

Dear All,

I am writing on behalf of the co-ordinating group (CG) of BAPCA in response to your open letter *The Future of the Person-Centred Approach in the UK and the Case against HPC and State Regulation*. We realise the letter was to the whole organisation. We also see it as part of our role to consider the matters you have raised, particularly in light of the recent survey undertaken with members concerning regulation. We would like to briefly record our response to the feeling that BAPCA's position has been of 'minimal action' and 'quiet collusion'. We are not clear of your differentiation, if any, between BAPCA and the CG. Certainly, the CG has, over many, many years been actively involved with the whole issue of regulation. As far as 'collusion' is concerned, I would suggest that this is, of course, a debate on whether one works within or outside of any given system.

However, moving to the main points of your letter. The current CG would be happy to assertively oppose state regulation through the HPC. At the same time, we are not convinced of the advisability of withdrawing completely from HPC, preferring to take what is being called the multi-track approach. It was not entirely clear to us what you are meaning by the phrase 'explicitly withdraw support for HPC'. I think this might depend on the definition of the word 'support' as we would argue that BAPCA has never supported HPC as such. We would be very happy to co-ordinate a consultation on the implications for the person-centred approach of statutory regulation and other civic accountability systems. We assume that yourselves and at least some of the signatories of the letter will be willing to form a working group to take this forward in partnership with the CG.

In respect of BAPCA publically supporting members considering taking a position of principled non-compliance, we would welcome suggestions from you on what this might mean.

We feel the decision to agree (or not) to the calls you are making to BAPCA, are beyond the constitutional powers of the CG. The constitution requires that

- '5.2 Decisions on all major issues must arrive from a process of consultation with the membership. Major issues are likely to include: -
...5.2.3 questions of principles of the PCA where BAPCA may be seen as significantly...affecting the membership...practice or professional standing or functioning of a significant portion of members.'

It is clear that the issue of regulation will significantly affect a significant portion of members. The questionnaire was the beginning of the consultation process, and your letter has profoundly helped in this process. It is our intention to take a set of proposals, based on this response, to the AGM/General Meeting in March. Specifically,

- that BAPCA assertively opposes regulation by HPC
- that BAPCA follow a multi-track approach to regulation
- that a working party be formed to lead a consultation regarding the implications for the person-centred approach of statutory regulation and other civic accountability systems.

You might want to consider a proposal to address the point you have raised about supporting members considering a position of principled non-compliance.

Finally, we would like to thank you all, and in particular the BAPCA signatories for taking the time and attention to putting this letter to the organisation and to the CG. It has helped concentrate the energy of what is a very new CG and aided us in the possible development of a more coherent approach to this whole issue.

Best wishes

Sheila

Sheila Haugh
Covenor
For and on behalf of the BAPCA CG.