Stakeholder details

Initial questions To help us better understand your situation and the context of your feedback please provide us with some details about you. These details will not be published in any summary of the collated feedback from this consultation. Question A Are you completing this submission on behalf of an organisation or as an individual? Your answer: □ Organisation Name of organisation: Click or tap here to enter text. Contact email: Click or tap here to enter text. Name: Contact email: Question B If you are completing this submission as an individual, are you: ☑ A registered health practitioner? Profession: Doctor ☐ A member of the public? ☐ Other: Click or tap here to enter text. Question C Would you like your submission to be published? ☐ Yes, publish my submission with my name/organisation name ☑ Yes, publish my submission without my name/ organisation name

☐ No – **do not** publish my submission

Your responses to the consultation questions

Is the content and structure of the draft revised specialist registration standard helpful, clear, relevant and workable?
The structure is clear
2. Is there any content that needs to be changed, added or deleted in the draft revised specialist registration standard?
I would suggest that the entire revised standard be scrapped
3. Are there any impacts for patients and consumers, particularly vulnerable members of the community that have not been considered in the draft revised specialist registration standard?
Relaxing standards increases the risk that less well trained doctors will be practicing in our most vulnerable (rural) communities
5. Are there any impacts for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples that have not been
considered in the draft revised specialist registration standard?
Relaxing standards increases the risk that less well trained doctors will be practicing in our most vulnerable (rural) communities

6. Are there any other regulatory impacts or costs that have not been identified that the Board needs to consider?
Impact on training places for junior doctors in Australia – the bottleneck will continue.
7. Do you have any other comments on the draft revised specialist registration standard?
7. Do you have any other comments on the draft revised specialist registration standard:
This is the wrong approach to fixing the issue. There should be a focus on working with the colleges to increase training places. Clearly you have tried to circumvent this and force their hand on the matter. The standards for IMGs should remain as strict as they are at present. Why place vulnerable communities at risk for a political statement?
This is the wrong approach to fixing the issue. There should be a focus on working with the colleges to increase training places. Clearly you have tried to circumvent this and force their hand on the matter. The standards for IMGs should remain as strict as they are at present. Why place vulnerable