## Framework for consultation feedback on professional documents

PS62(G) Position statement on cultural competence and cultural safety

**Stakeholder name: New Zealand Society of Anaesthetists** 

Questions		Yes or No	Comments
1.	Are the intent and purpose of the document clear and	Υ 🗵	
	unequivocal?	N 🗆	
	a. If not, then how could this be better achieved?		
2.	Does the scope of the document align with its purpose?	Υ 🗵	
	a. If not, then why not?	N 🗆	
3.	Are the applicable standards identifiable?	Υ 🗵	
		N 🗆	
4.	Does the information presented adequately address the	Υ 🗵	
	issues?	N 🗆	
5.	Do the recommendations fulfill the intent of the	Υ⊠	
	document?	N 🗆	
	a. Are there any other recommendations that should		
	be added? For example, are there any		
	jurisdictional requirements that have not been		

Questions	Yes or No	Comments
considered, in relation to geographical location		
and/or professional organisational context?		
b. Are there any recommendations that should be		
removed?		
6. Are there any aspects that have not been considered that	Υ	
merit consideration?	N 🗵	
7. Do you think that the document will serve its stated	Υ 🗵	
purpose?	N 🗆	
8. Any other comments		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the reviewed cultural competence and cultural safety position statement. We, the New Zealand Society of Anaesthetists only have feedback on grammatical errors in the Background Paper: In paragraph 3.2 <i>Broad range of cultures</i> the two instances of Māori are missing a macron on the a.  It is pleasing to see this review recognises the need for the statement to evolve with developments in delivering culturally competent and safe care, with a lens towards the needs of New Zealand and Australia alongside international standards. These updates are a positive improvement on the 2017 version. Our compliments to the review group.