



UKREMT

UK Register of Emergency Medical Teams

Managed Voluntary Register

Appeals / Review Guidance

Guidance on the appeals and review process following a Fitness to Practise outcome

Document title	UKREMT Appeals / Review Guidance
Document status	Controlled document
Version	Version 1.0
Effective from	June 2026
Document owner	UKREMT Governance Lead
Registered address	Turtle House, Cotswold Airport, Kemble, Cirencester, GL7 6BA

Website: ukremt.gwasambulance.charity

Document Control

Organisation	UKREMT – UK Register of Emergency Medical Teams
Register type	Managed Voluntary Register
Document title	Appeals / Review Guidance
Version	1.0
Date of issue	June 2026
Next review	June 2027 or sooner if legislation, governance or operating model changes
Document owner	UKREMT Governance Lead
Contact / website	ukremt.gwasambulance.charity

Important status note: UKREMT is a managed voluntary register. It is not a statutory regulator and this guidance does not replace the powers, rules, procedures or decisions of statutory regulators, employers, courts, police, safeguarding authorities or other competent bodies.

1. Purpose

This guidance explains how a UKREMT registrant may request a review or appeal following a Fitness to Practise outcome. It is designed to promote fair, consistent and proportionate decision-making while protecting patients, service users, colleagues, employers, the public and the reputation of the UKREMT Managed Voluntary Register.

The process is not intended to re-run every Fitness to Practise case from the beginning. It provides a controlled route to challenge an outcome where there is a recognised ground for review or appeal, such as a material procedural error, new evidence, apparent bias, or an outcome that may be unreasonable or disproportionate.

2. Scope

This guidance applies to UKREMT registrants, applicants and former registrants where a Fitness to Practise decision has resulted in one or more of the following:

- refusal of registration or renewal on Fitness to Practise grounds;
- conditions placed on registration;
- a formal warning or advisory outcome;
- temporary suspension from the register;
- removal, exclusion or refusal to restore registration;
- a published register status or outcome which materially affects the registrant; or
- any other Fitness to Practise outcome which UKREMT accepts as suitable for review.

This guidance does not prevent UKREMT from taking immediate interim action where public protection, patient safety, safeguarding, fraud, dishonesty, criminal investigation, forged documentation, unsafe practice or serious misconduct concerns require urgent action.

3. Legal and governance principles

Although UKREMT is a voluntary register rather than a statutory regulator, the appeals and review process should be administered in line with recognised UK legal and governance principles. These include:

- procedural fairness, including notice of the issue, a fair opportunity to respond and reasons for the decision;

- natural justice, including impartial decision-making and avoidance of conflicts of interest;
- proportionality, including use of the least restrictive outcome compatible with public protection;
- consistency, so broadly similar cases are treated in broadly similar ways;
- transparency, so the registrant understands the evidence, decision and route of review;
- reasonable adjustments where needed under equality law;
- confidentiality and lawful handling of personal information under UK data protection law; and
- public protection, including the need to maintain public confidence in the register.

4. Definitions

Term	Meaning
Review	A paper-based or administrative reconsideration of whether the original process, reasoning and outcome were proper, fair and proportionate.
Appeal	A more formal reconsideration by an appeal reviewer or appeal panel where a recognised ground of appeal is accepted.
Registrant	A person who is registered, applying to register, renewing, suspended, removed, or otherwise subject to a UKREMT Fitness to Practise outcome.
Outcome	The decision reached following Fitness to Practise assessment, investigation, panel, review or other governance process.
New evidence	Relevant evidence which was not reasonably available at the time of the original decision and could realistically have affected the outcome.
Procedural irregularity	A material failure to follow the applicable process, including a failure that may have affected fairness or the outcome.
Public protection	The combined need to protect patients, service users, colleagues and the public; uphold standards; and maintain confidence in the register.

5. What can be reviewed or appealed

A review or appeal may be considered where the registrant can identify at least one recognised ground. UKREMT may reject a request that merely disagrees with the outcome without identifying a proper ground.

5.1 Recognised grounds

- There was a material procedural error or the applicable process was not followed.
- There is new and relevant evidence that could not reasonably have been provided earlier.
- There is evidence of bias, apparent bias or a conflict of interest affecting the decision.
- The decision was unreasonable, disproportionate or unsupported by the evidence.
- The sanction or outcome was outside the range of reasonable responses available to UKREMT.
- Relevant mitigation was not considered, or irrelevant material was relied upon.
- The registrant was not given a fair opportunity to respond to an allegation or material evidence.
- A reasonable adjustment request was not properly considered and this may have affected fairness.

5.2 Matters normally outside appeal

- A request based only on disappointment, embarrassment or inconvenience caused by the outcome.
- A repeat of the original case without any recognised ground.
- Evidence that was available but deliberately withheld without good reason.

- Challenges to decisions made by statutory regulators, courts, police, employers or safeguarding bodies.
- An attempt to use UKREMT appeal routes to delay urgent public protection action.

6. Time limits

Stage	Expected timeframe	Notes
Request for review or appeal	Within 28 calendar days of the outcome letter	UKREMT may extend time where there is good reason.
Acknowledgement	Normally within 5 working days	Acknowledgement does not mean the appeal has been accepted.
Initial admissibility check	Normally within 10 working days	Checks whether a recognised ground has been raised.
Review decision	Normally within 28 calendar days of acceptance	May be extended for complex cases.
Appeal panel decision	Normally within 60 calendar days of acceptance	May be extended where evidence, availability or fairness requires it.

Where a case raises immediate patient safety, safeguarding, fraud, identity, forged certificate, criminal or public protection concerns, interim restrictions may remain in place while the review or appeal is considered.

7. How to request a review or appeal

A registrant should submit the request in writing using the UKREMT appeal/review form or by email where a form is not available. The request should be sent via the official UKREMT website route or to the email address stated in the outcome letter. See Section 17 for example template.

The request should include:

- full name, UKREMT registration number, contact details and current registration status;
- the Fitness to Practise outcome being challenged;
- the date of the outcome letter;
- the ground or grounds relied upon;
- a clear explanation of why the outcome should be reviewed or appealed;
- copies of any new evidence or supporting documents;
- details of any reasonable adjustments requested; and
- the outcome the registrant is seeking.

8. Initial admissibility review

UKREMT will carry out an initial admissibility review before opening a full appeal. This is a gatekeeping stage to ensure that the request identifies a proper ground and is not simply a disagreement with the decision.

At this stage UKREMT may:

- accept the request for review or appeal;
- ask the registrant for clarification or missing information;
- treat the request as a complaint rather than an appeal, where appropriate;
- reject the request as out of time or without a recognised ground;
- maintain, vary or impose interim restrictions where necessary for public protection; or
- refer the matter for urgent safeguarding, employer, police, statutory regulator or governance escalation where appropriate.

9. Review stage

A review is normally a paper-based reconsideration of the original decision. It should be conducted by a person who was not the original decision-maker wherever practicable. The reviewer should consider whether the original decision was procedurally fair, proportionate, supported by evidence and compatible with UKREMT governance standards.

9.1 Possible review outcomes

- uphold the original decision;
- vary the original decision;
- replace the outcome with a lesser or different outcome;
- remove or amend conditions;
- refer the case back for a fresh Fitness to Practise process;
- escalate the matter to an appeal panel; or
- take any other proportionate governance action available to UKREMT.

10. Appeal panel stage

Where a full appeal is accepted, UKREMT may appoint an appeal panel. The panel should include suitable independence from the original decision where practicable. Panel members should declare conflicts of interest before reviewing the case.

10.1 Panel bundle

The registrant should normally receive a bundle or summary of the material to be considered, subject to confidentiality, safeguarding, data protection and third-party privacy requirements. Redactions may be applied where necessary.

10.2 Attendance and representation

UKREMT may allow an appeal to be considered on the papers, online, by telephone, or in person. The format will depend on seriousness, complexity, fairness, proportionality and resources. A registrant may request to be accompanied or represented by a colleague, union representative, legal representative, professional adviser or other suitable person. UKREMT may refuse a proposed representative where their involvement would create unfairness, conflict, confidentiality risk, intimidation or disruption.

10.3 Appeal decision

The appeal panel should provide a written decision with reasons. The decision should explain the evidence considered, the grounds raised, the findings, the outcome and any continuing conditions, restrictions or publication status.

11. Interim restrictions during review or appeal

A request for review or appeal does not automatically suspend the original Fitness to Practise outcome. UKREMT may maintain or impose interim restrictions where necessary to protect the public, preserve confidence in the register or maintain standards. Interim restrictions may include temporary suspension, conditions, annotation of the register, withholding of digital card functionality, or restriction of specific register status.

Interim restrictions should be reviewed periodically and should not be more restrictive than necessary, unless the seriousness of the risk justifies that restriction.

12. Evidence

Evidence may include documents, certificates, identity checks, DBS information where lawfully held or shared, employer statements, witness statements, clinical records, training records, CPD logs, correspondence, audit material, public register data, digital system records or other relevant material.

Evidence should be handled lawfully, fairly and securely. UKREMT may refuse to rely on evidence that appears forged, altered, unlawfully obtained, irrelevant or unsafe to use. Where forged documentation is suspected, UKREMT may escalate the matter to relevant bodies.

13. Reasonable adjustments and accessibility

UKREMT will consider reasonable adjustment requests where a registrant, witness or complainant is disabled or otherwise requires support to participate fairly. Adjustments may include extra time, accessible document formats, remote attendance, breaks, communication support, modified questioning arrangements or allowing a supporter to assist.

A request for adjustment should be made as early as possible and should explain what support is needed and why. UKREMT may ask for enough information to understand the adjustment requested, but should avoid unnecessary intrusive enquiries.

14. Confidentiality, data protection and records

Appeals and reviews will involve personal information and may involve special category data. UKREMT will process information for legitimate register governance, public protection, legal, contractual, safeguarding and regulatory reasons, as applicable. Information should be limited to what is necessary, stored securely and shared only where there is a lawful and proportionate basis.

Records of appeals and reviews should normally include the request, acknowledgement, evidence, reviewer or panel notes, decision, reasons, outcome letters, register updates and any publication decision. Retention should follow the UKREMT records management policy and applicable data protection requirements.

15. Publication and register status

UKREMT may publish or annotate a register status where necessary and proportionate for public protection, transparency or governance. Publication should be limited to what is necessary, accurate, kept under review and removed or amended when no longer required.

Where an appeal changes the original outcome, the register should be updated promptly. If information has been published and is later varied or overturned, UKREMT should take reasonable steps to correct the public record.

16. Finality of decision and further routes

The appeal decision will normally be final within UKREMT. UKREMT may reopen a matter only where there is an exceptional reason, such as serious procedural unfairness, fraud, new material evidence, mistake of identity, safeguarding concern, or an error that undermines confidence in the decision.

This guidance does not remove any legal rights a person may have outside UKREMT. A registrant may seek independent legal advice. Where a registrant is also regulated by HCPC, GMC, NMC or another statutory regulator, the relevant statutory regulator’s rules and decisions will take precedence for that regulated profession.

17. Template: request for review or appeal

Registrant full name	
UKREMT registration number	
Email / telephone	
Outcome being challenged	
Date of outcome letter	
Grounds relied upon	
Summary of appeal / review request	
New evidence enclosed	
Reasonable adjustments requested	

18. Suggested outcome wording

When issuing a review or appeal outcome, UKREMT should aim to include the following elements:

- the decision being reviewed;
- the ground or grounds considered;
- the evidence considered;
- the findings on each ground;
- the final decision and reasons;
- any conditions, restrictions, review dates or register annotation;
- any change to digital card or public registration status;
- any external referral or safeguarding escalation made; and
- whether the decision is final within UKREMT.

19. Governance references

This guidance has been drafted with reference to the following UK legal and professional governance sources:

- UK GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018 – GOV.UK and Information Commissioner’s Office guidance.
- Equality Act 2010 guidance, including reasonable adjustments for disabled people.
- Human Rights Act 1998, Article 6 principles on fair hearing and procedural fairness, used here as a governance benchmark rather than a statement that UKREMT is a statutory tribunal.
- Professional Standards Authority material on Fitness to Practise appeals and public protection principles.
- HCPC public guidance that Fitness to Practise concerns may include skills, knowledge, character, health and conduct affecting public protection or confidence.

20. Controlled document statement

This document is controlled by UKREMT. Printed or downloaded copies may become out of date. The current version should be held on the UKREMT website or within the UKREMT governance system.