

GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL
Minutes of the 213th Public meeting of Council
held on 11 February 2015 at 11:30am in the Buckingham Room, De Vere West One,
9-10 Portland Place, London W1B 1PR

Present: Gareth Hadley (Chair), Paul Carroll, Brian Coulter, Peter Douglas, Rosie Glazebrook, Rob Hogan, Liam Kite, Scott Mackie, Fiona Peel, Helen Tilley, Glenn Tomison, and Selina Ullah.

GOC attendees: Alistair Bridge, Marie Bunby (paragraphs 8210 to 8213), Lisa Davis, Marcus Dye (paragraphs 8204 to 8209) Nicola Ebdon, Simon Grier, Josephine Lloyd, Nancy Mafico (taking the minutes) and Samantha Peters.

Other attendees: Hilary Tompsett, member of the GOC's Education Committee

Public gallery: Roger Goss, Patient Concern, Jo Mullin, Director of Policy, College of Optometrists, and Alan Tinger, Chairman Local Optical Councils' Support Unit (LOCSU)

Welcome

8155. The Chair welcomed members to the 213th public meeting of Council. The Chair extended a particular welcome to new Council members, Rosie Glazebrook (lay member) and Glenn Tomison (registrant member) as well as Lisa Davis, who was attending her first meeting since her appointment as Director of Fitness to Practise. He also welcomed Professor Hilary Tompsett, a recently appointed member of the Council's Education Committee, and members of the public, who he asked to introduce themselves.

Apologies

8156. No apologies were received.

Declaration of members' interests

8157. Item eight Council and committee member fees C06(15): all Council members declared an interest but were permitted to remain in the meeting during the discussion on this item. It was **noted** that Scott Mackie had an interest as a Continuing Education and Training (CET) Approver and that if Council were minded to discuss the remuneration of CET Approvers, he would be asked to leave the meeting for the duration of that discussion.

8158. There were no other declarations of interests.

Minutes of the 212th meeting held on 12 November 2014

8159. The minutes were **approved** as a true and accurate record.

Updated Actions – paper C01(15)

8160. Council **noted** the progress on the actions in the paper.

Matters Arising

8161. In relation to minute 8148, Council **noted** that the policy on using the local media to raise public awareness of Fitness to Practise (FTP) decisions had been implemented.

Chair's report – paper C02(15)

8162. Council **received** and **noted** a report from the Chair updating members on his activities since the Council meeting on 12 November 2014.

8163. Council **noted** that the Privy Council had approved Brian Coulter's reappointment as a Council member up to 31 March 2017 and that he had also been reappointed as the Senior Council Member by Council. Council also **noted** that, following James Kellock's appointment as a member of the FTP panel and his resignation as Chair of the Investigation Committee (IC), a vacancy had arisen for the Chair of that Committee which would be advertised in due course. The Chair informed Council that, with immediate effect, Lisa Gerson, a registrant member of the Investigation Committee had been appointed as interim chair of the Committee and would continue in the role until a permanent chair was appointed later in 2015.

Chief Executive and Registrar's report – paper C03(15)

8164. Council **received** and **noted** the content of the Chief Executive and Registrar's report.

8165. It was **noted** that the Department of Health's response to the proposed Professional Standards Authority's (PSA) levy had been published: the nature of the levy was expected to be announced during the week commencing 16 February 2015. The Chief Executive and Registrar reported that she had met with the General Secretary of the Association of British Dispensing Opticians (ABDO) and the Chief Executive of the Association of Optometrists (AOP) and that there was increasing collaboration with both these organisations.

8166. It was **noted** that, if the Law Commissions' Regulation of Health and Social

Care Professionals' Bill were not enacted, healthcare regulators would have the Private Members' Health and Social Care (Safety and Quality) Bill to fall back on with regard to regulating businesses. It was also **noted** that the Director of Strategy would be meeting with other regulators on 12 February 2015 to consider the position with regard to the implications of the Bill for the regulation of businesses.

8167. In relation to the level of employee turnover, Council **noted** that:

- three out of four leavers had cited career development or promotion as the reason for leaving;
- the Executive was reviewing job design and development opportunities;
- as a small organisation, the GOC provided fewer career development opportunities than could larger organisations;
- the Executive was planning to carry out an employee survey in Spring 2015; and
- the new performance related pay and reward framework would help keep turnover at an acceptable level.

8168. Council **commented** that, while pay was an important factor in employee retention, it was not the only determinant. Other relevant factors included working conditions and environment. Council also **commented** that the results of employee surveys should be taken into account in preparation of the business plan and in operational management more generally. Council **suggested** that the Executive consider identifying a more relevant benchmark for employee turnover rather than continuing to use the average level reported by the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD). It was **noted** that the assumption for turnover in the budget was not consistent with the current level of turnover or the current target, but that the Executive hoped that the actual rate would be closer to the budgeted rate of 25 per cent. Council **requested** that actual numbers of employees leaving be included in future performance reports and the Remuneration committee consider the issue of employee turnover and agree an appropriate benchmark.

8169. It was **noted** that the report on the public perceptions survey would be launched on 25 March 2015 at Friends House, London. Both Council members and members of the public present were **invited** to attend the launch.

Financial performance report quarter 2 (July to September 2014) – paper C04(15)

8170. Council **received** the financial performance report for the period ending 31 December 2014. It was **noted** there had been a steady increase in the level of income throughout the year resulting in a forecast annual income higher than budgeted. The increase was as a result of new registration income received throughout the year. It was **noted** that there was a predicted underspend in expenditure, which was mainly due to an underspend in fitness to practise (FTP) as a result of: changes in the mix of FTP cases; closer management of legal adviser contracts; there having been fewer hearing days than planned; and the reduced expenditure on legal advice and transcription services. An underspend of £40k was also noted in relation to training and development, as a programme of management development had been deferred. The increase in income and reduction in expenditure had yielded a forecast surplus of £780k.
8171. Although Council **recognised** that considerable progress had been made with improvements in financial control and particularly that there was greater transparency in reporting, it **expressed concern** about the size of the forecast surplus. Particularly, it **reaffirmed** that, in order to demonstrate more effective management of financial performance, it required the outturn to be considerably more closely aligned to the budget. Members expressed frustration with the uncertainty over costs, particularly in relation to FTP, which had resulted in surpluses and deficits each year and made it difficult to achieve budget. . It was **noted** with disappointment that the number of hearing days was considerably lower than the budgeted amount, but that performance in speeding up FTP cases still required improvement to meet the strategic objective. It was **noted** that the same number of FTP cases were being referred to hearings, despite an increase in the number of complaints received and investigations opened. It was **noted** that the Executive believed that the budgeted number of hearing days was not achievable and therefore the budget had been incorrectly set. It was felt 140 hearing days per year was more achievable with current resources and caseloads.
8172. Council **noted** the recommended plan to use the surplus at the year-end to increase the income and expenditure, strategic and special reserves. Council **expressed concern** that Phase 2 of the Customer Relations Management (CRM) system and implementation of the reward project would have been delayed without a top up of reserves at the year end. Council **requested assurance** that, given that it was difficult for Council to exercise oversight of costs not clearly included in the management accounts, the costs of projects

so funded from the strategic reserves were tightly controlled.,. Council **requested** that a report on the cost allocation for projects be brought to Council for consideration. Council **requested** that the Executive budget for projects included in the strategic plan rather than rely on an end of year surplus to pay for projects from reserves. Council **requested** that, when it next reviews the reserves policy, the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) give specific attention to the use of strategic reserves for projects and how they should be budgeted.

8173. The Executive advised Council that members had previously **requested** the Executive build an annual transfer to reserves into the budget but it had not yet been possible to action this request.
8174. Council **commented** that it was imperative that employees, and particularly managers, received training and support in relation to business and forward planning, budgeting and project management which were crucial areas required to achieve stable financial management. Council **noted** that the training budget would not be spent by the year end. It was **noted** that the Finance team would be working more closely with the FTP team to improve management of caseload and costs, as well as planning and performance. Council further **noted** that the processes would need to be in place for a full cycle in order to obtain useful management information.
8175. It was **requested** that Council receive a briefing on the FTP process as part of the programme of member development with a view to providing them with a greater understanding of the end-to-end FTP process and related costs. Amongst other things, Council wished to understand where delays to the process occurred and the impact of legal advisers on delays. Members also **requested** a briefing on the budgeting process. Council **requested** Selina Ullah, the Council Champion for member development to include these briefings in the plan for member development.

Performance Report: quarter 3 (October to December 2014) – paper C05(15)

8176. Council **received** and **noted** the quarterly performance report for quarter three, where the key challenges were improving the speed of dealing with FTP cases and high employee turnover. Council **noted** that the report would continue to be developed over time to ensure that the performance measures were relevant and the methodology appropriate.
8177. In relation to FTP performance, Council **noted** that:
- there had been a 53 percent increase in complaints received which was possibly due to a raised awareness of the FTP role of the GOC;

- a number of old cases had been concluded. As the number of cases concluded each month was small, this had a large effect on the performance indicator;
- the number of performance assessments ordered had increased but were taking a considerable time to process because of the small number of assessors available;
- third party involvement (seen in one third of cases) contributed to the delay in progressing cases;
- there had been significant change in the FTP team. This had necessitated an increase in the time allocated for training. Also, the team had started drafting allegations and case reports: the resultant change to process had taken some time to embed. While this had had an impact on the time taken to complete cases in the short term it should serve to improve performance in the longer term; and
- despite the increase in the caseload, the number of cases going through to the FTP hearing panel had remained consistent.

8178. Council **considered** the current FTP indicators and targets and **commented** that the target of completing the majority of FTP cases within 52 weeks was ambitious, but it **confirmed** that it was committed to achieving this over time. Members **commented** that, given that the median time taken to close FTP cases had not changed over the last six years, the target set represented a big challenge. It was necessary for the target to be underpinned by a plan with milestones against which improvements towards the objective could be monitored. Council also **suggested** that the methodology of calculating performance against the end-to-end indicator should be reviewed to ensure that it was appropriate. For example it was felt that it may not be appropriate to have a 52 week target for criminal cases or other cases subject to interim orders as often the ability to make progress was hindered by the requirements of external parties, such as by the need for police investigations to be completed. Members **noted** that the indicators and their methodology would be considered by Council at its annual Performance review day in June 2015. Council **requested** that the Executive identify the drivers behind the increase in complaints received, whether other health regulators were succeeding in closing cases within 52 weeks, and whether there were lessons to be learned from the methodology used by other regulators to calculate performance. Council wished to be kept informed of the steps being taken to develop more sophisticated measures. It was felt that the briefing on the FTP process requested in the previous item would be important to ensure members understood the drivers and what improvement in performance would be possible. Council **requested** that members spend time discussing FTP performance at the Council Performance Review Day in June 2015.

8179. In discussing FTP performance, Council **noted** the following actions which were being taken to improve performance:
- learning from other regulators;
 - improving the timescales and setting targets for panel law firms;
 - reviewing resource requirements of the FTP team;
 - early engagement with parties to ensure clarity and obtain appropriate legal and clinical input; and
 - profiling caseload to assess where the blockages causing delays were occurring to identify mitigating action.
8180. It was **requested** that the indicator used to measure performance of communications be reviewed.

Council and Committee member fees – paper C06(15)

8181. Council **considered** the recommended fees for Council and committee members for 2015/16. It was **noted** that all members recorded an interest as users and that no specific issues were indicated to be discussed in relation to CET approvers.
8182. Council **agreed** from 1 April 2015 to:
- increase the annual fee paid monthly to Council members from £12,000 to £13,000;
 - increase the annual fee paid monthly the Council Chair from £38,000 to £40,000;
 - increase the per meeting fee paid to the statutory advisory committee members and the independent committee members from £270 per day to £280; and
 - keep the daily fee for the Independent Assessor on selection campaigns at £400 as agreed in November 2014.
8183. It was also **agreed** that:
- no additional fee would be paid to Council members who were chairs of statutory or non-statutory advisory committees or who act as Council Champions at this time;
 - the fees for the Senior Council Member, chairs of the IC, members of the IC, FTP Chair, hearing panel members, education visitors and CET approvers would remain unchanged;
 - appraisal activity would not be remunerated for all Committee members and approvers, although expenses will be paid if necessary for this activity;
 - all fees would be reviewed in November 2015 (including the fixed fee for education visitors, the Investigations committee and the per

application fees for CET Approvers) and that thereafter fee reviews be undertaken on a three-year cycle, the next being in October 2018; and

- remuneration of Council and committee members should be kept broadly in line with the principles agreed in respect of employees. The Executive were asked consider how this might be achieved and implemented for the 2015 review of fees.

8184. In making its determination on Council and committee member fees, Council was **satisfied** that the fees were set at the appropriate level and had been benchmarked appropriately against other health care regulators and other bodies in the public sector.

2015/16 business plan – paper C07(15)

8185. Council **received** the 2015/16 business plan and **noted** that more work was needed to finalise it following some outstanding decisions by the SMT on resource requests and the internal audit plan. All managers had been able to engage in the development of the plan. Council **requested** that all the projects should be properly planned, with clear milestones, and adequately managed according to project management principles. Council further **requested** that the management and processing of corporate complaints be given a higher priority.

8186. Council **considered** the outcomes which had to be achieved in order to achieve the GOC's seven strategic objectives and the current and planned project and programme work for the duration of the strategic plan. Members **commented** that the 2014/15 and 2015/16 business plans did not include many projects to ensure achievement of the strategic objectives of improved complaints-handling and better service delivery and **recommended** the Executive to consider whether there should be new projects included to address the strategic objectives of improved complaints-handling and better service delivery.

8187. Council **considered** the areas of programme work which the SMT had proposed to postpone until 2016/17. Members **questioned** why "Business Planning – implementation of an organisational approach to planning" and "Project management – development and implementation of an organisational approach to project management" had been postponed. It was felt that these areas were integral to good financial management. It was **noted** that some progress had been made in both areas which needed to be embedded and that the organisation had limited capacity to embed further policies in these areas. Council **suggested** using additional resource to deliver these areas of work earlier than 2015/16, but the Chief Executive and Registrar commented that, even if this were possible, the organisation did not

have the capacity to embed the work. Members also **questioned** why “Complaints - progression of the review of corporate and member complaints processes” had been postponed as it was a key element of achieving the strategic objective of improved complaints-handling and current processes were very out of date. It was **noted** that the Executive were looking to improve the processes for FTP complaints first, illegal practice complaints second and then corporate complaints which is why that aspect of the work had been scheduled for 2015/16. Council **requested** clarity on the approach to corporate complaints, how the priorities had been agreed and that the work be undertaken earlier in the strategic plan if possible. The Executive commented that the organisation had limited capacity to embed further policies in these areas in 2015/16.

8188. Council **considered** a number of areas of work which had been removed from the business plan until a resource business case had been agreed, which included work on: equality diversity and inclusion; information governance; whistleblowing and protected disclosures; corporate policies and procedures; and stakeholder agreements. Council **commented** that all these areas of work were essential and requested the Executive to give further consideration to including them in the business plan.
8189. Subject to consideration of the recommendations made, Council **approved** the 2015/16 business plan and the outcomes which had to be achieved in order to achieve the GOC’s seven strategic objectives. Council **delegated authority** to the Chief Executive and Registrar to finalise the plan for publication once consideration of resource business cases had been undertaken in March 2015 and the internal audit plan for 2015/16 finalised.

2015/16 budget – paper C08(15)

8190. Council **received** and **noted** the content of the final budget for 2015/16. It was **noted** the final budget included the effects of office relocation and the impact of renting accommodation as well as the treatment of the income from the disposal of 41 Harley Street.
8191. In relation to the assumptions on which the budget was set, Council **noted** that:
- the PSA had not yet announced its levy but this was budgeted for at £97k based on an assumption of £3.50 per registrant;
 - costs for FTP casework were not certain but these had been budgeted for in the business as usual budget;
 - future resourcing requirements had been assessed and specified in the budget where agreed;
 - the SMT would review and agree changes to resourcing on a quarterly

basis; and

- the largest year-on-year increase in the budget was in facilities which included rent and service charges.

8192. In relation to the disposal of 41 Harley Street and renting of office accommodation, Council **noted** that:

- work was required with investment advisers on the assumptions around the potential income which could be generated from the proceeds of the disposal of 41 Harley Street;
- discussions with the external auditor on the treatment of the disposal of 41 Harley Street and the income generated from the sale had begun;
- advice in relation to the disposal of 41 Harley Street had been taken and assurance given that there were no tax (capital gains or corporation) consequences relating to the disposal;
- clarification had been sought from the external auditor on the capitalising of the ten year lease;
- there could be tax implications to one aspect of the sale which would impact on the 2015/16 budget;
- the external auditor had given verbal assurance that there were no tax consequences in relation to taking up the new lease;
- the lease would be reviewed by tax advisers before signing to reassure Council that there would be no tax implications; and
- the tax advice would be provided in writing by the tax advisers.

8193. Council **requested** an analysis of the £905,051 relating to facilities included in the budget, clarifying rent and service charges. Council also **requested** that Council receive in May 2015 a new balance sheet with an explanation of the changes to the treatment of the items on the balance sheet arising from the property relocation, as part of long term financial planning.

8194. Council **commented** on the requirement to be clear how future increases in registrant fees were in the public benefit in a way which was meaningful for registrants.

8195. Council **endorsed** the intention to carry out longer term financial planning work and **agreed** the final budget assumptions and the final budget for 2015/16 (Annex 1 of the paper).

Reappointment of the external auditors for 2015/16– paper C09(15)

8196. Council **noted** that both the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) and the Executive were satisfied with the external auditors' (Hays McIntyre) performance and that the ARC had recommended that Hays McIntyre be reappointed for a further year.

8197. Council **noted** that:

- the ARC had carried out a review of the external auditors' performance and had recommended their reappointment for a further year; and
- the draft audit plan and audit fee would be presented to the ARC in April 2015 and Council would be asked to consider and agree the auditors' fee at its meeting to be held on 13 May 2015.

8198. Council **agreed** the reappointment of Hays McIntyre as external auditors for a further year.

Reserves policy – paper C10(15)

8199. Council **received and noted** the content of the paper on the Reserves policy. It was **noted** that the ARC had already scrutinised the policy with the exception of the special reserve. It was also **noted** that the proposed changes to the policy removed references to specific levels of reserve at a particular point in time and instead included parameters for their use. It was further **noted** that the changes would create a new investment reserve and continue the special reserve for a second year.

8200. Council **noted** that that the ARC would review the investment policy once the size of the investment fund resulting from the sale of 41 Harley Street was clear.

8201. Council **accepted** the ARC's recommendation that the Reserves Policy be modified in accordance with the suggested changes in the Revised Reserves policy (Annex 1 of the paper).

8202. Council **agreed** to:

- maintain the current target level for both the legal contingency and income and expenditure reserves; and
- set up the Investment Reserve for the purpose specified in the Revised Reserves policy (Annex 1 of the paper).

8203. Council **agreed** the Revised Reserves policy (Annex 1 of the paper) and **noted** that it would be adopted for use with effect from 1 April 2015.

Standards review project – paper C11(15)

8204. Council **received** a paper presenting the proposed draft structure for the new standards framework, the draft standards for optometrists and dispensing opticians and the draft standards for optical students. Members **noted** that the framework aimed to present the GOC and stakeholders' roles clearly and that the standards were intended to be standalone and flexible enough to

allow registrants to exercise professional judgement as well as take into account the differences between the devolved nations. Council **noted** that the GOC might need to produce supplementary material in certain circumstances and that the standards for businesses would be reviewed separately. It was **noted** that the standards framework and the standards had been informed by input obtained from the standards of other healthcare regulators, reviewing the outcomes of recent reviews into poor patient care, patient research and consulting staff, the GOC advisory committees, including the Standards Committee and the Council Champions for Standards. It was also **noted** that the GOC would consult on the standards with a wide range of stakeholders including patients, the public and registrants for 12 weeks from March 2015 to June 2015 and that the responses to the consultation would be presented to Council at its meeting to be held on 29 July 2015.

8205. During discussion, Council **noted** that:

- focus groups would be held with patients to test their expectations of optical professionals and the feedback would inform further development of the standards;
- the consultation would be through an online consultation form on the GOC website, supported by specific consultations activities such as focus groups, telephone interviews and meetings with key stakeholders. The consultation will be open to the public to respond and include questions on communications and accessibility;
- students were a specific stakeholder group in the consultation;
- the objective of the standards was to help develop the professions and raise standards;
- once the standards had been agreed, it would necessary for thought to be given to implications for the framing of FTP charges;
- some areas of practice, such as safeguarding, consent and complying with the law might require further guidance, and where there are differences in the four nations, the consultation would assess if supplementary materials was required;
- some optical professionals may need further support to meet safeguarding requirements as this would not have formed part of their initial training. This would be explored further during the implementation stage of the project;
- the language of the standards for the optical context would be considered during the consultation process to ensure they were clearly understood and that the terminology was not unnecessarily medicalised; and
- the standards would be published in Welsh.

8206. Council **commented** that:

- the standards review had been welcomed by stakeholders and was a good framework for consultation;
- it was important to ensure that the communications strategy for each stakeholder group was appropriate and relevant;
- the standards were comprehensive but embedding them into the current syllabus would be challenging for universities;
- it would be necessary to review the educational core competencies to ensure that professionalism is embedded so that newly qualified professionals would have both technical skills and interpersonal skills to interact with patients. This was already planned as part of the standards review;
- the safeguarding standard (Standard 11) needed to be implemented as training for all registrants;
- the standard on consent needed to be clearly understood and this could be explored through the consultation;
- the standards were in an appropriate form to be issued for consultation, but that those responding should be offered the opportunity to comment on the standards to ensure there were not any unintended consequences from the language used;
- the consultation should state that the main purpose of the standards is to raise standards; and
- consideration should be given to publishing the standards in hard copy format to ensure that all registrants had a copy to which they could readily refer.

8207. Council **discussed** what types of personal actions might constitute unprofessional behaviour and a registrant not meeting GOC standards. It was **concluded** that actions taken in the personal life of professionals could be as equally important in terms of professionalism as actions taken in their professional life. The GOC would need to consider both to determine whether a registrant was fit to practise. The need for guidance on this standard could be explored further during consultation.

8208. Council **approved**:

- the draft structure for the new standards framework for consultation;
- the draft standards for optometrists and dispensing opticians, for consultation, taking into account Council's comments; and
- the draft standards for optical students for consultation, taking into account Council's comments.

8209. Council **delegated authority** to the Chair and Chief Executive and Registrar to sign off the final versions of the draft standards reflecting Council's comments and of the consultation document that would be drafted to seek

stakeholder feedback.

Illegal practice strategy update- paper C12(15)

8210. Council **received** and **noted** the update on the illegal practice strategy. The stakeholder steering group on contact lens supply chaired by Rob Hogan, the Council Champion for the illegal practice strategy had met on 4 February 2015. It was **noted** that Rob Darracott, Pharmacy Voice Chief Executive, had shared how the pharmacy profession had approached the issue of online pharmacies. Professor Phil Morgan of Manchester University had presented the research on the risks associated with contact lenses. It was **noted** the current legal framework could not adequately address illegal practice and the illegal practice strategy had been designed to try and address the issues as far as possible on a proportionate basis.
8211. In discussion the following points were **noted**:
- the stakeholder working group, chaired by Richard Edwards, had met on 4 February 2015 and would develop a code of practice for online contact lens suppliers and advise on options for its implementation;
 - the potential for refraction to be carried out remotely, particularly by overseas companies added a new dimension to illegal practice and internet supply; and
 - if it was successful, the code of practice for online contact lens suppliers could be extended to online spectacle suppliers.

Revised EC Directive on Recognition of Professional Qualifications: update on implementation – paper C13(15)

8212. Council **received** an update on the implementation of the revised EC directive on recognition of professional qualifications and **noted** the issues raised in the update. The Head of Education and Standards informed the meeting that the UK government was working on transposing the directive into UK law, which would allow free movement of European professionals across Europe. Council **noted** that partial access could potentially allow EU professionals to practise aspects of their professions in the UK.
8213. It was **noted** that:
- the GOC would not have to change its processes unless and until it was required to grant partial access to anyone;
 - the Department of Health (DH) consultation on amendments to the healthcare regulators' legislation would probably take place in May/June 2015 which would afford more time for collaborative working with other regulators;
 - the European Commission (EC) was conducting a series of peer

reviews (mutual evaluation) whereby member states would evaluate their regulatory frameworks governing a range of professions, assess if the provisions were still required and develop an action plan;

- “Optician” was one of the six professions chosen to begin the process in 2014 and the Head of Standards and Education had attended the peer review in Brussels in November 2014;
- following the peer review exercise for Optician, the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) would prepare the action plan for UK; and
- BIS did not believe that any changes to the UK system of regulation for optician would be required.

Any other business

8214. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 15:55

Date and time of next meeting

8215. The next public meeting of Council would be held on **Wednesday 13 May 2015**, De Vere West One, 9-10 Portland Place, London W1B 1PR.