intense Pulsed Light and Light Emitting Diode. (LIPLD). The JCCP also registers General Medical Council (GMC) registered surgeons for Hair Restoration Surgery (HRS). The JCCP Practitioner Register is divided into two parts: Part A: Practitioners who are registered with Professional Regulated Statutory Bodies (PSRBs) that can provide oversight and work independently – Doctors, Dentists, Nurses, Specific Allied Health Professionals and Pharmacists (some of whom will also be prescribers). Part B: Practitioners who are not in current membership with, or are not eligible to join a Professional Statutory Regulatory Body/Council and who require clinical oversight for specific procedural interventions – Beauticians, Aesthetic Practitioners and persons who are able to be registered with a PRSB but have elected not to do so.
Number of registrants	1047 (5 February 2026)
Overview of Governance	The JCCP is governed by its Management Board comprised of: Executive Chair, the Chair of the Practitioner Register Committee, the Chair of Education and Training Committee, the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee, a nominee by the Cosmetic Practice Standards Authority, 6 independent Trustees and a Stakeholder Trustee. The above committees are detailed here.
Overview of the aims of the register	The JCCP's objectives are to promote the health and safety of, and protection of the public by the development and promotion of high standards of practice among non-surgical cosmetic practitioners and hair restoration surgeons.

Inherent risks of the practice

This section uses the criteria developed as part of the Authority's *Right Touch Assurance tool*⁴ to give an overview of the work non-surgical cosmetic practitioners.

Risk Criteria	
1. Scale of risk associated with non-surgical cosmetic practitioners.	JCCP registrants are regulated health care professionals who practice non-surgical cosmetic procedures, and non-regulated aesthetic practitioners who provide similar non-surgical treatments. Treatments fall under the following five 'modalities': - Botulinum toxin injections - Dermal Fillers - Chemical peels and skin rejuvenation - Lasers, Intense Pulsed Light (IPL) and Light Emitting Diode (LED) treatments - Hair restoration surgery
<i>a. What do non-surgical cosmetic practitioners do?</i>	
<i>b. How many non-surgical cosmetic practitioners are there?</i>	As of 5 February 2026, the JCCP had 1047 registered practitioners. The register itself is split into two parts. Part A is for regulated healthcare professionals and Part B is for non-regulated practitioners, many of whom are from a beauty background.
<i>c. Where do non-surgical cosmetic practitioners work?</i>	The types of treatment within each modality are separated into the level of qualification required to include them on the JCCP register, based on their level of risk.
<i>d. Size of actual/potential service user group</i>	JCCP registrants mainly operate in private clinics. Treatments are mostly elective and provided to service users on a private basis. Cosmetic procedures are generally not available in the NHS, except to treat conditions such as HIV-related lipoatrophy ⁵ .
2. Means of assurance	The JCCP operates a public register at https://www.jccp.org.uk/MemberSearch which displays practitioners' status as a registered statutory healthcare practitioner or registered aesthetic practitioner. Qualifications, regulatory information and fitness to practice information are also displayed. JCCP registrants are subject to its Code of Practice and Fitness to Practice rules. Registrants are required to meet the JCCP's requirements for CPD, premises standards, and minimum treatment numbers. Registrants are also required to provide yearly anonymised data regarding adverse incidents for statistical

⁴ https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/policy-advice/right-touch-assurance---a-methodology-for-assessing-and-assuring-occupational-risk-of-harm91c118f761926971a151ff000072e7a6.pdf?sfvrsn=f537120_14.

⁵ <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg439>

analysis and must comply with other appropriate reporting systems. Registrants agree to ‘provide to customers only those products that have been ethically and responsibly sourced from appropriate suppliers, including medicines and medical devices from UK approved distributors or their nominated registered pharmacies.’

3. About the sector in which non-surgical cosmetic practitioners operate	Practitioners offering non-surgical cosmetic treatments practice in commercial clinics, CQC-regulated environments, and may also practice in home settings. They are also known to practice at conferences or other venues where demonstrations may be provided. JCCP registrants’ working environments must comply with JCCP’s premises standards, and those of the systems regulators where appropriate.
4. Risk perception <i>Need for public confidence in non-surgical cosmetic practitioners?</i> <i>Need for assurance for employers or other stakeholders?</i>	All non-surgical cosmetic interventions performed by JCCP registrants involve some risk of harm. The Review of the Regulation of Cosmetic Interventions⁶ highlighted that risks of physical harm exists in both ‘lower’ and ‘higher’ risk treatments: All laser and IPL treatments, for example, have the potential to cause scarring; skin melanocytes (cells that produce melanin) may be harmful and cause permanent hyper or depigmentation (unnaturally dark or light skin, loss of ability to tan). Exposure to laser irradiation may result in damage to the eye and vision, and there is a risk that clothing, hair or oxygen tubes may be ignited by high intensity laser beams. There are also psychological risks associated with non-surgical cosmetic treatments, and further risks including financial exploitation of people seeking to improve their appearance, and the use of unapproved or unregulated products that have not been appropriately sourced or prescribed. The JCCP aims to address such risks through its UK-wide register that has defined scopes of practice, standards of conduct, and which manages concerns about registrants with nationally published outcomes. Proposals to introduce a new system of regulation and licensing for non-surgical cosmetic procedures in Scotland and England are currently in different stages of development and implementation. This is likely to introduce new requirements for JCCP’s practitioners. The JCCP has been actively involved in discussions about these proposals.

6

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/192028/Review_of_the_Regulation_of_Cosmetic_Interventions.pdf

4. Assessment against the Standards

Standard One: Eligibility and ‘public interest test’

Summary

The Accreditation Panel found that Standard One is met.

Accreditation Panel findings

Standard 1a: Eligibility

- 1.1 At the time of this assessment we were not aware of any changes or new risks that would impact this requirement. We do however note the work being undertaken by UK Governments to introduce regulation and licensing in relation to the non-surgical cosmetic sector. We are aware that the JCCP are working closely with relevant government departments, such as DHSC, and intend to update its approaches and processes to align with any new nation-wide requirements. We will review whether such requirements, once made available, impact our assessment of Standard One.
- 1.2 We therefore found that the JCCP falls within the scope of the Accredited Registers programme and meets the requirements of Standard 1a.

Standard 1b: Public interest test

The Accreditation Panel found that this part of the Standard is met.

i. Evidence that the activities carried out by registrants are likely to be beneficial.

- 1.3 We previously found that non-surgical treatments carried out by registrants can provide benefits when performed correctly and safely. Such benefits can come in the form of physical and perceived improvements, leading to positive effects on an individual’s mental health and wellbeing.
- 1.4 We are not aware of any changes, benefits or risks that would alter our previous assessment of Standard 1b.

ii. Evidence that any harms or risks likely to arise from the activities are justifiable and appropriately mitigated by the register’s requirements for registration.

- 1.5 We previously found that both ‘higher’ and ‘lower’ risk treatments carried risk of physical harm, as well as psychological and exploitation risks of those seeking to improve their appearance. We noted that perceived benefits of cosmetic treatments were likely to be high for those with realistic expectations of their treatment, and that risks appeared to be appropriately mitigated by requirements to adhere to the JCCP’s Code of Practice and supporting guidance.
- 1.6 The Women and Equalities Committee undertook an inquiry to consider the safety of surgical procedures, including non-surgical cosmetic procedures such as fillers and liquid Brazilian butt lifts. A report⁷ was published in February 2026 where it sets out the

⁷ [Health impacts of breast implants and other cosmetic procedures - Committees - UK Parliament](#)

risks within the non-surgical cosmetic sector, particularly pertaining to the harms caused and absence of legislative framework or consistent standards for qualifications and training.

- 1.7 The PSAs own response⁸ to the Committee's inquiry highlights our concerns regarding members of the public being at risk of harm from underqualified or inexperienced practitioners and that the Accredited Registers Programme provides assurance for members of the public when seeking a practitioner to provide non-surgical procedures.

iii. Evidence of commitment to providing accurate information about treatments and services.

- 1.8 The JCCP covers non-statutory roles within the non-surgery cosmetics sector, where registration of practitioners meet a legitimate public interest. The Panel found that the JCCP is clear on the risks associated with the procedures carried out by its registrants, and also within the wider non-cosmetics sector.
- 1.9 The JCCP takes a number of steps to mitigate against these risks materialising, including publishing detailed guidance and resources, and requiring registrants to abide by the JCCP Code of Practice and advertising standards. The latter of which highlights that it is illegal to advertise prescription only medicines (POMs) like botulinum toxins (Botox) to members of the public.
- 1.10 Whilst the Panel recognised the JCCP's efforts of making clear the standards for which registrants must adhere to, our checks identified a number of cases where registrants were unlawfully advertising Botox. We were also made aware of instances where the websites of Part B registrants indicated that they offer injectable treatments, including Botox and other POMs, but that there was no clear indication as to whether a separate prescriber was part of the consultation process – as required by law. The Panel issued the following Condition to be addressed within 3 months:

C-JCCP-FR-25/26-1: The JCCP must undertake a review of registrant websites and take appropriate action to address breaches of law and standards, particularly in relation to advertising Prescription Only Medicine and prescriber requirements.

- 1.11 We also assess that the JCCP needs to have in place a more robust process to be able to identify and address concerns in relation to registrant websites and advertising practices. The Panel therefore issued the following Condition to be addressed within 9 months:

C-JCCP-FR-25/26-2: The JCCP must develop a sustainable approach to managing accessibility of registrant website links and misleading or inappropriate advertising practices.

Standard 2: Management of the register

Summary

Standard Two looks at how well a register is maintained and managed for public use. This includes checking that the registration process is fair and accessible, that the published

⁸ committees.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/143030/html/

register contains accurate and complete information about who is registered, that any restrictions on practice are clearly shown, and that there are proper processes for keeping the register up to date.

The Accreditation Panel found that Standard Two was met. It issued the following Conditions and Recommendations:

Conditions:

- **C-JCCP-FR-25/26-3:** The JCCP must consider how it can make clearer, the differentiation between non cosmetic qualifications and cosmetic procedural levels, including how this information is displayed on its register.
- **C-JCCP-FR-25/26-4:** The JCCP must review the circumstances pertaining to a delay in information being shared by a PSRB and consider if further measures are needed to mitigate re-occurrence.

Recommendations:

- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-1:** The JCCP should more clearly set out its two routes for application by publishing information on its arrangements with the BAAPS & BCAM on its website and other relevant supporting documentation.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-2:** The JCCP should review published Approved Routes documentation to ensure it is consistent.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-3:** The JCCP should consider making its 'Regulated Professions' webpage more accessible, for example by linking it to the 'Join Now' webpage.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-4:** The JCCP should review its Memorandum of Understanding with the BAAPS and assure itself that information is complete and up to date.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-5:** The JCCP should take steps to ensure conflicts of interests are appropriately managed in relation to its registration appeals process.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-6:** The JCCP should ensure any restrictions to practices made by other ARs or PSRBs are annotated in line with its own policy and explore the possibility of embedding a link that navigates to relevant practitioner information on the AR / PSRB register.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-7:** The JCCP should review its Practitioner Register Annual Sampling Procedure document to more accurately reflect the 2026 Standards for accredited registers.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-8:** The JCCP should review its documents relating to CPPD requirements to ensure consistency of expectations and requirements.

Accreditation Panel findings

- 2.1 The JCCP operates a public register for practitioners providing non-surgical cosmetic treatments and hair restoration surgery (Injections, Fillers, Lasers, Peels and Hair Restoration Surgery). Registration is open to regulated healthcare professionals and to unregulated aesthetic practitioners. As set out above, the JCCP register is divided into two parts – Part A and Part B.
- 2.2 The JCCP also has three categories of registration:

Full Registration – Category One: achieved where registrants demonstrate they have met all of the conditions set out by the JCCP and CSPA at the point of registration.

Full Registration – Category Two: achieved where registrants can demonstrate registration with a relevant PSRB, they have been practicing in the procedural area of practice for three years and the self-declaration of meeting of JCCP's competencies. This category only applies to Part A of the register. Practitioners registered under Category Two would usually be expected to demonstrate that they have undertaken an approved education and training qualification within two years. However, we previously agreed that this would be extended until such a time that policy and guidance on licensing of the non-surgical cosmetic sector is available.

Provisional registration: applied to registrants who have provided sufficient self-declared information but are yet to acquire the experience and / or evidence of qualifications require to be on the Register unconditionally. Similarly to Category Two, the JCCP would typically expect provisional registrants to meet the criteria of Full Registration within two years. We again agreed that some registrants can remain listed as Provisionally Registered beyond this point, until further details are available on non-surgical cosmetic licensing proposals.

- 2.3 The JCCP has two defined routes for application: 1) an online application via the JCCP website and, 2) a direct application for BAAPS and BCAM members. The Panel found that for route 1, there was a clear, detailed and accessible application process in place with defined eligibility criteria. However, the Panel found that whilst the criteria for route 2 were clear and working arrangements with relevant organisations were in place, there was limited publicly available information on this route making it less accessible. The Panel issued the following recommendation:

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-1: The JCCP should more clearly set out its two routes for application by publishing information on its arrangements with the BAAPS & BCAM on its website and within other relevant supporting documentation.

- 2.4 When reviewing evidence in relation to the JCCP's registration process, the Panel also found that some information and documentation were inconsistent and / or inaccessible. As such, the Panel also issued the following recommendations for the JCCP to consider:

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-2: The JCCP should review its published Approved Routes documents to ensure it is consistent.

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-3: The JCCP should consider making its 'Regulated Professions' webpage more accessible, for example, by linking it to the 'Join Now' webpage.

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-4: The JCCP should review its Memorandum of Understanding with the BAAPS and assure itself that information is complete and up to date

- 6.1 The Panel found that the JCCP has in place appropriate approaches to assessing and managing applications to join its register. This included consideration of practitioners' qualifications, requiring PSRB unique reference numbers (applicable to Part A) and the completion of a self-declaration statement. It also has in place a clear appeals process should an applicant be dissatisfied with the outcome of their application. Although the Panel found that the registration appeal process had the potential for a

conflict of interest to appear because the same post holder making initial decisions also considered appeals. The Panel therefore issued the following recommendation:

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-5: The JCCP should take steps to ensure conflicts of interests are appropriately managed in relation to its registration appeals process.

2.5 The JCCP's public register displays information relevant to the practitioner to support the public in making informed decisions. This includes (but not limited to) practitioner name, location, qualification, register Part (A or B) and category of registration. The Panel welcomed the JCCP's intention of wanting to provide a range of information on its register. However, the Panel also found that the way in which the register is currently set out can result in confusion for the public. This was specifically in relation to how the JCCP communicates the level of qualification a registrant holds and how this relates to the cosmetic level of procedure they are registered to perform.

2.6 The Panel recognised that there are some limitations linked to the anticipation of legislative changes to the non-surgical cosmetic sector. But the Panel also considered that it was important for information to be as clear as possible as we await these decisions. The Panel therefore issued the following Condition to be addressed within 6 months.

C-JCCP-FR-25/26-3: The JCCP must consider how it can make clearer, the differentiation between non cosmetic qualifications and cosmetic procedural levels, including how this information is displayed on its register.

2.7 The JCCP has in place mechanisms to ensure it captures the outcomes of professional conduct matters made by regulatory bodies and other accredited registers. This includes being a signatory of the Accredited Registers Information Sharing Protocol and working collaboratively with specified PSRBs supported by published Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs). For Part A registrants, the JCCP also conducts checks against selected registrants' unique reference numbers and PSRB registration status, as part of its sampling / auditing process.

2.8 As part of our website checks, we identified a concern in relation to a registrant being suspended from practicing by a statutory body, but this information had not reached the JCCP and therefore its register was not updated to reflect this decision. Once aware, the JCCP took quick action to address this by striking the practitioner off the register. However, the Panel found that this potential for delay in information sharing could have a big impact on public safety and believed it appropriate that the JCCP review this incident to consider if additional measures need to be put in place. The following Condition was issued to be addressed within 3 months:

C-JCCP-FR-25/26-4: The JCCP must review the circumstances pertaining to a delay in information being shared by a PSRB and consider if further measures are needed to mitigate re-occurrence.

2.9 Where the JCCP is aware of restrictions to practice, the Panel saw evidence that it takes appropriate steps to record this against the registrant's public facing record. To go further, the Panel believed the JCCP should ensure annotated wording on restrictions to practice reflected that which is set out in its FtP Publication guidelines. The Panel also determined it would be beneficial for the JCCP to explore further opportunities to make it easier for members of the public to find information on fitness

to practice decisions, made by regulatory bodies or other accredited registers. The Panel issued the following recommendation:

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-6: The JCCP should ensure any restrictions to practices made by other ARs or PSRBs are annotated in line with its own policy and explore the possibility of embedding a link that navigates to relevant practitioner information on the AR / PSRB register.

- 2.10 The Panel noted that the JCCP ensures continued practice competence via Continuing Personal and Professional Development (CPPD) requirements, details of which are made available on its website. The JCCP assures itself of compliance of these requirements via an annual auditing process. The Panel again noted inaccuracies and inconsistencies within some of the documentation on CPPD and the Auditing process, for which it issued the following recommendations:

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-7: The JCCP should review its Practitioner Register Annual Sampling Procedure document to more accurately reflect the 2026 Standards for accredited registers.

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-8: The JCCP should review its documents relating to CPPD to ensure consistency of expectations and requirements.

Standard 3: Standards for registrants

Summary

Standard Three examines the professional standards that people on the register must meet. This covers the competency requirements, ethical guidelines, and business practice standards that registrants must follow, including how they should behave professionally, handle confidential information, and conduct their practice safely and appropriately.

The Accreditation Panel found that Standard Three was met. It issued the following Recommendation:

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-9: The JCCP should review its guidance and information to make it more accessible for its different audiences, including members of the public.

Accreditation Panel findings

- 3.1 The JCCP's published Code of Practice sets out the requirements in relation to registrant's scope of practice, including expectations for safe, ethical and person-centred practice. It also details the need for registrants to be aware of and recognise their own limitations and highlights that registrants are responsible for assessing a person's capacity to consent and must refer cases to other professionals if necessary. All registrants must agree to abide by this Code and the JCCP Terms and Conditions of Registration, via the completion of a self-declaration statement at the point of initial registration and renewal.
- 3.2 The Code of practice is also supported by the CPSA's published Overarching Principles, which sets out a clear ethical framework. The Panel noted that these ethical expectations are helpfully weaved throughout multiple documentation and guidance published by the JCCP such as its Unconscious Bias Procedure (2026), Safeguarding Guidelines (2025) and Social Media Policy (2021).

- 3.3 The JCCP has in place guidance and advice relating to the products used for both registered and adjunctive procedures, recognising the high use of products and equipment in the cosmetic sector. The JCCP also has in place a Premises Audit Toolkit, supporting practitioners to assess their environment against a standard and to take remedial action when gaps are identified. Further information is included in; the CPSA's Overarching Principles which sets out the clinical and practice requirements for non-surgical cosmetic procedures and hair restoration surgery; CPSA Toxins Standards which sets out associated risks, premises requirements and education and training expectations; and, a webpage on 'Fat Dissolving' Injections which explicitly prohibits JCCP Registrants from using, or promoting the use of, specific products for cosmetic purposes.
- 3.4 The Panel found that the JCCP provides a comprehensive level of detail pertaining to the Standards for which its registrants must adhere to. This is supported by published guidance, toolkits and information on best practice. The JCCP demonstrated a continued commitment to supporting registrants that are operating within a complex landscape, which the Panel recognised and appreciated. However, it considered that at times, the volume of information and documentation made available by the JCCP could lead to confusion and /or inconsistencies. The Panel therefore issued the following recommendation:
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-9:** The JCCP should review its guidance and information to make it more accessible for its different audiences, including members of the public.
- 3.5 To further support the JCCP in addressing this concern, the Panel identified specific areas to be considered as part of this recommendation:
- Whether it might be helpful for the JCCP to gather feedback from its registrants to understand if the volume of information / documentation results in a barrier to understanding expectations of them.
 - Reviewing and potentially combining the two Safeguarding Guideline documents listed on its website and ensure that all signposts to the Guidelines are correct and consistent.
 - Consider how it may categorise or set out its advice and guidance in a way that makes it easier for Registrants (and in some cases the public) to identify what is relevant to them and their practice(s).

Standard 4: Education and training

Standard Four assesses whether the register sets appropriate education and training requirements for people who want to join it. This includes checking that training programmes adequately prepare registrants to work safely and competently, and that registrants know when they should refer people to other health or social care professionals.

The Accreditation Panel found that Standard Four is met. It issued the following Recommendations:

- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-10:** The JCCP should ensure its JCCP Education and Training Provider Registration Process infographic document is more readily accessible on its website.

- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-11:** The JCCP should ensure details pertaining to the frequency of annual reviews and re-approval processes for ETPs are consistent across relevant webpages and documentation.

Accreditation Panel findings

- 4.1 For practitioners on Part A of the JCCP register, the JCCP assures general medical competence by requiring registrants to be registered with an appropriate PSRB. To ensure competence of delivering non-surgical cosmetic procedures, for both Part A and Part B registrants, the JCCP also sets out core and modality specific competencies within its published Education and Training Competency Framework.
- 4.2 Our Standards require that registrants should be equipped through their training to care for diverse populations, which the JCCP assures through these requirements of statutory regulation and adherence to the Competency Framework.
- 4.3 In addition to the Register for practitioners, the JCCP also holds a non-accredited Register for approved Education and Training providers (ETPs). It has in place a dedicated Committee to assess and quality assure approved ETPs against its Education and Training Standards. Given the nature of the practices of those on the register, the JCCP also ensures suitability of ETP premises as part of this process. To further support the JCCP in providing clear and accessible information regarding the ETP Registration process, the Panel issued the following recommendation:
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-10:** The JCCP should ensure its JCCP Education and Training Provider Registration Process infographic document is more readily accessible on its website.
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-11:** The JCCP should ensure details pertaining to the frequency of annual reviews and re-approval processes for ETPs are consistent across relevant webpages and documentation.
- 4.4 The Panel found that the JCCP sets out extensive information on its website and supporting documentation to support the public in identifying the types and level of qualifications required for registration, including treatment specific training and CPPD requirements. As with other Standards, the Panel found that the information reviewed demonstrated the complexity of the non-surgical cosmetic sector and recognised the role the JCCP plays in attempting to standardise, and make safe, practices within the sector.
- 4.5 The Panel noted the work being undertaken by the English and Scottish Governments in relation to implementing a new system of regulation and licensing for the non-surgical cosmetic sector, which is likely to have an impact on JCCP's current education and training requirements.

Standard 5: Complaints and concerns about registrations

The Accreditation Panel found that Standard Five was met. It issued the following Condition and Recommendation:

Condition:

- **C-JCCP-FR-25/26-5:** The JCCP must make clear in its complaints process that appeals will be considered by individuals not previously involved in the matter.

Recommendation:

- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-12:** The JCCP should review and consider how it can consolidate published information relating to its complaints process.

Accreditation Panel findings

- 5.1 Concerns and complaints can be submitted to the JCCP via an online complaint form or email. The processing of complaints includes multiple stages depending on the nature and seriousness of the complaint. Upon receipt, all complaints are sent to the Registrar to confirm practitioner registration with the JCCP and to acknowledge receipt. The complaint will be reviewed separately by the Registrar and Fitness to Practice (FtP) Committee and Practitioner Register Committee (PRC) Chairs, before discussing. The Registrar may seek the opinion of a relevant PSRB if the complaint has also been referred to them.
- 5.2 Where a complaint meets the threshold for a Fitness to Practice investigation, the Registrar hands responsibility over to the FtP Chair who initiates the Fitness to Practice process, which includes the allocation of case examiners. Where it is agreed that the complaint does not meet the threshold, the Registrar will close the complaint and inform the complainant of the reasons why. If there is no consensus, the FtP Committee takes precedence.
- 5.3 If a complaint does not meet the threshold for an FtP investigation, but identifies a need for practice improvement, the PRC Chair will take on responsibility and agree, with the Registrar, any improvement actions needed. The JCCP also require registrants to have their own complaints procedures, or to link to third party redress schemes, but will not turn away concerns that are yet to be considered under these.
- 5.4 At the time of our assessment, information on the JCCP's complaints process was published on its 'Raise a Concern'⁹ webpage as well as a separate website - jccpandme.org.uk – which was created to provide tailored information to the general public. The Panel recognised the JCCP's attempt to make its complaints process accessible to the public and welcomed the language adopted within its published information, which demonstrated a good understanding of how raising a concern or complaint can be difficult. However, the Panel also identified that the way in which this information was made available could lead to confusion or key elements of the policy being missed / misunderstood. This was mainly due to information relating to the JCCP's complaints process being spread across two different websites, multiple webpages and at least 6 different documents. The Panel therefore issued the following recommendation:

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-12: The JCCP should review and consider how it can consolidate published information relating to its complaints process.
- 5.5 The JCCP have since suspended the JCCP&me website which we assess will help to address this concern. The JCCP informed us that they have started to take action to consolidate the information they publish but expect this will take some time.
- 5.6 Our assessment also found that whilst the JCCP had in place processes for publishing outcomes from disciplinary proceedings and thresholds for escalation of concerns,

⁹ <https://www.jccp.org.uk/ThePublic/raising-a-concern>

this information was not clearly set out in published documentation. The JCCP has since updated its Complaints Policy to address this concern, including by providing examples of concerns that would typically meet the threshold for investigation, such as criminal prosecution, safeguarding concerns and bullying and harassment.

- 5.7 The Panel did find that the Complaints Policy clearly detailed the appeals process should someone be dissatisfied with the outcome of a complaint. In doing so it highlights; the process can be initiated by email; how the process will be carried out including carrying out a paper-based review of the complaint, obtaining additional information where necessary, and reaching a decision within 10 working days; and, likely actions resulting from the appeal such as informing the complainant of the outcome and how to request a formal review of the appeal, where necessary.
- 5.8 We did, however, note the policy sets out that it is the responsibility of the JCCP Registrar to carry out the appeals process. Given that some aspects of the initial complaint may also involve the Registrar, it is important that where this is the case, an independent person is responsible for conducting the appeal. The following recommendation was issued by the Panel:

C-JCCP-FR-25/26-5: The JCCP must make clear in its complaints process that appeals will be considered by individuals not previously involved in the matter.

- 5.9 We assessed that JCCP's documentation on its complaints process provided a comprehensive breakdown of the kind of support available to Witnesses and Complainants, including telephone support, face to face support, an independent supporter to accompany them on the day, signposting to other organisations where appropriate, and consideration of any reasonable adjustments.
- 5.10 Our standards require Accredited Registers to have in place processes to notify other relevant bodies of disciplinary outcomes, where appropriate. During our assessment we found that the JCCP had in place Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) with the relevant statutory regulators for the healthcare professionals it registers (e.g. GMC and NMC). These MoUs set out that the JCCP will share any relevant information and uphold FtP concerns, if relevant to the registrants practice as a JCCP member. The JCCP is also a part of the Accredited Registers Information Sharing Protocol which supports the sharing of disciplinary outcomes with other Accredited Registers. The JCCP publishes decisions about sanctions on its website.
- 5.11 The JCCP's Practitioner Register Committee reviews all complaints to ensure fairness and consistency in application of thresholds and actions taken. The Committee may request that a review is undertaken should it identify inconsistencies. The Committee conducts an annual review of complaints to further gauge consistency, fairness and transparency. The findings are reported to the JCCP's Oversight Committee and any subsequent recommendations are reported to the Board of trustees.

Standard 6: Governance

Standard Six looks at how the register is governed and managed as an organisation. This includes examining the leadership structures, financial management, transparency measures, and decision-making processes to ensure they support the register's public protection role and promote accountability and integrity.

The Accreditation Panel found that Standard Six was met. It issued the following Recommendations:

- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-13:** The JCCP should include in its complaints material, possible outcomes available in response to complaints or concerns raised in relation to the JCCP.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-14:** The JCCP should formally document its process for setting annual budgets and reserves.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-15:** The JCCP should review its Terms of Reference and other relevant documents to ensure that the expectations set out are aligned with its Articles of Association filed with the Charity Commission and Companies House.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-16:** The JCCP should take steps to assure itself that the Charity Commission is satisfied with the current tenures in place.

Accreditation Panel findings

- 6.2 The JCCP is a registered Charity and Private Limited Company, run by its Board of Trustees under its Executive Chair, and includes lay membership. The Board is supported by committees and groups responsible for key distinct functions:
- The Trustee Board provides strategic oversight but does not intervene in the operational registration decisions.
 - The Practitioner Register Committee is responsible for overseeing registration standards and fitness to practice processes.
 - The Education and Training Committee manages course and provider requirements and approval.
 - The Clinical Advisory Group provides advice to the JCCP Trustee Board on clinical governance and clinically related matters, with public protection and patient safety in mind.
 - The Marketing and Communications Committee advises the JCCP Trustee Board on the implementation of its marketing and communications strategy, and other related issues.
- 6.3 The JCCP is also supported by its Stakeholder Council which provides advice from across the industry including service users, the statutory regulators and industry representatives. These Committees and Groups are defined and supported by, for example, JCCP's Articles of Association, corporate risk registers and published terms of reference.
- 6.4 The JCCP's governance arrangements include diverse perspectives and expertise. The JCCP has two Lay Patient Representative Roles and its Board currently has an equal number of lay and professional Trustees (five each), which is consistent with the commitment set out in the published Terms of Reference for the Board. Such commitments are also set out for its Practitioner Register Committee where it states it 'must include a majority of 'lay members''.
- 6.5 The Panel found that the JCCP demonstrates a commitment to maintaining openness and transparency through publishing information relating to key governance structures and decisions. This includes publication of Board meeting minutes, JCCP's Constitution, external partnership agreements (e.g. MoUs) and a wide range of policy and process documents.

-
- 6.6 The JCCP has in place a conflict-of-interest policy which applies to all Trustees, Officers, Committee members and contractors. It sets out how they will protect the integrity of the Organisation's decision-making process. It notes the need to avoid actual conflicts as well as the perception of conflicts. The Panel saw evidence that demonstrated conflict declarations were a standing item at Trustee Board meetings, the minutes of which are published on the JCCP website. Declarations are also recorded in a published central register, which again, has been published on the JCCP website.
- 6.7 We assessed that there is a clear route for anyone to raise a concern or complaint about the JCCP in place. Such complaints are managed in line with its published Complaints Procedure. We however note that information pertaining to potential outcomes, specifically in relation to complaints / concerns raised about the JCCP, was not included in the documentation reviewed. The Panel issued the following Recommendation:
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-13:** The JCCP should include in its complaints material, possible outcomes available in response to complaints or concerns raised in relation to the JCCP.
- 6.8 A responsible officer at the JCCP manages the day-to-day financing and budgeting, including reporting at the bimonthly Trustee Board meeting. The JCCP's annual budget is reviewed and approved by its Trustee Board at the Annual General Meeting. Public notice is given two weeks in advance via the JCCP website and minutes are published post meeting. The JCCP maintains reserves to ensure orderly operations. We found that there were adequate practices in place to support financial management at the JCCP, but also found that these arrangements were not formally documented, and so the following recommendation has been issued:
- R-JCCP-FR-25/26-14:** The JCCP should formally document its process for setting annual budgets and reserves.
- 6.9 The JCCP has appropriate protections in place to manage risks of operation, including liability insurances and maintaining current data protection arrangements. Its Data Protection Policy and Privacy Notice sets out how data is stored and processed, retention schedules, details of the JCCP Data Protection Officer, and how it complies with relevant data protection laws and requirements.
- 6.10 The Panel recognised the approach taken by the JCCP to ensure a fair recruitment and training process, including supporting relevant EDI training. However, the Panel identified a gap in such approaches being formally set out which risked there being inconsistencies in the process of making appointments, particularly when considering the need to achieve diversity. The JCCP has since developed a Recruitment, Training and Monitoring document which sets out how recruitment will be undertaken, including the need for a person specification and involvement of the JCCP EDI representative. The Panel welcomed the swift action taken by the JCCP to address the concerns raised.
- 6.11 The JCCP's published Business Continuity Plan is supported by internal Business Continuity Strategies and relevant third-party business continuity arrangements. We assessed that together, these policies provide a good level of detail regarding what the JCCP will do should a disruption prevent normal operations, including key governance
-

roles and responsibilities, how stakeholders will be communicated with and how the Register will be maintained during an incident or disruption.

- 6.12 We received multiple Share Your Experience submissions which raised concerns regarding JCCP's Governance, Transparency and perceived conflict of interest. Our assessment of the submissions did not identify significant concerns with the JCCP's Governance processes in relation to our Standards. It did highlight a small inconsistency within its published Articles of Association and Terms of Reference documents. As well as a potential need for the JCCP to take steps to assure itself that it is operating in line with the requirements of other organisations. The following recommendations were issued::

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-15: The JCCP should review its Terms of Reference and other relevant documents to ensure that the expectations set out are aligned with its Articles of Association filed with the Charity Commission and Companies House.

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-16: The JCCP should take steps to assure itself that the Charity Commission is satisfied with the current tenures in place.

- 6.13 Full details of these concerns and our assessment can be found under the Share Your Experience section of this report.

Standard 7: Management of the risks arising from the activities of registrants

Standard Seven assesses how well the register understands and manages risks that could arise from the activities of people on its register. This includes checking that potential risks to service users and the public are identified, monitored, and properly addressed through appropriate safeguards and controls.

The Accreditation Panel found that Standard Seven was met.

Accreditation Panel findings

- 7.1 The JCCP maintains two Risk Registers relating to patient safety and corporate risks. These are reviewed bi-annually at JCCP Board of Trustee meetings, minutes of which are published on the JCCP website. Our assessment found that the Risk Registers adequately identify risks associated with activities of registrants, including failure to meet standards, safeguarding issues and breach of practitioner / client boundaries. They also set out detailed mitigations, indicate trends and clearly assign ownership of risk.
- 7.2 The JCCP website provides clear and accessible information about the purpose and scope of registrant roles, the benefits and side effects of procedures and the standards for which registrants are expected to meet.
- 7.3 To further support the public in understanding each procedure and the risks involved, the JCCP publishes information sheets for each of the Modalities it registers. These cover:
- What the procedure is
 - What to expect at consultation
 - Effects / Benefits
 - Side-effects
 - Restrictions (e.g. advertising or prescribing requirements)

-
- 7.4 The JCCP also have in place dedicated guidance on Advertising, Adjunctive Procedures, prescribing and Supervision requirements. All of which set out information on what Registrants are required to adhere to and why.
- 7.5 Recognising particularly dangerous risks within the non-surgical cosmetic sector, the JCCP also provides dedicated guidance on Buttock Augmentation (BBLs) which explicitly restricts this practice to specified qualified practitioners on the JCCP register, as well as precluding the use of off-label dermal fillers for this procedure. The Panel welcomed the JCCP's guidance on Body Dysmorphia and Safeguarding, which aim to address the known challenges associated with psychological and emotional harm caused by the delivery of some treatments on vulnerable adults.
- 7.6 The Panel found that the JCCP demonstrates a strong understanding of the risks associated with the activities of its registrants and has in place clear processes to manage these risks. We assessed that the way in which information is set out across the JCCP's website reflects the clear commitment it has to public protection.

Standard 8: Communications and engagement

Standard Eight examines how the register communicates with the public and engages with relevant stakeholders. This includes checking that the register's website and other materials provide clear and accessible information, and that the register works collaboratively with other organisations to strengthen public protection.

The Accreditation Panel found that Standard Eight was met. It issued the following Recommendations:

- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-17:** The JCCP should conduct regular checks of its website(s) and resolve broken links, duplication and inconsistent information.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-18:** The JCCP should document its approach to understanding and using the experiences of service users and stakeholders.

Accreditation Panel findings

- 8.1 At the time of our assessment, the JCCP had two websites:
- **www.jccp.org.uk** – aimed at practitioners, stakeholders and registrants. Containing information on registration policies, professional standards and the wider work JCCP undertakes in the non-surgical cosmetic sector.
 - **www.jccpandme.org.uk** – aimed at the general public. Providing information on cosmetic procedures and how the JCCP register works.
- 8.2 The Panel recognised the rationale behind separating out information for those within the sector and members of the public, particularly given the complexity associated with the practices and procedures covered by the JCCP and its registrants. However the Panel also considered that there was a risk of the public becoming confused regarding where best to find information relevant to them. This concern was also highlighted under our assessment of Standard Five, where we found information pertaining to the complaints processes was confusing and inconsistent at times due to the use of both websites. The JCCP have since suspended the JCCPandme website to address this concern.

-
- 8.3 The remaining site uses a simple layout, clear headings and avoids distracting features such as popups. Some animations are used but this is limited to the 'Home' page and acts as a tool to help present navigation options. Our assessment did identify small navigation / link errors throughout the website and the Panel believed it necessary to issue a recommendation for the JCCP to consider:

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-17: The JCCP should conduct regular checks of its website(s) and resolve broken links, duplication and inconsistent information.

- 8.4 The Panel found that the JCCP undertakes extensive communication and engagement to support its work in the non-surgical cosmetic industry. This includes collaborating with other Accredited Registers (ARs) and relevant stakeholders. It is a signatory of the AR Information Sharing Protocol, enabling mutual recognition of decisions and cross-notification of disciplinary outcomes. As well as a member of the AR Collaborative Group. The JCCP also has clear and established collaborative relationships with other relevant stakeholders, such as PSRBs, details of which are available on its website, including published partnership agreements and Memoranda of Understanding.

- 8.5 The JCCP uses multiple channels to engage with service users and stakeholders, including the use of Patient Trustees, council meetings, listening events and webinars. The Panel recognised that the JCCP partakes in a lot of stakeholder collaboration and communication, which demonstrates a willingness to listening to the experiences of services users and its registrants. However, it was noted that there was not an overarching approach or policy in place to support this work, which we believe would be beneficial for the JCCP to be able to take a more proactive and consistent approach to its stakeholder engagement work. The following recommendation was therefore issued:

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-18: The JCCP should document its approach to understanding and using the experiences of service users and stakeholders.

- 8.6 The JCCP provides clear information about its accredited status on its website and makes clear distinctions between elements of its work that fall outside of the AR programme. The AR Quality Mark is clearly displayed in the footer of the JCCP website and a toolkit is provided to active registrants to support them in using it too. The Panel recognised the JCCP's commitment to openness and transparency through the way it makes available key policy and processes across its website.
- 8.7 We received Share Your Experience submissions which raised concerns regarding how the JCCP communicates its role as an Accredited Register, in that it inflates its responsibility by attempting to appear as a statutory regulator. Upon reviewing communications by the JCCP, including information submitted within the SYEs, the Panel did not identify concerns that would result in the JCCP not meeting Standard Eight. Full details of these concerns and our assessment can be found under the Share Your Experience section of this report.

Standard 9: Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

Standard Nine assesses the register's commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion. This includes checking that the register's processes are fair and free from discrimination, that it understands the diversity of its registrants and service users, and that it works actively to promote equality and remove unnecessary barriers to access.

The Accreditation Panel found that Standard Nine was met. It issued the following Recommendations:

- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-19:** The JCCP should continue to consider how it can use its registrant demographic data to identify and address potential barriers and unfairness.
- **R-JCCP-FR-25/26-20:** The JCCP should develop a proactive and planned approach to understanding the demographics of service users, identifying barriers and putting in place support and guidance where appropriate.

Accreditation Panel findings

- 9.1 The JCCP has in place a range of policy and guidance in relation to Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI), including an EDI Policy, EDI in Recruitment Policy, Unconscious Bias Statement, Whistleblowing Policy and a Bullying and Harassment policy. The content of these documents set out how the JCCP complies with the Equality Act 2010 and demonstrates its commitment to promoting EDI more broadly.
- 9.2 We assessed that the JCCP provides clear and accessible information to the public, including by publishing dedicated ‘easy to read’ guidance and information explaining its complaints procedure, register structure and key definitions.
- 9.3 The JCCP also has in place guidance on the help and support available for Witnesses and Complainants. This (and other complaints documentation) provide a comprehensive breakdown of the kind of support available such as phone and face to face support, an independent supporter who can accompany them on the day, practical assistance and reasonable adjustments.
- 9.4 Since 2024, the JCCP collects Registrant EDI data at the point of application via a questionnaire – the format of which has been adopted from relevant PSRBs such as the GMC and NMC, to help reduce the burden placed on registrants who may hold multiple registrations. The JCCP reviews and analysis the collected EDI data on a monthly basis, which forms the content of a quarterly Report. EDI is a standing item on all Practitioner Register Committee meetings and EDI Data Analysis Reports are discussed annually at the JCCP Trustee Board meeting. Similarly, the Panel recognised the JCCP’s steps to understand the likely demographics of service users and how they may be impacted by treatments and practices.
- 9.5 We assessed that the JCCP has the commitment and mechanisms in place to form a solid basis for its work in relation to EDI, but that further action is needed to reinforce such policies and ensure they are being delivered and applied consistently. It was also understood that a more proactive approach to understanding, addressing and promoting EDI would be beneficial. The Panel therefore issued the following recommendations:

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-19: The JCCP should continue to consider how it can use its registrant demographic data to identify and address potential barriers and unfairness.

R-JCCP-FR-25/26-20: The JCCP should develop a proactive and planned approach to understanding the demographics of service users, identifying barriers and putting in place support and guidance where appropriate.

Share your experience

- 10.1 We invite anyone with experience of a register to share their views with us during our assessment process. This helps us understand how the register works in practice and whether there are any concerns about its registrants or processes. We consider all feedback we receive as part of our decision-making; alongside the evidence we gather directly from the register itself.
- 10.2 We did not receive any responses to the invitation to share experience of the JCCP. However, we did receive 23 SYE's since the JCCP's last assessment which we considered at this full renewal. Many submissions contained extensive materials and information, including detailed dossiers, that we reviewed in full. Many submissions also contained the same or similar wording so we have summarised the main concerns and our assessment of them.

Government and Legislative influence

- 10.3 Many of the points raised within the submissions linked back to an overarching concern in relation to the JCCP's involvement in the development of national legislation and policy, and how this has impacted non-medical independent aesthetic practitioners. The Panel determined that this falls outside of the scope of the Accredited Registers programme given we do not have jurisdiction to decide how other organisations should consider evidence or conduct stakeholder engagement when developing their own policies.

Conflicts of interest

- 10.4 Concerns were raised in relation to conflicts of interests at the JCCP, particularly conflicts associated with some Trustees. Our Standards do not prohibit an Accredited Register from having conflicts of interests, but what we do consider is how such conflicts are managed. We therefore considered the JCCP's Conflict of Interest policy and how the concerns submitted may impact Standard Six (specifically minimum requirement 6a.2). In doing so we determined that there was no evidence that demonstrated the JCCP operates outside of its own Conflict of Interest policy. As set out under Standard Six, the JCCP publishes information on declared conflicts, of which the conflicts in question have been included. We also sought further assurances from the JCCP that conflicts had historically been handled in line with its Policy, to which the JCCP provided evidence to demonstrate that they were.
- 10.5 We are aware that these concerns were also raised with relevant bodies such as the Financial Conduct Authority, Ethical Standards Committee and the Charity Commission (not limited to) and we will consider any decisions made by these organisations as a result. As of June 2026, we have not seen communications from these organisations that indicate the JCCP is failing to comply with the requirements of other oversight bodies.

Trustee Tenure

- 10.6 Concerns were noted regarding some JCCP Trustees holding a tenure for approximately eight consecutive years and the view that this risks there being a loss of independence. Our Standards do not require ARs to have in place policies specifically related to trustee tenure lengths. What our Standards do require is that Governance arrangements are published (6b.11) and that there are clear expectations for Board

members that will ensure they can discharge their legal responsibilities (6b.12) and therefore this is what we considered.

- 10.7 As set out under Standard Six, we assessed that the JCCP clearly publishes its governance arrangements. This includes its Articles of Association and Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Board, both of which include conditions for which someone can be appointed and serve as a Trustee. We assessed that the tenures in question were in line with the requirements set out in the JCCP's governing document. As such, the Panel assessed that the points raised do not impact the JCCP meeting Standard Six. We did identify a discrepancy between the two documents and so the Panel issued a recommendation for this to be addressed as it is important that there is consistency (see Standard Six for recommendation).
- 10.8 Some of the SYEs specifically asked the PSA to confirm if the JCCP's policy complies with the Charity Commission's requirements and guidance. As with the previous concern, the responsibility of determining compliance sits with the relevant body, in this case the Charity Commission. The Panel thought it appropriate for the JCCP to take steps to assure itself that the Charity Commission is satisfied with the tenure lengths in question and issued a Recommendation to that effect (see Standard Six for recommendation).

Communication and Engagement

- 10.9 Concerns were raised regarding how the JCCP communicates its role as an Accredited Register, by inflating responsibility and attempting to appear as a Statutory Regulator. We considered this against Standard Eight. We reviewed examples of communication provided within the SYE submissions as well as our own desk-based search. We did not identify evidence of the JCCP presenting itself as a Statutory Regulator and the Panel determined that the JCCP continues to meet Standard Eight.

Complaints and Concerns

- 10.10 Some submissions highlighted potential confusing communications regarding the JCCP's complaints process. In particular the perceived conflation between the JCCP fitness to practice procedures and other routes for clinical negligence to be reported, such as the Cosmetic Redress Scheme (CRS)¹⁰. We considered this against Standards Five and Eight. We assessed that published information by the JCCP provides sufficient information on when and where to report a concern, including redirecting to the CRS website. It also notes within its policy and guidance documents that it may not be the appropriate body for some complaints to be heard and that it will sign-post where this is the case. This particular claim therefore does not change our assessment of Standards Five or Eight.
- 10.11 Some submissions highlighted concerns in relation to inappropriate and potentially unlawful activity within a WhatsApp Group. Upon reviewing the evidence and further information from the JCCP, we did not identify inappropriate / unlawful messages from individuals affiliated or registered with the JCCP. Should future evidence be provided that demonstrate registrants / JCCP affiliates behaved in ways that go against the JCCPs own Code of Practice and our Standards, we would expect the JCCP to take necessary steps to address this.

¹⁰ <https://www.cosmeticredress.co.uk/>

Impact assessment (including Equalities impact)

- 11.1 We are required by law to assess the likely impact of our decision to accredit a register. This means considering how accreditation might affect different groups of people, including registrants, employers, service users, and those with protected characteristics under equality legislation. We examine both the potential benefits and any possible negative effects to ensure our decision serves the public interest.
- 11.2 We carried out **an impact assessment** as part of our decision to accredit the JCCP. This impact assessment included an equalities impact assessment as part of the consideration of our duty under the Equality Act 2010. We found that renewing accreditation is likely to have positive effects on some services users and an overall improvement of standards provided throughout the aesthetics industry in the UK.
- 11.3 The Panel recognised the unique nature of the aesthetics and cosmetics industry in that the types of procedures and service users are constantly changing, heavily influenced by things such as social media. This includes emerging trends identified by the JCCP in relation to potentially halal/haram cosmetic products and procedures, which could highlight a negative impact on some religious groups (if true and unaddressed), as well as an increase in men accessing aesthetic / cosmetic procedures. We therefore noted some areas where the JCCP could continue to develop its approach to ensure it remains aware of the risks and impacts on people from diverse groups (see Standard Nine).
- 11.4 We also noted that the JCCP's own equality and diversity data shows a large proportion of its registrants are women, which is also reflected in the wider non-surgical cosmetic landscape. We therefore acknowledge that any policies or registration requirements are more likely to impact women. However, we note that the JCCP have a public protection rationale for its registration policy / criteria and we have not seen clear enough evidence to suggest that it is not appropriate.
- 11.5 A similar point was reflected within the SYE submissions which highlighted a perceived substantial negative impact on women as a result of proposed legislative changes, of which was attributed to the influence of the JCCP on UK Governments. We do recognise that these changes are likely to have a significant impact on the non-surgical cosmetic sector, of which are mostly women. However this assessment is in relation to the impact of the PSA's decision to accredit the JCCP, it is the responsibility of the relevant UK government to undertake an Equalities Impact Assessment of the proposed legislative changes.
- 11.6 No significant negative impacts were identified and no environmental impacts were noted.