Page 2: Information about the person or organisation completing this submission

Q1 This submission was completed by:

Name	**Ivan**

Q2 Are you making this submission	**as a registered practitioner**

Q3 Please tell us which part of the sector your submission represents	**a registered dentist or dental specialist**

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

Q4 What, if anything, do you like about our proposed core recertification programme?

I do not like any bit of the new proposal!!!

Q5 Is there anything about our proposed core recertification programme you would change?	**Yes,** Please explain.: It has so many components that does not necessary mean it will help maintain the competence of a practitioner and in fact puts more stress on the practitioner on a year to year basis.

Q6 Do you support our proposal to change the recertification cycle to 12 months?	**No,** Please explain.: The current cycle of 3 years is adequate to allow a balance of work and study for practitioners.

Q7 Do you think our proposed core recertification programme should include a requirement for practitioners to complete an online open-book assessment of their technical and clinical knowledge and skills?	**No,** Please explain.: Completing a test online does not mean you can work well in a hands on approach in the world of dentistry.

Q8 If a proposal about an online open-book assessment of a practitioner's technical and clinical skills and knowledge is supported, how often should practitioners be required to complete an assessment?

Every five years ,
Please explain.:
or never! Not everyone has the same interest in specific areas of dentistry and different practitioners have different opinions on a specific matter.

Q9 Do you have other proposals about our proposed core recertification programme you would like us to consider? Please explain.

Don't fix something that is not broken and keep to the same programme

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

Q10 What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for supporting new registrants?

Respondent skipped this question

Q11 Is there anything about the draft proposals for supporting new registrants you would change?

No

Q12 Do you think the proposed two year minimum period for the mentoring relationship is:

just right

Q13 Do you think all new registrants should participate in a mentoring programme, or are there some new registrants who should not be required to participate in a mentoring programme?

Yes

Q14 Do you have other proposals about supporting new registrants you would like us to consider? Please explain.

Not all mentors will be able to provide the same quality/amount of mentorship so there will be a disparity in skill level

Page 5: Area three: addressing health-related competence decline concerns

Q15 What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns?

Respondent skipped this question

Q16 Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would change?

No

Q17 Do you have other proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would like us to consider? Please explain.

Respondent skipped this question

Page 6: Area four: addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours

Q18 What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours?

Respondent skipped this question

Q19 Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would change?

No

Q20 Do you have other proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would like us to consider? Please explain.

Respondent skipped this question

Page 7: Final thoughts and comments

Q21 Do you have any other comments, suggestions or information you want to share with us about the draft proposals for improving our approach to recertification?

Respondent skipped this question