

GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL

Minutes of the 216th Public meeting of Council held on Wednesday 11 November 2015 at 10:30 at 10 Old Bailey, London, EC4M 7NG

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

GOC attendees: Alistair Bridge, Marie Bunby (paragraph 8316 to 8338 only), Lisa Davis, Marcus Dye, Nicola Ebdon, Simon Greer, Lisa Harmshaw (minutes), Paul Johnston, Josephine Lloyd, Philippa Mann, Manori Izni-Muneer (paragraph 8316 to 8344 only), Samantha Peters and Batool Reza.

Welcome

8316. The Chair welcomed members, employees and members of the public to the 216th public meeting of Council.

Apologies

8317. There were no apologies for absence.

Declaration of members' interests

8318. The following declarations of interest were **noted**:
- Item 8, Continuing Education and Training (CET) Scheme: **Scott Mackie** declared his interest as a CET approver and provider. Council **agreed** that as the item did not require any decisions to be taken Scott would be permitted to remain in the meeting during the discussion; and
 - Item 14, Registrants' Fees Rules: **all registrant members of Council** declared their interest as a 'user as a trustee' for this item. Council **agreed** that the registrant members would be permitted to take part in this decision.

Minutes of the last meeting held on 29 July 2015

8319. Council **requested** an amendment to paragraph 8260 of the minutes to ensure they accurately reflected the discussion in relation to un-registered businesses. Council **delegated authority** to the Chair of Council to finalise and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2015. Subject to this amendment, Council **approved** the minutes.

Updated Actions – paper C41(15)

8320. Council **noted** the progress made on the actions in the paper.

Matters Arising

8321. In relation to paragraph 8300 of the minutes from the Council meeting held on 29 July 2015, Council **noted** that this action had been omitted from the 'updated actions' paper. Council were advised that legal advice had been sought as to whether the appointment of clinical advisers to the FTP Committee and Registration Appeals Committee could be delegated to the Chief Executive and Registrar and **noted** that the advice confirmed that such delegation was permitted. Given this, Council **agreed** to delegate such appointments to the Chief Executive and Registrar and **approved** the consequential amendment to the GOC Scheme of Delegation (part one), following which the Scheme would be published on the GOC website.

Chair's report – paper C42(15)

8322. Council **received** and **noted** a report from the Chair updating members on his activities since the Council meeting on 29 July 2015. Council:
- **noted** that Privy Council had approved the appointment of David Parkins as a registrant member of Council, to replace Rob Hogan who would step down as of 31 December 2015. Council **noted** that David would be appointed as of 15 March 2016, following his having stepped down from his appointment as President of the College of Optometrists;
 - **noted** that a GOC Selection Panel had recommended the appointment of two optometrist members to the Investigation Committee and that a formal announcement would be made in due course;
 - **noted** that a GOC Selection Panel had been unable to recommend the appointment of a dispensing optician to the Investigation Committee and that a further recruitment exercise would be undertaken in early 2016;
 - **noted** that the Chair of Council had appointed Council member Glenn Tomison to the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) as of 1 January 2016, to replace Rob Hogan; and
 - **agreed** to appoint David Parkins as a registrant member of Council to the Standards Committee as of 15 March 2016, at which point Glenn Tomison would step down from that role.

Chief Executive and Registrar's report – paper C43(15)

8323. Council **received** and **noted** the content of the Chief Executive and Registrar's report.
8324. Council **discussed** the Professional Standards Authority's (PSA) intention to review its processes for assessing performance of the regulators which they

PUBLIC

oversaw. Council **noted**:

- that the PSA had now completed its review of the performance review process and that the outcome of its consultation was expected shortly; and
- that it had yet to fully understand how the new process would operate and what the impact on resources would be in relation to the transition to new data collection and reporting arrangements and in taking forward any learning opportunities which could result in the re-prioritisation of work.

8325. Council **congratulated** the Fitness to Practise Team for having achieved the closure of 22 per cent of FTP cases within 52 weeks, against a target of 20 per cent. Council **noted** that this was the first time this target had been achieved since it was set in April 2014. Council **agreed** that the Complaints Strategy project would further assist with achieving this target and **noted** that an internal review and consultation with employees involved in FTP had recently been concluded and that the consequential revised organisational structure to be implemented before the end of 2015 was expected to enable better end-to-end management of cases.

8326. In relation to the GOC's relocation to 10 Old Bailey, Council **noted** that all hearings were now being held at Old Bailey and that the organisation was expecting to fully relocate between Friday 27 and Monday 30 November 2015 subject to successful router testing. Council **extended their thanks** to all those involved in helping the GOC to relocate.

8327. In relation to the PSA paper '*Rethinking Regulation*', Council **discussed** how the GOC might contribute to the debate and:

- **noted** that the Chief Executive and Registrar would prepare a response to stimulate discussion on the issues raised in the paper;
- **noted** that, even though the paper contained no specific recommendations to be taken forward, collaboration with stakeholders and other regulators would be key to enhancing information sharing. In particular Council **welcomed** the appointment of David Parkins to Council in March 2016 who would bring a valuable insight as the Chair of the Clinical Council for Eye Health Commissioning;
- **requested** that, at a future Council meeting, it should consider how it might engage with other regulators and with NHS commissioners; and
- **noted** that there was an appetite amongst the regulators to collaborate but **recognised** that a barrier to achieving collaboration was the time and resources available to undertake additional work.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00am for two minutes silence on Armistice Day. The meeting reconvened at 11:02am.

STRATEGIC

Illegal Practice strategy: outcome of Code of Practice consultation

– paper C44(15)

8328. Council **received** a paper which provided an update on the development of the voluntary code of practice for online contact lens supply, which formed part of the implementation of the GOC illegal practice strategy. Council **noted** that:
- the consultation on the draft voluntary code closed in October 2015. Given that some of the consultation responses had raised issues which warranted further consideration, Council was not being asked to approve the code pending further work;
 - discussions to identify a suitable industry sponsor were positive and ongoing;
 - one of the respondents (Scottish Equity Partners) had initially wished their responses to the consultation to be anonymised but after seeing their anonymised response they had since changed their mind and had now requested that their name be published. Therefore, a revised version of the paper would be published after the Council meeting; and
 - that research with contact lens wearers had been commissioned in order to provide data on, for example, how frequently they had eye examinations and contact lens check-ups and the extent to which they received and followed advice on how to wear contact lenses safely. The findings would help to target consumer information and establish a benchmark upon which to evaluate the impact of the code of practice. The research involved focus groups with contact lens wearers in September 2015, with an online survey of over 2,000 UK contact lens wearers in October 2015. Council **noted** that the findings would be presented to Council at their next meeting in February 2016.
8329. Council **noted** the analysis of the responses to the consultation on the draft code of practice and:
- **welcomed** the number of responses received, which Council **considered** positively demonstrated the value of a full consultation;
 - **agreed** that more needed to be done to enable members of the public to contribute to such consultations. The Chair of Council **agreed** to raise as an issue at the next regulatory chairs' meeting;
 - **discussed** stakeholder engagement; and
 - **requested** the Executive to consult with the actors' trade union *Equity* to seek their views on the supply of zero-powered contact lenses and to understand their approach and any relevant advice that they provided to their members.

PUBLIC

8330. Council **considered** and **approved** a revised timescale for the planned further work on the code of practice which would include:
- a stakeholder group meeting in January 2016 to further review the outcome of consultation;
 - returning to Council in February 2016 to enable Council to further discuss the outcome of the consultation and the findings of the contact lens consumer research; and
 - publishing a statement on the outcome of the consultation in March 2016.

Standards strategic review: standards implementation – paper C45(15)

8331. Council **considered** a paper which provided an update on the progress in implementing the new standards of practice for optometrists and dispensing opticians and standards for optical students. Council **noted**:
- the activity undertaken since the last Council meeting as detailed in the paper;
 - that supplementary material (such as guidance and case studies to help registrants understand how some of the standards applied in an optical context) on the areas of consent, care and compassion, candour and the legal requirements that registrants must satisfy, was being developed. Council **noted** that the Standards Committee Working Group would meet on 13 November 2015 to discuss the guidance further;
 - that the Indicative Sanctions Guidance (ISG) would need to be revised to reflect the new standards, and was particularly relevant in respect of the standards relating to obtaining consent, safeguarding and whistleblowing and also reflecting the additional specifically defined standard relating to candour. Council **noted** that the Standards Committee Working Group would also consider this guidance at their meeting on 13 November 2015 particularly in relation to the level to which it could be contextualised for the optical profession;
 - the intention to consult on the revised ISG and that a workshop on the revised ISG had been included in the FTP training agenda on 25 November 2015 in order to garner the views of the panel. Council **noted** that the consultation document would be presented at the Council meeting in February 2016, following consideration by the Standards and Education Committees in January 2016; and
 - the views of the Companies, Standards and Education Committees which had been factored into implementation work, together with the current iteration of the implementation plan.

Continuing Education and Training (CET) Scheme – paper C46(15)

8332. Council **received** a paper, which provided an update on the progress registrants were making towards completing their CET as part of the current

PUBLIC

CET cycle, an explanation of the process for the end of the current three-year CET cycle and the changes which would take place from the beginning of the new three-year CET cycle from 1 January 2016. It was **noted** that this was a key priority for the organisation, and as such a cross organisational team approach was been taken to ensure delivery.

8333. In relation to the current three-year cycle, Council **noted**:

- that since the paper had been finalised, 15,457 registrants (73 per cent of the Register) had completed their CET requirement for the three-year cycle and 5,649 were outstanding. There were no current concerns with the numbers outstanding which were comparable to previous cycles, and would likely result in a group of around 800 registrants not completing their CET requirements. Of the registrants not completing their CET, around 200 had indicated that they wished to be removed from the register;
- that written communication had been sent to those with CET requirements outstanding advising them of the need to meet their requirements by 31 December 2015, or risk removal from the Register as a result of insufficient CET, unless exceptional circumstances could be demonstrated;
- there would be no automatic period available to make up the shortfall, as allowed in previous cycles, and again, this had been communicated to registrants;
- those who were removed from the Register as a result of insufficient CET would have the opportunity to appeal;
- in order to be restored to the Register registrants would generally be required to make up the shortfall in CET points from the 2013-15 cycle and undertake a further 12 CET points of which 50 per cent would need to be interactive, and meet all relevant competencies. In addition optometrists and those on the specialist register would need to undertake one peer review; and
- a full evaluation of the 2013-2015 cycle and any lessons learnt would be undertaken once the cycle was complete and this would involve engagement with stakeholders to receive their feedback.

8334. Council **discussed** the update on the current three year cycle and:

- **were content** with how the CET scheme had evolved since its establishment eight years previously;
- **questioned** why there was no end date for those who wished to restore to the Register as a result of removal due to insufficient CET. The Executive confirmed that the GOC's legislation did not require restoration within a specified period as long as the criteria for restoring had been met;
- **welcomed** the update and the GOC's internal collaboration to ensure the

PUBLIC

end of the current cycle went smoothly, as well as ensuring appropriate communications with registrants and ensuring the GOC was properly prepared for the new cycle;

- **agreed** that it would be helpful for Council members to 'spread the word' about the current cycle ending and any new changes coming into effect, in order for registrants to then pass the message on to their colleagues;
- **thanked** the optical press for their various messages to registrants regarding the end of the current cycle; and
- **welcomed** the intention to undertake a comprehensive post-cycle evaluation and **suggested** that the following be included:
 - analysis of any linkages to those failing to undertake their CET and being involved in FTP proceedings;
 - whether length of registration was a factor in failing to comply with CET requirements;
 - whether the minimum of six CET points per year could be increased to 12 meaning that there would be fewer points to make up towards the end of the cycle; and
 - involve stakeholders in the evaluation, particularly members of the Education Committee.

8335. In relation to the new three-year cycle, Council **noted** that:

- there would be additional emphasis placed on registrants having a personal development plan and that they would be asked to define their scope of practice and set a learning goal for the first year, which would on this occasion be automatically set in relation to understanding the new standards of practice to come into effect by 1 April 2016. Council **noted** that even though the requirement to define their scope of practice was not included in legislation, it would assist registrants in planning their CET activities appropriately and **requested** that the definition of scope of practice would not be taken into account should they be subject to FTP proceedings. Council **requested** that the latter point be made clear to all registrants before the start of the new cycle;
- it was intended that registrants complete a reflection statement on each CET activity (this was previously only required for peer review);
- the criteria for distance learning had been revised; and
- changes to the approval system had been communicated to both approvers and providers of CET and we would take into account any feedback received in finalising the system changes.

8336. Council **discussed** the new three year cycle and:

- **agreed** that CET was an area which would benefit from a Council Champion which would be agreed outside of the meeting;
- **suggested** that for future cycles communication to registrants should be sent before the start of August in order to avoid the busy holiday period;

PUBLIC

- **welcomed** the planned communications with CET providers; and
- **noted** that CET was an area of concern to members of the Education Committee and **acknowledged** the benefit of re-establishing a CET advisory group which could be involved in the evaluation, lessons learnt and future improvements.

Optical Sector report – paper C47(15)

8337. Council **received** the draft report on optical sector developments and trends for their comments before finalisation and publication on the GOC website. Council **noted** that comments resulting from the draft considered by Council at the Strategy Day in September 2015 and from the statutory advisory committees were contained within the version presented.
8338. Council **discussed** the draft report and:
- **requested** incorporation of a preamble explaining why data on gender but on no other protected characteristics had been included and explaining that the GOC would report data on all protected characteristics once it was available;
 - **requested** an amendment to paragraph 17.5 to make it clear that smoking was linked to the development of dry (not wet) Age Related Macular Degeneration (AMD);
 - **requested** the inclusion of the use of PEK technology in developing countries in paragraph 64;
 - **suggested** that future reports should consider inverse care law (those who most need medical care are the least likely to receive it) and the impact on public protection; and
 - **requested** clarification on the data presented at 51.2 and 51.3 and whether the figures in 51.3 were combined to include optometrists and dispensing opticians.
8339. **Council approved** the report for publication, subject to the requested amendments above and **delegated authority** to the Chief Executive and Registrar to approve the final version of the report.

ASSURANCE

GOC annual report and financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2015 – paper C48(15)

8340. Council **received** the GOC annual report (including the FTP annual report) and financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2015. Council **noted** that the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) had considered the report at their meeting on 19 October 2015 and were content to recommend its approval to Council.

PUBLIC

8341. Council **requested**:

- an additional note at table six which detailed Council members' fees and expenses so that readers would understand that the expenses published only represented those which had been reimbursed to members and did not include costs incurred through the GOC travel and accommodation bookings systems; and
- that thought be given to how figures including costs incurred through the GOC travel and accommodation bookings systems might be reported for 2015/16 beyond the minimum reporting requirements.

8342. Council **noted** and **agreed** with the ARC recommendation that, when taken as a whole, the annual report for the year ended 31 March 2015 was fair, balanced and understandable and provided the necessary information to assess performance during 2014/15. As a result, Council **approved** the annual report for the year ended 31 March 2015 for signature by the Chair of Council before it was submitted to Privy Council.

8343. The Chair of Council **signed** the Letter of Representation for and on behalf of the GOC and Council **noted** the GOC Senior Management Letter of Representation.

Financial performance report: quarter two 2015/16 – paper C49(15)

8344. Council **received** a paper, which set out the quarter two (Q2) financial results for 2015/16. Council **noted** the main headlines which were:

- a surplus of £4,175k compared to the budget of £3,869k surplus which was a positive variance of £307k;
- the Q2 forecast data, which showed an estimated year end position of £151k surplus (£113k better than the budget) which was made up of £147k reduced income and £260k reduced expenses including identified savings made in a number of areas;
- the income performance indicator as green for Q2 meaning that actual income was very close to budget, differing by only one per cent;
- the expenditure performance indicator as red which was due to actual expenditure being below budget for the period ended 30 September 2015 (compared to the target of 5 per cent); and
- project expenditure amounting to £130k for the six months ended 30 September 2015 which was £115k lower than the budget as a result of the delayed implementation of the CRM system.

8345. Council **welcomed** the improved forecasting and phasing and **noted** the report.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 for lunch and reconvened at 13:20.

Performance and management information report: quarter two 2015/16 – paper C50(15)

8346. Council **received** the performance and management report for quarter two of 2015/16 which advised that that the GOC was currently meeting five of eight performance targets, and that one was within 3 per cent of the target and that it was the first time that the FTP target for closing cases within 52 weeks had been met.
8347. In discussion, Council:
- **questioned** whether the comparator of nine per cent employee turnover was realistic. Council **noted** that the nine per cent comparator would be considered by the Remuneration Committee at their next meeting in December 2015;
 - **questioned** how the effectiveness of the new in-house advocacy would be measured in relation to improving FTP performance. Council **noted** that financial savings were already apparent and that further consideration would be given to how the effectiveness of the role could be measured as part of the complaints strategy project;
 - **welcomed** that the introduction of case examiners had not led to a change in the referral rate, which indicated that consistency of decision making had been maintained through the change to the new FTP Rules;
 - **noted** that all the FTP performance targets would be considered as part of the complaints strategy project and **welcomed** the development of more appropriate indicators;
 - **questioned** whether the monitoring of protected characteristics would be embedded within CRM. Council **noted** that this would be implemented in phase 2 which would be delivered during 2017/18, and that interim measures would include monitoring via the registrants' survey or a separate monitoring exercise in quarter four 2015/16. Council **noted** the intention to present a diversity monitoring report to Council in February 2016;
 - **noted** that SMT were progressing the work to clarify the status of the various people working with the GOC (employees, members or contractors). Council **expressed** their desire for this work to be concluded as soon as possible;
 - **requested** benchmarking information and engagement with other healthcare regulators in relation to FTP complaints, to help understand how many concerns raised became full investigations and any other relevant trends; and
 - **noted** that there were mechanisms in place to change performance indicators and review performance targets mid-year if it was considered appropriate to do so.

PUBLIC

8348. Council **agreed** the targets for 2015/16 and **noted** that where there was ongoing project work these would be re-visited as required during the year.

OPERATIONAL

Draft 2016/17 business plan – paper C51(15)

8349. Council **received** the draft business plan for 2016/17 in advance of its approval by Council in February 2016. Council **considered** the draft business plan and:
- **requested** clarification of the resources allocated to delivering the programme and project work be built into ongoing planning which would assist Council in prioritisation decisions;
 - **recognised** the need to balance resources appropriately between delivering the GOC's public protection duties and regulatory reform and modernisation;
 - **indicated** that of the projects not currently included in the draft plan, the Education Strategic review was considered a priority due to the length of time it would take for the outcomes of the project to come into effect; and
 - **agreed** that all projects must underpin the current GOC strategic plan.
8350. Council **noted** the timeline for the further development of the 2016/17 business plan.

Draft 2016/17 budget and registrants fees – paper C52(15)

Draft 2016/17 budget

8351. Council **received** the draft budget for 2016/17, on the basis of which Council would be asked to set the registrant fees for 2016/17.
8352. In considering the draft budget, Council **noted** the assumptions on which the draft budget was based and the current areas of uncertainty which included the unknown amount of the PSA levy, the impact of performance related pay progression for employees and the caseload for FTP which was inherently uncertain meaning that legal fees remained a high risk cost area. Council also **noted** the inclusion of a contingency budget of £150k.
8353. In considering the budget and assumptions Council:
- **sought confirmation** from the Executive that there were no employees paid less than the London living wage, which was duly provided;
 - **noted** that the Executive intended to make every effort to maintain the capital from the sale of 41 Harley Street and only use the interest derived from it for as long as possible, ideally for 15 years, but **acknowledged** that this might need to be revisited in the context of longer term financial planning in order to ensure the GOC was capable of fully supporting its activities;

PUBLIC

- **noted** that the Council's reserves policy requirements were more than met and that if transfers were required between reserves this was permissible;
- **considered** whether it remained appropriate not to use the proceeds of the sale of the lease of 41 Harley Street and whether there were other cost efficiency savings to be made; and
- **questioned** whether £100k for further in-year resourcing would be sufficient, taking into account earlier discussions regarding workload and resources. The Executive advised that further consideration would be given to this prior to Council agreeing the final budget in February 2016.

8354. Having considered the draft assumptions which had been used to underpin the formulation of the draft budget and fee proposal, these were **agreed** by Council.

Registrants Fees for 2016/17

8355. Council **considered** a proposal to increase the fully qualified registrant fee by £10 from 1 April 2016, an increase of 3.2 per cent, that the fee for students be not increased, and that the low income fee discount be held at £100.

8356. In considering where to set the fee for 2016/17, Council **took into account**:

- the assumptions underpinning the 2016/17 budget and the need to build in an appropriate level of flexibility to ensure the GOC could operate adequately;
- the need to ensure sufficient resources to enable the GOC to continue to protect the public;
- Council's desire to implement longer-term financial planning to ensure future financial stability;
- the need to maintain pace at implementing work already underway such as the standards review project; and
- that, given that registrants' fees were the GOC's primary source of income, it was necessary when setting the fees to have regard to forecast resourcing, activity requirements and inflation.

8357. Council **agreed** to set registrants' fees at tariff two for 2016/17 and **requested** that the press release announcing the increase explain the factors which Council had taken into account when setting the fee. The Chair of Council **signed** the Fees Rules for 2016/17 on behalf of Council and **advised** that these would be published on the GOC website shortly.

8358. Council **noted** that, as part of longer term financial planning and the development of the next strategic plan, it would wish to further consider the fee structure including, amongst other questions, the factors to be taken into account when determining low income discounts (both the threshold and level of the fee), charging structures for bodies corporate, and the incremental costs of undertaking specific activities such as the processing of late

applications and the maintenance of specialty registers.

Raising concerns with the GOC (whistleblowing) policy – paper C53(15)

8359. Council **received** the draft policy on raising concerns with the GOC (whistleblowing), which applied to workers in the optical sector (employees, registrants, students/trainees and agency workers) to enable them to report concerns to the GOC under the protection of the Public Interest Disclosure Act, in our capacity as a prescribed person. Council **noted** that the policy did not apply to GOC employees and lay members and that a separate piece of work was being undertaken to review this policy.
8360. In considering the policy, Council:
- **requested** that as part of the consultation, work be undertaken to engage with students (via AOP student representatives) to understand barriers to whistleblowing and confusion between the GOC and University whistleblowing processes;
 - **noted** that the GOC standards included a duty on registrants to report whistleblowing concerns;
 - **welcomed** the thorough equality impact assessment and recommended an equality impact assessment be undertaken on other policy proposals made to Council;
 - **welcomed** the recognition in relation to differences in legislation between England and Northern Ireland;
 - **requested** clarification as to whether the Health Service Ombudsmen (HSO) were also 'prescribed persons' and what would happen to a complaint if it were received via this route. Council **noted** that the Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) were currently updating their list of 'prescribed persons' and that the GOC would check if the HSO was included. Council **noted** that the planned desk research would inform what would happen to concerns received via this route; and
 - **noted** and **agreed** with the comments made by the Audit and Risk Committee at their meeting on 19 October 2015 and noted their feedback had been incorporated into the policy in relation to further clarity regarding why anonymous complaints are discouraged and the inclusion of the production of example case studies to accompany the policy as part of the desk review.
8361. Council:
- **considered** and **approved** the proposal to consult on the policy for ten weeks and undertake research;
 - **considered** and **approved** the proposal to include enhanced information in our 2015/16 annual report on protected disclosures; and
 - **noted** the progress against the whistleblowing action plan.

PUBLIC

Gifts and Hospitality policy – paper C54(15)

8362. Council **considered** the gifts and hospitality policy which was presented for approval, following ARC's consideration of it at their last meeting on 19 October 2015.
8363. Council:
- **noted** the outcome of the trial of the G&H policy (held between 1 December 2014 and 21 August 2015), the comments from the Senior Management Team (SMT) held on 21 September 2015, the comments from the ARC meeting held on 19 October 2015 and the changes made to the policy as a result;
 - **approved** the G&H policy for publication (subject to one minor amendment on the gifts flowchart) and circulation to employees and members; and
 - **delegated authority** to the Chief Executive and Registrar to approve the amendment and determine the publication date of the register.

Council forward plan – paper C55(15)

8364. Council **noted** the forward plan of activity for the Council for the remainder of 2015/16 and 2016/17.

Any other business

8365. Council extended thanks to Rob Hogan who was attending his final Council meeting as a member after eight years' to service to the GOC.
8366. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 14:55pm.

Date and time of next meeting

8367. The next public meeting of Council would be held on **Wednesday 10 February 2016** at 10 Old Bailey, London, EC4M 7NG. The time of the meeting was to be confirmed.