

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING TUESDAY 22<sup>ND</sup> JULY 2014**

Agenda Item		
<p><b>1. Introduction &amp; Welcome, Apologies, Public Attendance noted</b></p>	<p><b>Present</b></p> <p>Mr Garry McKenna (Acting President            Mr Ciaran Hunter (Honorary Treasurer)            Mrs Helena Buchanan            Dr Anne Marie Telford            Professor Martin Bradley            Mr James Perry            Mr Paul Douglas <b>Items 1-10.1.d only</b>            Mr Mark Nelson            Mrs Brenda Maitland <b>Items 1-12 Only</b>            Mrs Marie Smith <b>Items 1-12 Only</b></p> <p><b>In Attendance</b></p> <p>Mr Trevor Patterson (Chief Executive)            Mr Brendan Kerr (Registrar)            Mrs Joan Duffy (Business Manager)            Mr Mark Neale (Head of Public Affairs)            Miss Michelle McCorry (Post Registration Lead)            Mrs Claire Williamson (Executive Assistant)</p>	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Dr Lisa Byers            Professor David Jones</p> <p><b>Public Attending</b></p>
	<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<p><b>Action/Supporting Information</b></p>

<b>1. Introduction &amp; Welcome, Apologies, Public Attendance Noted</b>	Apologies were noted for Dr Lisa Byers and Professor David Jones.	
<b>2.1 Minutes of Council</b>  <b>2.2 Approval of the minutes</b>  <b>2.3 Matters Arising</b>	<p>The minutes of the Council meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> May were accepted as a true record. Mrs Marie Smith requested her name was added to the attendee list.</p> <p>Council agreed the agenda addressed any outstanding actions.</p>	<b>Proposer: Mark Nelson</b> <b>Seconder: Marie Smith</b>
<b>3. Tabling of Any Other Business</b>  <b>3.1 Conflict of Interest</b>	<p>The Acting President tabled an item regarding staff appraisals.</p> <p>No member declared a conflict of interest.</p>	
<b>4. CEO Update</b>	<p>The CEO presented his report on recent activity and matters of interest that have taken place since the last Council meeting. A brief discussion took place and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CEO gave a brief overview of his written report and highlighted some areas of special interest to Council. He asked Council to note that the Law Commission Bill is not being taken forward in the next Parliamentary session however there are several work streams coming from it.</li> <li>• The CEO asked Council to note that the PSA initial Fitness to Practise proceedings audit was now complete and a draft response had been submitted to the PSA. The CEO informed Council that several other regulators have expressed concern regarding the overall approach from the PSA to audits.</li> <li>• Council enquired if other regulators such as the GMC would be minded to challenge the outcome of their own independent adjudication process. The CEO confirmed that the GMC have been frustrated by the decision of some of their panels. He confirmed that an independent national adjudication panel (OHPA) had been proposed by the Labour administration however the current</li> </ul>	

	<p>government decided to not take forward the plan. GMC had instead created the MPTS, an arm's length body with similar governance separation to our Pharmacy Forum. Other regulators have discussed the possibility of using MPTS to adjudicate for them but no commitments have been given.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Acting President informed Council he has recently attended the Regulator's Chair's Meeting and it was considered that an opportunity had now been missed with the Law Commission report not proceeding and any progress on it would be a considerable time away. He informed Council that we need assurance that any proposals that are UK wide are appropriate for us and reflect our needs.</li> <li>• Council agreed that the bar needs to be reset in relation to the PSAs Section 29 appeals and expressed some concerns about the outworking's and implications (especially cost) for some of the regulators of the proposal as drafted.</li> <li>• The CEO asked Council to note the information in their papers in relation to the proposed Private Members Bill from Jeffrey Lefroy and the letter from Nick Clarke proposing 3 draft changes to legislation in response to the Bill which refers to the Pharmaceutical Society NI 'larger role'.</li> <li>• Council briefly discussed the role of both regulatory and professional leadership. The Acting President informed Council he felt that the dual role was of benefit to both registrants and in terms of public safety as registrants have 100% membership of both.</li> <li>• Council discussed the implications and benefits of the proposed changes to the legislation and agreed that this is a sensible approach however they would like to have their larger role reflected in much more detail.</li> <li>• The CEO updated Council on recent discussions with DHSSPS on Council's ability to set output based registered pharmacy standards. There was now an opportunity for Council to have this power. Council discussed the sensitivity around premises style standards and the importance of consultation. The Acting President highlighted it was important that we learn from others as we are a small organisation it would be beneficial in terms of workload. Council briefly debated the practicalities of how this power would work, agreeing that the standards would be developed in consultation with others, including the inspectorate. Council</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>expressed their support to acquire this power.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CEO referred Council to the PSA FtP Audit and confirmed that some operational and some minor administrative issues had been raised however there is nothing contained in the report to suggest the public have not been fully protected. The main concerns were around a case which was not referred to the Scrutiny Committee and a health case that was. The CEO asked Council to note that an issue had also been raised regarding Pre-Registration students and this would be discussed in greater detail under agenda item 9.</li> <li>• The Registrar will draw up an action plan in response to the audit and this will be presented to the FtP committee before a final draft is presented at the September Council meeting for approval.</li> <li>• The CEO informed Council the tender for the IT review will be with the SMT by 23<sup>rd</sup> July and 3 companies will be approached and asked to tender for the work.</li> <li>• Council enquired if the tender process is open and transparent if 3 companies are being approached and the tender is not advertised to a wider audience. The CEO confirmed IT Consultants Unity IT had drawn up the list and had ensured the companies are competent to carry out the work that meets our requirements.</li> <li>• The Honorary Treasurer confirmed that all companies will be judged on quality and robustness not just cost, he informed Council an element of the budget had been allocated to the costs of the project from this year's budget.</li> </ul>	
<b>5. PSA</b>	<p>The CEO asked Council to note the amended timetable from the PSA regarding the submission for this year's report. Council were informed the new timetable now puts us in a position where we receive a final report in May and start gathering evidence in September for the following year's submission. The CEO asked Council to note that other regulators have feedback they are not content with this approach and this will be raised at the next Chief Executives Steering Group meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> July. The Chief Executive of the PSA Harry Cayton is expected to provide an update at this meeting on this and an overall review of the Performance Review process.</p>	

<p><b>6. Internal Audit</b></p>	<p>The Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee, Mr James Perry presented the final audit reports from ASM to Council along with the recommendations and the management responses. A brief discussion took place and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Chair informed Council the committee had met on 2<sup>nd</sup> July with Pauline Poots, Director of ASM, to review the final reports and they were content with the final reports. The Audit &amp; Risk committee will have oversight of the progress of the recommendations contained in each report.</li> <li>• The Acting President joined the Chair in commending the SMT, the Audit and Risk Committee and ASM on the work carried out to produce the reports. The Acting President confirmed he was content with the satisfactory level of assurance provided and informed Council that internal audit is a vital part of how Council conduct their business.</li> <li>• The Chair advised Council that they would be reviewing the schedule for audits in 2014 2015 in the light of the outcome of the review of the risk register and balanced scorecard</li> </ul>	
<p><b>7. Strategy</b></p>	<p>The Acting President gave a brief overview of the work that has been carried out so far to develop the Balanced Scorecard, Risk Register and Strategy for the year ahead. Council were asked to note that at two separate workshops the scorecard had been drawn up, 5 risks had been identified for the strategic risk register for Council; members had confirmed they were content with the 6 pillars of the strategies and the quadrants of the Balanced Scorecard had been debated. The CEO confirmed that he had made amendments to the Balanced Scorecard based on the discussions from the workshop on 2<sup>nd</sup> July and this was included in the meeting papers.</p> <p>The Acting President invited Council to give their views on whether the Balanced Scorecard as it currently stands is sufficiently good for further refinement or whether an additional workshop was required to debate the detail further. A brief discussion took place and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professor Bradley highlighted that our core function is protecting the public and he felt that this wasn't reflected well in the Balanced Scorecard. He also observed that there should be more focus on numbering the priorities in terms of importance.</li> <li>• It was also highlighted that the measures contained under the quadrant 'Learning and Growth' were light in comparison to the others. A request was made to define</li> </ul>	

	<p>the objectives under the Resources quadrant to provide more clarity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Acting President enquired if Council were content for the SMT to further refine the Balanced Scorecard and communicated the changes by email to Council so that a final draft can be presented at the Council meeting in September for final approval.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action Point:</b> The SMT agreed to make further amendments to the Balanced Scorecard (as per the discussion) within the next two and a half weeks and circulate by email to Council for feedback. Feedback needs to be received within one week in order for the document to be presented at the Chairs committee on 4<sup>th</sup> September and final approval at the Council meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> September.</p>	CEO/SMT
8. Rebalancing	<p>The CEO provided Council with an overview of the written report on Rebalancing he had provided in the papers and asked them to decide upon the issues raised in 2.5 to 2.8. A brief discussion took place and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Regulatory Policy Committee had been asked to carry out an impact assessment on the overall policy of Rebalancing. However they have 'red' flagged the transferring of powers and therefore separate impact assessments will now be carried out. The CEO informed Council that the Scottish Referendum will also delay the work and it has been advised to hold the consultation until after the referendum in September. This calls into question the ability to get the S60 Orders in place before the Westminster elections.</li> <li>The CEO highlighted points 2.5 to 2.8 in his report that have direct implications for Council. The CEO asked Council to note that this is taking a different approach to the previously envisaged joint work on the Review of the Code of Ethics. Rebalancing will need to become its own project but the timing for commencement is not clear. Council enquired if this could be an opportunity to look at behaviours. The CEO confirmed that the review of Code of Ethics will be sufficient for this and it was suggested that wherever possible the document be future proofed.</li> <li>The Acting President informed Council it was obvious that Rebalancing would not be completed now or any time in the near future and asked the CEO what can be sensibly done whilst waiting on the project to complete.</li> <li>The CEO asked Council to note appendix A of the report in relation to the registering of technicians. He confirmed that DHSSPS were minded to review the</li> </ul>	

	<p>registration of technicians again. Some Council members queried this and asked had Council not already expressed a strong interest to register technicians.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Acting President confirmed that this had been the case however as rebalancing and registration of technicians had been in correlation Council now needed to take a view whether they wished to open discussions with DHSSPS in the absence of the Rebalancing S60 vehicle to legislate.</li> <li>• Council confirmed they would like to begin discussions with DHSSPS and express their view for this necessity in terms of patient safety. Council noted that it would bring us in line with the rest of the UK and would be financially viable in the long run.</li> <li>• Council agreed to de-couple the review of the Code of Ethics from Rebalancing but with a view to future proofing where possible</li> </ul> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p><b>Action Point:</b> Council confirmed they would like to raise the matter of registering technicians with DHSSPSNI formally.</p> <p><b>Action point;</b> Wherever possible the documents in the Code of ethics should be future proofed to minimise further changes arising out of the registration of technicians or aspects of rebalancing</p> </div>	<p><b>CEO/Acting President</b></p> <p><b>Code of Ethics Task Group</b></p>
<p><b>9. Pre-Registration Fitness to Practise</b></p>	<p>The CEO provided an overview of an issue that had been raised regarding Pre-Registration students and Fitness to Practise processes by the PSA during their recent audit, having been identified as an issue by a Statutory Committee around the time of the PSA audit. A brief discussion took place and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CEO explained that the 1976 Pharmacy Order had previously contained Article 20 which dealt with FtP matters and which referred to a 'registered person' restricted to those on the pharmacist or druggist register, The CEO highlighted that terminology with regard to the legislation is important and informed Council that it had been assumed that the term 'registered person' was inclusive of pre-registration students because they are registered on the pre-reg register. An issue arises because our legislation was derived from the Pharmacy 2010 order for GPhC but we are unlike the GPhC who do not register their students. Para 20 (5) dealt with people applying to be on any part of the register, including students,</li> </ul>	

	<p>empowering the statutory committee to enquire into misconduct and adjudicate entry onto the register. Article 20 was repealed in the new amended Order 2012 and therefore the power to sanction someone applying to be on the Pre-Registration register was gone. This was an unforeseen consequence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CEO informed Council three pre-registration students had made self-declarations at the time of registering and the organisation was advised by their legal Counsel to register the students in order to be in a position, if deemed appropriate, to engage FtP processes. Council noted that this seems to have been poor advice.</li> <li>• Council were informed that the power to sanction students actually on the register was never there, even with the previous 1976 Order and this had been missed by the legal and staff teams.</li> <li>• The CEO confirmed that the student cases have all been rescinded. The PSA have been informed of these decisions.</li> <li>• The CEO informed Council that a decision would need to be made to deal with this both in the short and long term. He proposed dealing with the short term administratively by amending the internal document 'Procedures for initial education and training of pharmacists in Northern Ireland 2014' which had been presented to Council with the proposed changes tracked.</li> <li>• Council enquired if we have the power to amend the criteria to refuse entry to the pre-registration programme for individuals who make declarations at this time. The CEO confirmed that the current criteria are that a student must have a placement and tutor in place and we cannot refuse entry if they have both in place. The CEO referred Council to 3.3 of the document that specifically states students will give permission for the Pharmaceutical Society NI to disclose evidence to employers and other statutory bodies thereby allowing employers and tutors to determine fitness to be on the programme.</li> <li>• The CEO informed Council that this document would allow us to manage this situation in the short term as we do not have the power to apply a fit and proper person test to manage entry to the programme. Council agreed that these changes could be made to the document. However it was stressed that all employers and tutors should be notified ahead of the first induction courses for this year's programme.</li> <li>• A request was made that more detail was included in the document when referring to appeals to ensure there is total clarity around this issue.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CEO and the Acting President confirmed they would raise the matter of reinstating something similar to Article 20 (5) to the legislation with the Chief Pharmaceutical Officer at their next meeting.</li> <li>• The CEO confirmed that he has raised this matter with the CPO and he has undertaken to work with us and is sympathetic to our position.</li> <li>• Council agreed that any other discrepancies in the legislation would need to be identified immediately so that they can be addressed at the same time. The Acting President informed Council that a review may be required on how the organisation deals with legislation overall to ensure better quality control.</li> <li>• Council expressed concern that legal advice from Cleaver Fulton Rankin and Counsel was not correct in these cases and a substantial cost in terms of financial and staff resources had been lost. The Acting President agreed and confirmed that Cleaver Fulton Rankin will be invited to make proposals for compensation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Decision:</b> Council agreed to endorse the proposed changes to the document 'Procedures and for initial education and training of pharmacists in Northern Ireland 2014'.</p> <p><b>Action Point:</b> All employers and pre-registration tutors are to be informed of the changes to the document prior to the programme induction days</p> <p><b>Action Point:</b> The CEO agreed to seek legal advice from Counsel on the appeals procedure and incorporate their recommendations into the procedures</p> <p><b>Action Point:</b> Council agreed to invite Cleaver Fulton Rankin to make compensation proposals for cost expended in the relevant cases</p>	<p><b>Proposer: Martin Bradley</b>  <b>Seconder: Paul Douglas</b>  <b>Registrar</b>    <b>CEO</b>    <b>CEO</b></p>
--	---	---

<p><b>10. Committees of Council</b></p> <p><b>10. Motions/Specific actions to Council</b></p> <p><b>10.1</b></p>	<p>The Honorary Treasurer presented a motion to Council in relation to a proposed increase to retention fees. A brief discussion took place and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council were asked to note that the budget had been approved at their previous meeting in principle with an understanding that all sources of income would be reviewed. The Resources committee presented a recommendation for Council to consider; increasing fees over a three year period.</li> <li>• The Honorary Treasurer provided Council with a brief overview of increased costs in the past 2 years namely Fitness to Practise and Governance costs. Council were asked to note that the Resources Committee preferred option 2 on the paper which would have an initial uplift from £372 to £395, then 2.5% increase over each of the next two years.</li> <li>• The Honorary Treasurer discussed the deficit in the budget and informed Council that the increased costs in these areas are consistent and therefore he had adapted a multi-step approach to combat this and ensure the organisation is able to maintain a sufficient amount of reserves. Council were informed the HT is keen to get this project started in good time to enable any issues to be raised during the consultation period and allow registrants to attend the AGM in October to raise their concerns and therefore ensure the process is clear and transparent.</li> <li>• Dr Telford concurred that a fee increase was necessary however she highlighted that the fee increase was modest and enquired if it was an adequate rise. The HT confirmed that getting the balance between the two is challenging as it is difficult to push a bigger increase when there is almost £1 million in reserves currently.</li> <li>• Mrs Marie Smith highlighted that as there is a very wide range of the type of registrant, any increase will need to be totally transparent as some registrants are on very low incomes or struggling to find work while others employers reimburse their fees. It was highlighted that tax relief is available to registrants to claim back their fees and this should also be made transparent in the consultation document.</li> <li>• Mrs Brenda Maitland expressed concern that the new Council regime from 2012 had driven up costs and enquired if there was a business case presented during the time of legislative change to support the new regime. The HT confirmed that DHSSPSNI did not draw up a business plan when the legislation was changed and highlighted to Council there had not been a fee increase since 2009. Mrs</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>Maitland asked that the consultation document should be clear in demonstrating that every possible option to combat the deficit had been considered and exhausted and to highlight the benefit of the new regime to registrants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CEO asked Council to note that this is the right time to propose any increase as we now have a better understanding of the rising costs of Fitness to Practise and Governance. Some members expressed concern that registrants who have not or never will go through FTP proceedings will find the increase unfair.</li> <li>• The Acting President informed Council that this organisation has to bear all FTP costs no matter how many registrants go through and it is a matter for public safety in doing so. He confirmed we have spent approximately £140k in the last year on proceedings and this spend could not continue without reviewing the organisation's main source of income.</li> <li>• The HT confirmed that the Resources committee had recommended option 2 as it is expected that inflation will rise by 2.5% and will be in line with this but is still below RPI. Some members of Council requested that a business case was presented to detail these reasons at the next meeting in September prior to agreeing a consultation document for release.</li> </ul> <div data-bbox="562 844 1715 1051" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>MOTION:</b> Council agreed to approve the second option detailed in the fees analysis paper as recommended by the Resources Committee subject to a satisfactory business case presented at the September Council meeting</p> <p><b>Action Point:</b> The EA will issue the benchmarking exercise to all Council members</p> </div> <p>The Chair of the Corporate Communications Committee asked Council to consider the proposal to host the Regulators Healthcare event next year. She provided a brief overview of this year's event held at Parliament Buildings on 11<sup>th</sup> June and informed Council it had been a very successful and useful event for both staff and Council members. She asked Council to note that the overall cost would be approximately £900 to host the event and this is subject to all the regulators agreeing that the event should be held again in 2015.</p>	<p><b>Proposer:</b> Ciaran Hunter  <b>Seconder:</b> Anne Marie Telford</p> <p>EA</p>
--	---	--

	<p><b>MOTION:</b> Council agreed to host and fund the Regulators Healthcare event in 2015.</p> <p>The CEO outlined the changes to the existing MOU with the GPhC and informed Council this had been made following a review by the CEOs of both organisations.</p> <p><b>MOTION:</b> Council approved the MOU between the Pharmaceutical Society NI and GPhC</p> <p>The Registrar asked Council to approve the MOU between the Pharmaceutical Society NI and the Disclosure and Barring Service NI (Sharing Information).</p> <p>The CEO asked Council to approve the Threshold Criteria recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee. The CEO gave a brief overview of the background and explained the Scrutiny Committee were concerned there was a lack of provision in the criteria for matters of Professionalism, or behaviours within and outside practice. The recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee would allow them to process any future concerns.</p> <p><b>MOTION:</b> Council agreed to the amendments to the Threshold Criteria as per the recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee</p>	<p><b>Proposer: Helena Buchanan</b> <b>Seconder: Martin Bradley</b></p> <p><b>Proposer: Helena Buchanan</b> <b>Seconder: Martin Bradley</b></p> <p><b>Proposer: Anne Marie Telford</b> <b>Seconder: Marie Smith</b></p>
--	--	---

	<p>Council were asked to permit the Registrar to remove registrant for non-payment of fees on 1<sup>st</sup> September.</p> <p><b>MOTION:</b> Council permitted the Registrar to remove those registrants who have not paid their retention fees on 1<sup>st</sup> September</p>	<p><b>Proposer: Helena Buchanan</b>  <b>Seconder: Martin Bradley</b></p>
<p><b>10.1.2 For Council Consideration</b></p>	<p>The Chair of the ESR committee providing Council with a verbal update on the work being carried out by the committee on the review of the Code of Ethics and Continuing Fitness to Practise. A brief discussion took place and the following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to the review of the Code of Ethics Council were asked to note that a draft has been sent to the task group and the revision takes into account all types of registrants. The task group will meet again to discuss the amendments and further update can be provided at the next Council meeting.</li> <li>• CFtP will now incorporate the PSA approach and will base it around the 6 PSA principles. The Chair asked Council to note that the amendments made by the ESR committee were to ensure that the timelines are realistic and that CFtP is workable and affordable for this organisation, a further update will be provided at the next Council meeting.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair of the Corporate Communications committee provided Council with a brief overview of the pre-consultation engagement that was carried out as part of the review of the Code of Ethics. The Chair asked Council to note the feedback received from participants was very positive and this is in line with the response to the Berwick reports and that this work is key to consultation work.</p> <p>Council were also asked to note the preliminary report of CPD communication included in their meeting papers and the Chair confirmed there had been an excellent response to the submission date and further work would be carried out once an assessment could be made to the quality of the portfolios submitted.</p> <p>The Chair asked Council to note that the Communications Strategy review had been delayed until the Balanced Scorecard is agreed by Council.</p>	

<b>10.2 Corporate Communications Committee</b>  <b>10.2.1 Key action points from last meeting</b>	<p>The key decisions and action points were provided for Information only. Full committee minutes were provided on the website in advance of the Council meeting.</p>	
<b>10.3 Resources Committee</b>  <b>10.3.1 Key action points from last meeting</b>	<p>This committee has not formally met since the last Council meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> May and there are no minutes or action points to provide.</p>	
<b>10.4 Education, Standards and Registration Committee</b>  <b>10.4.1 Key action points and decisions from last meeting</b>	<p>The key decisions and action points were provided for Information only. Full committee minutes were provided on the website in advance of the Council meeting.</p>	
<b>10.4.2 Pre-Registration Tutors</b>	<p>Council were asked to note the papers for information.</p>	
<b>10.4.3 GPhC Standards</b>	<p>Council were asked to note the papers for information.</p>	
<b>10.5 Fitness to Practise</b> <b>10.5.1 Key action points and decisions from last meeting</b>	<p>This committee has not met since the last Council meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> May and there are no minutes or action points to provide.</p>	
<b>10.6 Audit and Risk Committee</b>  <b>10.6.1 Key action points and decisions from last meeting</b>	<p>The key decisions and action points were provided for Information only. Full committee minutes were provided on the website in advance of the Council meeting.</p>	
<b>10.7 Chairs Committee</b>  <b>10.7.1 Key action points and decisions from last meeting</b>	<p>The key decisions and action points were provided for Information only. Full committee minutes were provided on the website in advance of the Council meeting.</p>	

<b>11. Staff Reports</b> <b>11.1.1 Pharmacy Forum Report</b>	<p>Council were asked to note the report from the Pharmacy Forum Manager for information. Council confirmed they were pleased to see the Balanced Scorecard from the PF and commended the level of detail provided.</p>	
<b>12. Correspondence Log</b>	<p>Council were asked to note the enclosed correspondence for information.</p> <p>Council discussed the email from Kieran McAteer regarding language testing and would confirm they would like to be included in any proposed legislation.</p> <div data-bbox="562 539 1715 612" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <p><b>Action Point:</b> Council agreed to pass the invite to FIP to the Pharmacy Forum as it was felt this would be more appropriate</p> </div>	EA
<b>13. Recent and Coming Events</b>	None	
<b>14. AOB</b>	<p>The Acting President confirmed that in line with the recent BDO review regarding staff salaries and appraisals work will begin soon to commence their recommendations. The appraisal system will start with the CEO and be filtered through the organisation.</p>	
<b>15. Date of next meeting</b>	<p>The next meeting date was confirmed for 15<sup>th</sup> September at 09.30am.</p> <p>The CEO informed Council that he has asked DHSSPSNI to inform us as soon as possible of all new appointees to Council in order that they can be invited to observe the next Council meeting if they wish.</p> <p><b><i>The meeting concluded at 1.30pm</i></b></p>	