

Recognising the decisions of Accredited Registers and other regulatory bodies

We require that where the parties, complaints and facts are the same, Accredited Registers accept professional conduct decisions made by other Accredited Registers. This relates to a registrant's behaviour, and to competence in the same occupation. Where a register does not intend to accept a previous decision, it should make the reasons for this clear and consider the legal implications of its intentions.

Our [Standards for Accredited Registers](#) aim to protect the public by preventing registrants who have been removed from one register from joining another register without the public knowing any professional conduct action has been taken or sanction applied. We want the public to feel secure that in choosing a registrant from an Accredited Register, they will avoid practitioners who have been found to be unsafe, whether through dishonest or predatory behaviour or through lack of competence.

We set out the type of information used to determine whether our Standards have been met in our [Evidence framework](#):

For *Standard 2: Management of the register* we look for:

'A process for recognising decisions regarding professional conduct made by regulatory bodies and other registers accredited by us when deciding whether a person should be admitted to the register.'

For *Standard 5: Complaints and concerns about registrants* we look for:

'Processes for ensuring that other Accredited Registers are notified of disciplinary outcomes.'

Through the use of the word 'recognise', it is expected that Accredited Registers will accept the professional conduct decisions of other registers, unless to do so would be unlawful. Professional conduct decisions include both the behaviour of registrants and their competence and cover both positive and negative outcomes.

We assess Accredited Registers' complaints and professional conduct processes against the same standards, and so registers should have confidence in the decisions made by each other. We therefore expect, for example, that a registrant who has been removed from one register for sexual misconduct or dishonesty will not be admitted to any other Accredited Register. We also expect registers in the same occupation to recognise each other's decisions regarding lack of competence, except where the facts turn on such matters as seniority of practice and specialisms.

We accept that there may be some cases where an Accredited Register can clearly distinguish that the professional conduct action taken by one register is not relevant to their own register. For example, where a registrant practises a number of different occupations such as counselling and complementary therapy, lack of competence in counselling may not necessarily be relevant to consideration by a complementary therapy register. We also accept that one register may need to make enquiries of another, to satisfy itself that it can place reliance on the findings of the other.