

# Mobility of healthcare professionals

Joint EPSU/HOSPEEM response on reviewing the Recognition of Professional Qualifications Directive

# Basic principles

- Health and safety of patients and quality of service provision paramount
- Higher safety and quality standards should apply to healthcare professions, as the risks are much higher and patients are vulnerable
- We support the principles of mutual recognition and free movement - on the whole the system works well
- Freedom of movement is good but it mustn't be at the expense of safety and quality. (Concern that the Commission wants to reduce checks on migrants to an absolute minimum –not appropriate for health sector).

# Simplification

- Agree Directive needs updating for 21<sup>st</sup> century.
- Would like to see minimum qualifications updated to take account of outcomes achieved as well as hours put in.
- Code of Conduct should not become mandatory.
- Dubious about concept of partial access for health care professions –very hard to ensure that individuals granted partial access only practise within the scope of their competence.

# Integration (1)

- Welcome the idea of extending mandatory use of IMI (electronic database system) to health professions
- Not keen on “professional card” –think there are better alternatives, such as using IMI. We think a card would be open to abuse (how would it be updated? What details would it hold?) and are sceptical about the costs and benefits.

# Integration (2)

- Do not want checks on professionals providing services on a ““temporary and occasional” basis to be relaxed.
- Prefer that the term “temporary and occasional” should not be clarified in the Directive – better left to the regulator’s discretion on a case by case basis.
- Do not have firm views yet on the idea of a European curriculum, but will examine any proposals with interest.

# Trust and confidence

- Welcome greater emphasis on continuing professional development in Directive
- Welcome placing a duty on regulatory bodies to exchange proactive warnings about fraudulent or incompetent registrants
- Language competence –primary responsibility for testing language competence remains with the employer (where one exists).