

Page 2: Information about the person or organisation completing this submission

**Q1** This submission was completed by:

Name **Kyoung hoon kim**

**Q2** Are you making this submission **as a registered practitioner**

**Q3** Please tell us which part of the sector your submission represents **a registered dentist or dental specialist**

Page 3: Area one: new core recertification programme

**Q4** What, if anything, do you like about our proposed core recertification programme?

I like there's been thought to changing the certification

**Q5** Is there anything about our proposed core recertification programme you would change? **Respondent skipped this question**

**Q6** Do you support our proposal to change the recertification cycle to 12 months? **Yes**

**Q7** Do you think our proposed core recertification programme should include a requirement for practitioners to complete an online open-book assessment of their technical and clinical knowledge and skills? **No,**  
Please explain.:  
This does not show competence, rather writing abilities which has no improvement on the current system.

**Q8** If a proposal about an online open-book assessment of a practitioner's technical and clinical skills and knowledge is supported, how often should practitioners be required to complete an assessment? **Respondent skipped this question**

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**Q9** Do you have other proposals about our proposed core recertification programme you would like us to consider? Please explain.

**Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 4: Area two: support for new registrants

**Q10** What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for supporting new registrants?

I think it's unfair for the solo clinicians such as myself that are the only dentists in town

---

**Q11** Is there anything about the draft proposals for supporting new registrants you would change?

**Yes,**  
Please explain.:  
Do not agree that it is compulsory

---

**Q12** Do you think the proposed two year minimum period for the mentoring relationship is:

**too long** ,  
Please explain.:  
Should have the capacity to change mentorship, mentors are not regulated so it could be blind leading the blind

---

**Q13** Do you think all new registrants should participate in a mentoring programme, or are there some new registrants who should not be required to participate in a mentoring programme?

**No**

---

**Q14** Do you have other proposals about supporting new registrants you would like us to consider? Please explain.

**Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 5: Area three: addressing health-related competence decline concerns

**Q15** What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns?

**Respondent skipped this question**

---

**Q16** Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would change?

**No**

---

**Q17** Do you have other proposals for addressing health-related competence decline concerns you would like us to consider? Please explain.

**Respondent skipped this question**

---

Page 6: Area four: addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours

## Phase two consultation on recertification

**Q18** What, if anything, do you like about our draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours?

---

Respondent skipped this question

**Q19** Is there anything about the draft proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would change?

---

No

**Q20** Do you have other proposals for addressing recurring non-compliant practitioner behaviours you would like us to consider? Please explain.

---

Respondent skipped this question

Page 7: Final thoughts and comments

**Q21** Do you have any other comments, suggestions or information you want to share with us about the draft proposals for improving our approach to recertification?

---

Respondent skipped this question