

## Annex C Summary of Previous QASA Consultations

Consultation	Areas covered	Responses and main themes	Main changes post consultation
First consultation (December 2009 to March 2010)	Consultation on proposed advocacy standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 responses received</li> <li>• No major issues identified, some detailed suggestions on the standards.</li> <li>• Some responses noted importance of not penalising different styles of advocacy and not discriminating.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main standards remained the same with some amendments to content of standards and descriptions to make clearer.</li> </ul>
Second Consultation (August to October 2010)	Consultation on the development of a framework for a quality assurance scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 70 responses received.</li> <li>• Support for mechanisms to assure quality.</li> <li>• Largely supportive of work-based assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed that JAG should retain responsibility for implementation and oversight of scheme rather than new body (Performance of Advocacy Council).</li> <li>• Quality Assurance Advisory Group established to advise upon development of scheme.</li> <li>• Agreed that should be no minimum period of time at any given level.</li> </ul>
Third consultation (August to November 2011)	Consultation on proposed regulatory rules to implement QASA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 108 responses received</li> <li>• A number of respondents noted that some advocates chose not to undertake trials and therefore would not be able to undergo judicial assessment and be accredited under the proposed scheme due to their pattern of practise rather than their competence.</li> <li>• A number of equality impacts were identified.</li> <li>• A perceived lack of consistency between the rules presented by</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A route to become accredited at level 2 only by assessment at an assessment centre was introduced.</li> <li>• Judicial evaluation to be the only method of assessment at levels 3 and 4.</li> <li>• Implementation was delayed and a fourth consultation planned to cover the full range of changes required to address issues raised in responses.</li> </ul>

		the SRA and BSB	
Fourth consultation (July to October 2012)	Consultation on scheme rules and Handbook following revisions after the third consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 348 (148 substantive) responses received</li> <li>• Concerns about proportionality of scheme, availability of assessment opportunities for judicial evaluation and whether it was in the public interest to introduce a route to accreditation that did not include assessment in trials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The period of time that advocates will have to acquire two pieces of judicial evaluation in order to enter the scheme has been extended to 24 months.</li> <li>• The number of judicial evaluations required for progression and re-accreditation has been reduced to bring it into line with the requirements for entry to the scheme.</li> <li>• The ability for clients to consent to an advocate “acting up” has been removed.</li> <li>• Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 cases have been removed from the scope of the scheme.</li> <li>• A level 4QC has been introduced to differentiate QCs</li> </ul>