

Question	Answer
Will we have the slides please?	Yes, the slides will be made available
Training	
How does David see the training needs of Religious Congregations being met?	This is a challenge; there isn't a simple solution. RLSS needs to provide training to all religious in active ministry as well as more specific training such as trustees etc to create a safer environment. There are considerable training needs and we are thinking of putting training staff in place within RLSS to meet this need. CSSA may assist with some training.
Will there be training available for congregational trustees?	Yes
Please can you clarify a couple of the more practical aspects of the RLSS function e.g. will they be responsible for training and DBS enquiries?	Training, yes. DBS will be with CSSA but RLSS will provide the second signature
Would it be possible to train trainers from within congregations to allow for cascade of training	Yes. This is being included within our plan and we hope this will be rolled out wherever possible
Will current DBS documents be honoured as they stand and will training already completed be honoured e.g. by Educare?	Yes
How will the training take place?	We imagine this will be a combination of delivery methods, from online courses, Zoom training, in person sessions (when regulations allow) etc.
Contracting	
How will the 'contracting in' process work for religious congregations?	The contract is looking likely to be between the religious congregations and CSSA and then possibly a second contract between the religious congregations and RLSS. However, this is still with the lawyers who are considering a number of options. We want to keep the system as simple and streamlined as possible
What exactly will be the contract between CSSA and RLSS? Who will develop this contract?	There may not be a contract between CSSA and RLSS however this is still with the legal team. We will update you on this as soon as we have the legal advice.

Contracts with CSSA cannot remove the ultimate responsibilities of the religious superiors, both at Provincial and International level. So, in some ways the relationship will still have to be advisory.	In a way, but CSSA will have a regulatory function which will identify non-compliance and ultimately withdraw services in which case the Congregation will have to assure the Charity Commissioners that there are adequate safeguarding measures in place
Auditing	
Will RLSS provide an auditing service?	The auditing service will be provided by CSSA. There will be some aspects of compliance with standards and policy that RLSS will support congregations in achieving. The Standards work in underway.
CSAS have not always understood Religious Orders and their officers have shown poor judgement at times. Would not the RLSS personnel, with hopefully good understanding of Religious, be not far better in auditing Religious Orders Safeguarding practice?.	CSSA is the regulatory body. Advice and support from RLSS. CSSA will have an external audit to ensure that it is meeting oversight functions adequately.
Logistics	
Will the RLSS be on a national basis or on a regional level?	There are pros and cons both ways. We expect there to be one National office (mainly in an attempt to keep costs down) but we will be consulting Religious on this very point.
What is the time scale for RLSS establishment?	Hopefully within 5 months
Commissions	
Will the Religious Order still be able to have communication with their Diocesan Commission?	Alignment to the diocesan will end under this new project so the commission will no longer be responsible for any religious congregations however we recognise there will be need for a transition period. There will also need to be a good working relationship between the RLSS and the Safeguarding coordinators at each diocese. There is no reason why Religious Safeguarding Leads and Diocesan Safeguarding Coordinators could not keep up informal contact.
Where/what will be the role of the diocese going forward with regard to Safeguarding? Will the existing commissions be disbanded	Alignment to the diocesan will end under this new project so the commission will no longer be responsible for any religious congregations. Commissions will cease to exist except perhaps as a voluntary advisory body and will be replaced by sub-groups of the trustee board. Dioceses will be audited by CSSA in the same way as Religious Congregations.

Do independent commissions have to have a relationship with RLSS, or can they opt for a different body?	They can opt for a different solution, but we hope that they will have some relationship with RLSS to promote the One Church approach to Safeguarding. The Commissions will become sub-committees of the Religious Trust body and the Congregation's safeguarding will still be audited by CSSA and will be required to have a contract with them so to do.
Will there be two models for Safeguarding provision? that of the current 5 commissions retaining the responsibilities for operational Safeguarding service and those currently aligned to Diocese will access RLSS?	There will be a couple of different ways to structure Safeguarding but the standards will provide the common thread. Larger Congregations (or groups of Congregations) can have sub-committees of their Trust body to oversee safeguarding. Commissions will cease to exist except perhaps as a voluntary advisory body. It is hoped that all Religious with their own commissions now will seriously consider join RLSS.
Case Management	
Who will manage the cases? Currently, the Safeguarding commission does all the process and advises the Provincial. Will this change completely?	It is expected that Religious Safeguarding Leads will manage cases with support from RLSS. Where the Safeguarding Lead is unable to do this (for whatever reason) then RLSS will provide case management support – but this will mean having a larger team of Safeguarding staff and cost more.
Will the new advisory ICLSAL service guarantee a response time to ensure SAFEGUARDING leads can deal with cases in a timely manner and they are not left waiting too long?	This is an important point, we aren't at this level of detail yet, but I will note it and address it a bit later on in more detail. I expect one of the audit areas for Religious congregations is speed of response to allegations and this will, where given, also include the response time of RLSS.
will the RLSS undertake case management on behalf of religious congregations?	This is one possible model, but it seems clear that Elliott proposed that Religious Safeguarding Leads would ordinarily handle safeguarding matters. The Review also seems to envisage that on occasion RLSS will provide some case management. How much of this will be available will be a significant resource and funding question.
who will hold records/files of case work?	We need to do some consultation on this, it is my current view that the files will stay with the Religious Congregations as ultimately they are the ones responsible for them and it makes data protection more straightforward.
RLSS	

<p>If in the current system some dioceses have been overwhelmed by the number of religious congregations they serve, how will an organisation of 2.5 staff cover all religious Congregations?</p>	<p>That was Elliott’s proposal. We are working to expand the model that Elliott suggested as 2.5 professional staff cannot provide what we are likely to need the service to deliver.</p>
<p>What matters is keeping the system as simple as possible. At the moment some diocese require an additional 4 forms as well as the DBS form. This is complex and puts people off. The turn around is also very slow. This needs to change in any new system.</p>	<p>Speed and simplicity are two key elements of any good safeguarding administrative service. The DBS service will be provided by CSSA. They will need to have sufficient staff to process DBS applications speedily. Other systems and forms must be accessible, straightforward to complete and easily able to assist in tracking progress of cases.</p>
<p>Is it obligatory for every Religious Congregation or Order to join this group?</p>	<p>It is not. There is a hope that all will join to ensure the one Church approach but there is no obligation to do so as long as the Religious Congregation can assure the Charity commission and the CSSA that there is adequate safeguarding oversight by the Trustees and that all the Standards set will be reached or surpassed.</p>
<p>How does the Elliott Review affect us if we are a small community of only 3 Brothers in the whole UK and never had any abuse cases to deal with.</p>	<p>Elliott ends alignment so you will need another solution which is suggested to be RLSS. Your financial contribution to RLSS will obviously be very small based the number of brothers in active ministry and your safeguarding history (among other factors). More on this as the models are discussed and the financial modelling is also developed.</p>
<p>Do qualified staff have to be Religious or any professionally qualified staff?</p>	<p>In the RLSS it will be professionally qualified staff, this may include Religious however the strength of their ability in Safeguarding will be the basis of their appointment.</p>
<p>What will be the role of the Safeguarding Lead in this new RLSS?</p>	<p>Religious Safeguarding Leads will still play an important role. They will work with RLSS to ensure that all aspects of safeguarding are dealt with well.</p>
<p>Our Question (from the Group) was the position and role of the Safeguarding Leads - Congregations may and do struggle to identify suitable people - what help will RLSS provide in such identification? Second part of the question is what changes will there be in the role and responsibilities of the S Leads?</p>	<p>This will depend on the model for RLSS that we adopt. Religious Safeguarding Leads will however take ‘lead’ responsibility for safeguarding supported by RLSS. If there are cases that need handling the safeguarding advisors at RLSS will advise and assist the Religious Safeguarding Lead. If case management is not possible by the Religious Safeguarding Lead then RLSS will handle this but</p>

	there will inevitably be addition costs to this approach. We will be consulting you on this very matter in due course.
Some small orders of woman who have never had any allegations might decide not to sign up to the RLSS.	They will need to show that they are complaint with the new Safeguarding standards and regulations (which go beyond case management) so will need some form of Safeguarding in place – this may not be RLSS, however Safeguarding issues are a lot bigger than just allegations. There is a hope that all congregations will join with RLSS
How can one body the religious life resource service all the religious in England and Wales?	It is a very good question and one that we are currently trying to address in the various models that we are working on and will consult you about at the 5 th of March meeting.
What training/qualifications/experience will staff at RLSS need to have? how will they ensure they have knowledge of religious congregations?	We aren't at the job description stage yet but part of our role is to ensure that the staff are adequately qualified, suitably trained and experienced.
Funding	
Is the funding for this whole process of 50:50 Religious and diocese fair ... and equitable given the location of many cases?	The balance of funding for the CSSA and the National Tribunal Service will be explored in the Financial (bursars) workstream in due course. The view from most dioceses is that the aligned Religious Congregations received a good service at minimal cost – a cost borne by the dioceses. Religious will now have to pay their way on a fairer basis. The 50:50 split re funding of CSSA and NTS is the current proposal.
The dioceses will have less work as the RLSS will take the previously aligned Religious congregations. As a result they will have less work to do and so have more money available.	See my comment above.
Structures (including CSSA)	
Will each Congregation's Safeguarding policy still be different to that of other Congregations or will we need to adopt the same policy?	We imagine there will be a template system so that policies are fit for purpose and reflective of a congregation's particular situation but will be

	broadly the same. The Standards approach will require some rethinking of how safeguarding policies and practices should be written and applied.
The papers state that the CSSA and RLSS bodies will be set up as limited companies - why is this? I would have thought that a charitable structure would be more appropriate for tax purposes and in line with objectives?	There has been arguments made about 'public good' and other requirements of charitable status that these companies will be unable to meet. However, we are still discussing how these bodies will be constituted and relate to one another.
Can we negotiate about the idea of a Trading Company being set up to run the religious life resource, This seems very unrealistic. Could we look at some form of commission?	We are currently exploring how these bodies will be constituted.
For very small communities will structure be difficult	We are working hard to ensure this structure is inclusive and that small communities and their needs aren't left out.
Other	
If the existing CSAS staff move over to the CSSA, how will they guarantee that the current failings of the structures as identified by IICSA and Elliott won't continue?	The new structure will give the CSSA regulatory powers that CSAS did not have. There does not seem to be a shared view that CSAS had significant failings.
How will the victim/survivor benefit from the new proposals?	It is hopes that the whole Standards-based approach will help victim/survivors by providing a more "best practice" approach. Part of the new training programme will also include interacting with victims and Survivors.
Is it true that current CSAS staff will form part of the new staff team?	CSAS staff will migrate to CSSA.
Is what has happened, leanings and mistakes, in Religious Life Conferences in other countries being considered.	Yes, the standards are being drawn looking at Ireland and Australia particularly but also other countries were considered by Elliott. We will continue this work by reaching out to these resources and trying to understand their approach
what is the role of the National Tribunal Service in relation to religious	We are still waiting on the details of this.
Will the Standards based approach be similar to that in place in Scotland?	Somewhat similar but more based on the Irish and Australian models, as I understand it.
Is it acceptable for religious to have a lay person as the Safeguarding lead	Yes, absolutely.
If Safeguarding leads are to be managing future allegations, has there been any discussions with Insurance and legal teams as there approach in the past has usually been defensive rather than believing the victim/survivor ?	Not as far as I know. However, IICSA was very clear that this defensive approach needs to change. Training will need to address this issue too.

<p>I am the international leader of a Secular Institute. Previously we were advised that we did not need to have a Safeguarding set up of our own but that members should come under parishes /dioceses for our pastoral work in parish etc and under our employers for professional work. So far, no SI in the country has a Safeguarding set up. I have been increasingly uneasy about this.</p>	<p>We would be happy to talk to you in more detail about this particular circumstance. Both Elliott and IICSA are very clear that all need to take responsibility for Safeguarding very seriously.</p>
<p>How often do the Safeguarding leads meet in in a year?</p>	<p>Regular meetings for religious Safeguarding Leads will need to be set up.</p>
<p>So far none of the SI s have received complaints. As our members age I can foresee families making allegations that we have undue influence on decisions that members make. As chair of trustees for my Institute I need to set up a system.</p>	<p>We or RLSS can advise you on this in due course.</p>