

**Comments by the BHCAG on the submissions of the  
British Paediatric Cardiac Association**

1. The BHCAG accept that the sentiments expressed are well intentioned. They are, however, based on a number of principles that the BHCAG cannot support. These are as follows:-
  - a) Self regulation;
  - b) Peer reviews;
  - c) Possibly five year intervals between reviews;
  - d) Funded by the trusts themselves;
  - e) Medically dominated and therefore biased.
  
2. Additionally, the Association is ill equipped to deal with the role it proposes which would essentially be one of sole regulator. The BHCAG would wish for a totally independent body, financed by the state, to oversee the areas covered by the Associations submissions. "The weakness with the BPCA's proposal is that it fails to ensure a proper independence of view. The BHCAG submit that during the Inquiry, it has become evidence that the medical world is a small one in which specialists almost inevitably know each other personally. Although this may often produce great benefits, it is essential that bodies responsible for specialist audit have lay members who are able and willing to challenge the status quo where necessary"
  
3. Paragraph 5.4 on page illustrates the BHCAG's concern. All of the bodies mentioned were (nominally) "responsible" for monitoring the work at Bristol between 1984 and 1995. In fact, none of them took any effective action".