Please find some comments / feedback on the NRAS consultation paper:

- Q1 – it would be interesting to know what is in place currently that provides the same or similar function. Agree in principle that the AHWAC being reconstituted is a good idea
- Q2 – agree to this suggestion or in partnership with AHPRA boards
- Q3 – no
- Q4 – agree
- Q5 – agree
- Q6 – agree
- Q7 – no
- Q8 – no
- Q9 – consistency of decisions, timeliness of outcomes & regular and final communication of outcome to notifier
- Q10 – no
- Q11- agree
- Q12 – agree and the agreed KPI outcome should be set at 100%
- Q13- no – detail of process to be transparent, realistic / achievable timeframes, regular update on progress, outcomes shared with the notifier
- Q14- yes – a lot of issues sent to AHPRA relate to performance which could be dealt with using alternative options which could speed up the outcome
- Q15- depends on the severity of the issue, state /territory boards should decide on appropriate time frames
- Q16- stay as is
- Q17- stay as is and allow for some differences in the interpretation of the act
- Q18- no
- Q19- yes – it is working well within WA and has had no real impact to the number of notifications
- Q20- currently poor and provide no flexibility
- Q21- agree
- Q22- currently poorly done
- Q23- it needs to be strengthened as a matter of urgency e.g. the interpretation & compliance with English language standard is a good example of poor partnerships
- Q24- currently very poor and is having an impact on industry needs and access to skilled nursing & midwifery workforce
- Q25- yes and skill/ professional experience
- Q26- yes but identification and marketing of the difference would be useful
- Q27- no this could be strengthened if the relationship was stronger between boards and accrediting authorities
- Q28- no issue with the proposed amendments to the national law