

Public minutes of the meeting of the UKPHR Board held on Thursday 5 March 2026 via Teams at 11:00 hours

Present: Andrew Jones (AJ) (UKPHR Chair)
Jessica Lichtenstein (JL) (Chief Executive)
James Sandy (JS)
Marianne Coward (MC)
Linda Smith (LS)
Gill Jones (GJ) (Registrar)
David Evans (DE)
Duncan Vernon (DV)
Benjamin Humphrey (BH)
Ranjit Khutan (RK)
Rachel Flowers (RF)
Joanna Dowd (JD)
Chris Emmerson (CE) (Observer)
Lynn Butler (LB) (Observer)
Pavenpreet Johal (PJ) (Secretariat)

Apologies: Jenny Douglas

1. Welcome, apologies for absence and new declarations of interest

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were noted as above. There were no new declarations made.

2. Minutes of public Board meeting held on 26 November 2025

The public minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2025 were agreed as a true and accurate record with the removal of tracked changes.

ACTION	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
	JL	Update and publish the 26 November 2025 public Board minutes on website	ASAP

3. Actions and matters arising

JL reported that all actions were on track except for the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) report. She noted that comprehensive EDI data collection commenced during last summer's renewal cycle, when registrants were prompted to complete any missing information. An additional data collection exercise will take place during the forthcoming annual renewal to enhance coverage. Work is continuing with Fortesium to develop improved reporting mechanisms, transitioning from Power BI to a more sophisticated in-house system, which is expected to be available soon. Once implemented, this will enable the production of more detailed EDI reporting. JS raised the need to consider the impact of delays in data availability within the organisation's risk register, given the implications for forecasting and financial planning.

ACTION	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
	JL	Consider impact of quality and availability of data within the organisations Risk Register	Next ARRC

4. Governance forward planner – 2026

JL reported that the forward planner contained no unexpected items at this stage. She advised that the Board would receive substantial information on fitness to practise at its next meeting, noting that the Education and Standards Committee had been considering this area in detail and that work was progressing at pace, including new strands of work that had been on the organisation's work programme for some time. She further noted that other forthcoming items were cyclical in nature, including consideration and approval of the budget, potential staff pay awards, and further information on the ongoing practitioner standards review.

The Chair noted that the agreed Board strategy day did not appear on the forward planner as it fell outside routine Board business. He confirmed that the strategy day would take place on 16 April and asked members to note the date.

The Chair informed members that his term of office would have concluded by the time of the strategy day and that LS would lead the session with JL. He noted that he and Jenny Douglas, the other outgoing Board member, had been invited to attend the session as a guests.

5. For decision

a. SRbPA History & development of the route

The Chair introduced the item on the SRbPA route, explaining that it was brought to the Board to ensure members received sufficient information to inform subsequent discussion and decision-making on the related strategic risk that had been considered by the Audit and Risk Committee (ARRC) at their last meeting in January. In reviewing the ARRC minutes and their discussion of that risk, the Chair's attention had been drawn to several aspects of the route, including the number of applications being received, the nature of the portfolio route itself and the way in which applications were being processed.

The Chair noted that there is already strong and accessible information on the website for potential applicants, including the results of annual audits of the pre-application stage, which provide useful assurance about the route. He observed that updates had also been brought to the Board previously through the Chief Executive's reports but that the Board had not yet received this information in a single, consolidated context focused specifically on the SRbPA route to enable the Board to move on to a more informed discussion of the associated risks later on the agenda.

The Chair thanked JL for preparing the paper at pace and acknowledged that it had necessarily been produced quickly. The paper set out several initial discussion points and example areas for consideration and that further issues or requests for clarification might emerge through Board members questions and wider discussion. The Board was encouraged to raise any additional examples or points they felt were relevant so that these could be captured and addressed in future reporting.

The Chair drew attention to the fact that the item appeared under the "decision" section of the agenda. He clarified that the immediate decision required was not on the substance of the SRbPA route itself, but rather on how the Board wished to handle further information and assurance. He suggested that the Board might decide to receive more detailed information at a future Board meeting or to build further consideration of the route into the forthcoming strategy day, and that this item effectively opened the door for that next stage of scrutiny.

It was agreed that the discussion under this item would inform both the later consideration of the risk register and any request for further, more detailed information at a future Board meeting or at the Board strategy day.

b. SRbPA: Risks and mitigations

The Board received a further paper on SRbPA risk, following earlier scrutiny by the ARRC. JL reported that ARRC had reviewed the escalation of the risk to “red”, considered potential mitigations and scrutinised a business case for development of an e-portfolio, which requires specific funding but was judged appropriate in the context of a balanced budget and other organisational priorities for the coming year. She explained that the version presented to the Board included a more detailed table setting out short-, medium- and long-term mitigating actions, and invited questions, particularly from members not on ARRC.

JL highlighted that key issues for the Board’s discussion were: clarity about the nature and ownership of the risk; actions UKPHR itself could take to mitigate it; and further discussions needed with other organisations to address system-level aspects. She noted UKPHR’s strong track record with Fortesium and explained that the ARRC had felt a degree of urgency about progressing the e-portfolio because Fortesium was actively developing its portfolio functionality and had again offered UKPHR a significantly discounted arrangement in return for contributing to testing and development. This would reduce the likely cost to around £36,000 compared with a usual range of £50,000–£100,000 for similar systems, with the added benefit of working with a familiar supplier. She advised that Fortesium remained keen to begin work in the year ahead, was seeking clarity to plan its 2026 work programme, and was willing to offer flexible payment arrangements.

In discussion, Board members considered the nature and distribution of the risk. DE observed that while the risk was shared across the public health system, UKPHR appeared to bear a disproportionate reputational risk if delays or blockages in the SRbPA route created perceptions that the assessment process was not being well managed. The Chair agreed this concern but emphasised that if UKPHR was held reputationally responsible for a risk over which it did not have full control of the mitigating factors, the organisation would be placed in a difficult position. He stressed the need to distinguish between risks wholly within UKPHR’s control and those that were shared, and to work with partners where collective action was required.

BH questioned the extent to which the risk was currently material, noting that he was not aware of significant complaints about waiting times and that many applicants appeared to understand that the process was necessarily lengthy. He suggested that as long as UKPHR was transparent about current processing times through its communications and website, the risk might be manageable and proposed exploring whether an annual “window” model similar to the practitioner scheme could support better forward planning of SRbPA assessments. JL agreed and undertook to add enhanced direct communication with applicants and prospective applicants to the short-term mitigations, noting that UKPHR had already received some complaints about delays and that she had offered to speak to relevant networks in response.

The principal risk was recognised as reputational and closely linked to confidence in UKPHR as a regulator. Visible action and clear communication could strengthen confidence in the system. RF drew attention to the relatively small number of public health specialists using the UKPHR portfolio route compared with alternative routes in medicine and dentistry, highlighting the broader workforce and equity dimensions, particularly for multidisciplinary professionals across the four nations. She suggested there was a need for targeted communication with other regulators and bodies such as the Association of Directors of Public Health to address misconceptions and ensure the route was understood and supported across the system.

LS proposed that UKPHR consider developing formal standards for assessors, comparable to those used by some statutory regulators, to underpin employer expectations about the time and support required for assessors to perform their role to the required standard. The Chair agreed this should be incorporated into the mitigation plans, noting that reciprocal assessment arrangements across regions and countries would also be necessary to avoid conflicts of interest and to share pressure on the assessor pool.

The Board discussed practical aspects of the risk, including assessment turnaround times and the sustainability of the assessor pool. GJ reported that the Registration Approvals Committee

(RAC) had recently discussed the significant variation in time required to assess different portfolios and the difficulty of defining precise time limits, given the impact of portfolio quality and structure. She stressed the importance of a robust pre-application stage to improve the quality of submissions and reduce unnecessary burden on assessors. On behalf of RAC, GJ thanked the Registration Panel, including specialist moderators and assessors for their ongoing work to ensure a robust and transparent process. JD suggested that dedicated resource, including possible funding, might be required to recruit and retain sufficient assessors to meet anticipated increases in application volumes.

MC highlighted the importance of considering neurodiversity within the Education and Standards Committee's work and suggested that additional time might need to be factored into portfolio assessment for some candidates, which could have implications for the risk and should be reflected in the risk register. RF, speaking from personal experience as a neurodivergent assessor, stressed the importance of maintaining equivalence with other specialist registration routes while recognising the practical challenges of lengthy and complex assessments. She proposed that UKPHR explore commissioning appraisers for semi-retired or retired public health professionals who wished to maintain registration but found it difficult to obtain appraisals, in return for a commitment to undertake a set number of assessments per year, thereby supporting both professional standards and expansion of the assessor pool.

The Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) funding referenced in the paper was queried. JL explained that the DHSC funding was intended to support approximately 50 individuals over three to five years with the drafting and submission of portfolios, with the tender due to be issued in April 2026. She noted that UKPHR had already provided input to the tender and had secured a requirement that any locally funded support provider must also be an assessor, which should enable an increase in the assessor pool, albeit with no direct funding flowing to UKPHR itself. She added that there was scope within the programme design for reciprocal regional arrangements and other indirect support to assessment capacity.

The Board also discussed the potential of the proposed e-portfolio system to address operational risks. It was confirmed that the e-portfolio would allow UKPHR to dictate navigation and structure, linking standards directly to evidence and replacing the current complex digital folder approach, which should significantly streamline both application and assessment. An evaluation of the impact of the e-portfolio on assessment efficiency had been built into the longer-term mitigations to test whether it improved quality of applications. RK noted that guidance already existed for assessors, including an indicative threshold (for example, six hours) beyond which assessors should consult moderators if a portfolio remained difficult to interpret, and agreed that a well-designed e-portfolio was likely to support more methodical and efficient assessment.

The Board also considered whether the e-portfolio would help address the time constraints faced by assessors. JL acknowledged that the system might not directly attract new assessors but could reduce attrition by making assessments less frustrating and time-consuming, thereby retaining trained assessors within the pool. The Chair underlined that, alongside the e-portfolio, UKPHR would need to consider actions such as clearer communication of expected processing times and volumes, development of assessor standards, and work with employers and partners to secure adequate time and support for assessors.

In drawing the discussion to a close, The Chair invited the Board to agree that the set of short-, medium- and long-term mitigations in the table be approved in principle, subject to revision to incorporate the Board's suggestions; and that, as a policy principle, UKPHR should proceed to develop an e-portfolio as a medium-term mitigation, with detailed procurement and funding arrangements to follow through the normal prioritisation and budget processes. The Board agreed these proposals in principle, subject to refinement of the mitigation table to: (1) add explicit timeframes (for example by quarter) for each mitigation; (2) identify lead responsibility and accountability for each mitigation, including where actions rested with partner organisations; (3) reflect potential costs and resource implications; (4) include enhanced communication with

applicants and stakeholders on processing times and expectations; (5) incorporate development of assessor standards and reciprocal cross-regional assessment arrangements; and (6) capture relevant system-wide issues, including neurodiversity, workforce equity and use of DHSC-funded support programmes.

It was agreed that JL would revise the mitigation table accordingly and circulate it to Board members for information, with the Board's approval enabling work to proceed on the agreed mitigations and partner engagement, and on the inclusion of the e-portfolio within the organisation's priorities for the coming year.

ACTION	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
	JL	Update the mitigation table in the report in line with recommendations and proceed to work on the agreed mitigations and partner engagement for the SRbPA route	ASAP

6. Setting fees for 2026/27

The Chair introduced the item on the setting of fees for 2026–27, emphasising that the decision on fees should be considered separately from earlier discussions on SRbPA risks and related matters. He noted that the ARRC had previously undertaken a detailed examination of the fee proposals and that the Board was now asked to reach a decision based on that scrutiny and the paper presented.

JL reminded members that the Board reviews fees annually and that, since the Covid-19 pandemic, the organisation's approach has been to apply small incremental uplifts each year, taking into account a range of factors set out in the paper. She confirmed that ARRC had carried out a deep dive into the proposals, including benchmarking against other regulators, and indicated that the Board discussion could therefore remain at a higher, strategic level. ARRC members present confirmed that there had been an appetite for uplifts, including a higher uplift for specialists than for practitioners, and a request to explore an uplift for SRbPA fees.

JL summarised the comparative analysis with other regulators, noting that UKPHR's specialist annual fees continued to lag behind those of the GMC and GDC, while practitioner fees were broadly in line with comparable regulators. On that basis, JL recommended a 5 per cent uplift to specialist annual fees and either a 2 per cent or 3 per cent uplift to practitioner annual fees, explaining that the difference between 2 per cent and 3 per cent for practitioners equated to only around £2 per registrant and less than £1,000 in total income, and was therefore unlikely to act as a deterrent. She also noted that specialty registrar fees had historically been set at practitioner level, but that technical limitations in the GoCardless payment system meant that, in practice, specialty registrars and practitioners could only be distinguished reliably by the amount paid, which might require a small differential in future.

In discussion, HF queried whether the proposed uplifts would be sufficient in the light of emerging geopolitical and economic uncertainty, including recent developments in the Middle East and the potential for rising costs. The Chair acknowledged this wider uncertainty but observed that it was not possible to plan precisely for such events and that the key requirement was to ensure clear and transparent communication of the rationale for any fee changes, including reference to relevant cost-of-living indicators such as the recently announced 3.3 per cent NHS Wales uplift.

Turning to the specific proposals, the Chair invited views on the recommended 5 per cent uplift for specialist annual fees and the 3 per cent uplift for practitioners and registrars. JL advised that, in the circumstances, a 3 per cent uplift for practitioner fees would be reasonable, remained below anticipated cost-of-living increases, and was consistent with the Board's longstanding intention to keep practitioner fees as affordable as possible. No member proposed an alternative percentage for specialists or practitioners, and no dissent was expressed. The Board therefore agreed a 5 per cent uplift to specialist annual fees and a 3 per cent uplift to

practitioner and speciality registrar (£2 higher than practitioner fees to allow distinction) annual fees for 2026–27.

The Board then considered SRbPA. JL reported that ARRC had debated whether to increase SRbPA fees in view of the escalated portfolio-related risk, the issues experienced with that route, and the potential cost of developing an e-portfolio. She noted that, while UKPHR's portfolio fees remained significantly below those charged by the GMC, the applicant groups were not directly comparable, as GMC portfolio applicants were all doctors, often already working overseas at consultant level, whereas most UKPHR portfolio applicants worked in the UK and were not yet employed as consultants and were therefore likely to be on lower salaries.

Modelling a portfolio fee uplift broadly in line with other proposed increases resulted in additional income amounting to only around £800, while the logistics of implementing changes under the current system were complex and labour-intensive. JL suggested that it might therefore be more proportionate not to uplift portfolio fees for 2026–27, but instead to plan for a more significant uplift in the following year.

JD agreed that an uplift in portfolio fees in the coming year could be problematic, given existing operational issues with the route and the work still required to improve processes, and recommended that any increase be deferred until a clearer improvement plan was in place. Regarding the substantial difference (around £700) between UKPHR's reassessment fee and the equivalent GMC charge, JL explained that UKPHR had only introduced reassessment fees in the previous year, having historically not charged for reassessments at all, and that the GMC itself had only recently moved away from requiring full resubmission of applications. She acknowledged that there was likely to be scope, on review next year, to increase reassessment fees, although the variability in the scale of reassessments (from very minor to highly intensive) made it more difficult to scope.

RF suggested, drawing on her recent experience of reassessment, that there might in future be opportunities to link cost and workforce measures by, for example, offering some form of fee discount to registrants who agreed to become assessors. The Chair noted the idea but advised that it should not be brought into the present decision-making on fees and could instead be considered as part of wider work on assessor recruitment and retention.

In concluding the discussion, the Chair noted that there had been no dissent to the suggestion not to uplift portfolio fees for 2026–27. He agreed with JL proposal that, for reasons of administrative efficiency and future flexibility, UKPHR should ensure that applicants pay the portfolio submission fee in force in the year of their application, rather than the fee applicable at pre-application stage. He stressed that this would avoid constraining future decisions on portfolio fees and should be reflected clearly in the guidance.

The Board:

- Agreed a 5 per cent uplift to specialist annual registration fees (£430) and a 3 per cent uplift to practitioner (£132) and registrar (£134 to distinguish between practitioner fees in financial systems) annual registration fees for 2026–27.
- Agreed not to uplift SRbPA fees for 2026–27, with a view to considering a more substantial uplift as part of the 2027–28 fee review, alongside improvements to portfolio processes and the potential introduction of an e-portfolio.
- Agreed that, applicants should pay the portfolio submission fee in force at the time of portfolio submission rather than the pre-application fee.

ACTION	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
	JL	Communicate and implement 2026/27 fees	ASAP

7. 2026/27 Priorities

The Chair introduced the item on the strategic priorities for the forthcoming year, noting that the priorities would be familiar to members but had been brought together in a single paper so that the Board could view them in the round. He explained that the proposed e-portfolio should now be considered in the context of all other priorities and the need to agree a coherent programme of work to underpin budget setting and delivery. He emphasised that the intention was to agree overall priorities for the year, rather than make ad hoc budget decisions on individual projects.

JL confirmed it was helpful to see how the agreed mitigations for the portfolio route risk aligned with the wider work plan for the coming year. She advised that the staff team will now break these priorities down into a detailed operational plan, with a planning session scheduled in the coming weeks and the resulting plan to be shared with the Board in due course. She highlighted one specific change for the Board's attention: a proposal to rebalance the approach to the annual practitioner conference.

JL reminded members that the Board had previously recommended alternating between in-person and virtual conferences but noted that in-person events were significantly more expensive. In light of other high-risk and high-priority areas requiring funding, she proposed that the next conference be delivered virtually rather than in-person. She stressed that this should not diminish the quality of the event and could, in fact, improve accessibility for those unable to travel. She added that the team remained committed to exploring hybrid models, but that viable options identified to date were considerably more expensive and not currently affordable within the budget. The proposal, therefore, was to deliver a virtual conference this year, incorporating lessons learned from the previous virtual event and placing greater emphasis on networking opportunities.

The Chair welcomed the clarity of the proposal and confirmed that one of the reasons he had declined to take Chair's action on this point previously was that it would have conflicted with an earlier Board recommendation on alternating formats. He considered it appropriate that the Board as a whole now review that position and make a collective decision. He underlined that practitioner registration remained the organisation's top priority and that the proposed change to conference format was intended to support, not detract from, that priority by allowing resources to be focused on high-impact areas.

HF asked whether management of reserves should feature more explicitly within the strategic priorities, noting that the organisation was drawing on reserves to fund certain activities and that it would be helpful to understand the impact on reserve levels. She suggested that protecting or rebuilding reserves might appropriately be framed as at least a medium-level priority, alongside the existing reference to maintaining financial discipline. JL agreed, and the Chair supported this suggestion, describing it as consistent with work already in train and with the Board's intention to return to a balanced budget position. He reminded members that reserves had been used in-year to meet unplanned costs associated with the office move and reiterated his view that the organisation should normally operate on a balanced-budget basis.

Subject to inclusion of an explicit reference to the management and protection of reserves within the strategic priorities, the Board agreed the strategic priorities for the coming year, including the decision to deliver the next practitioner conference as a virtual event. The Chair confirmed that these agreed priorities would form the framework within which the team would develop the detailed operational plan and balanced budget, and that resources should be allocated in line with the order of priorities endorsed by the Board.

ACTION	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
	JL	Update the 26-27 priorities to include management and protection of reserves	ASAP

ACTION	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
	JL	Confirm arrangements for a virtual 2026 practitioner conference	ASAP

8. Policy: Single Tender action

The Chair introduced a paper on the introduction of a single tender approval policy, noting that this represented an important strengthening of the organisation's governance framework where a specific gap had been identified. He explained that the policy had arisen from ARRC discussions on the rationale for proceeding with Fortesium as the preferred supplier for the proposed e-portfolio system without undertaking a full market tender exercise.

JL reported that indicative market research had shown that comparable e-portfolio products were typically priced in the range of £50,000–£100,000 or more, with additional financial and practical complications if a new vendor were selected. In the interests of good governance, she had therefore drafted a concise single tender approval policy to provide a formal basis for situations where there was one clearly appropriate route forward and seeking further quotes would not be in the charity's best interests. The policy was intended to support transparency, protect against conflicts of interest (for example, where a board member might be connected to a potential supplier), and reflect accepted good practice.

JL highlighted that under the draft policy any single tender decision with a value over £20,000 would require formal Board approval via a written paper, and she noted a drafting correction to ensure such decisions were explicitly reserved to the Board rather than the Chair. She also confirmed that she had applied the proposed policy framework in a short accompanying paper setting out a single-tender case for appointing Fortesium as supplier for the e-portfolio, covering contract value and duration, rationale, value for money (including the impact on staff resources during a period of maternity leave cover), and confirmation of the absence of conflicts of interest.

The thresholds in the draft single tender policy mirrored those already in the organisation's existing procurement and tendering policy and related to total contract value rather than reserves. JD suggested that, where reserves were low, additional oversight might be appropriate.

HF proposed including an explicit provision allowing the Chair to make an exception to the standard process in clearly defined emergency circumstances, while ensuring that higher-value commitments remained subject to full Board approval. She noted that similar arrangements operated in other regulatory bodies. The Chair agreed that emergency single-spend situations should be provided for, while stressing his intention not to place undue decision-making burden on the Chair for planned, high-value expenditure in a small organisation. It was agreed that HF would work with JL to draft an appropriate caveat covering emergency decisions for inclusion in the final policy text.

JS recommended that the policy also include clear definitions of roles and terminology, in particular to avoid any ambiguity between "Chair of the Register" and a chairing role at an individual meeting, and to ensure that references to "Chair's approval" were understood to apply only to the designated office-holder. DV suggested clarifying that the financial thresholds applied to total contract value (not annual spend) and that the policy should include review dates. HF further observed that the agreed thresholds and delegations would need to align with, and be reflected in, the organisation's developing scheme of delegation.

Subject to these amendments and clarifications, the Board agreed the introduction of a single tender approval policy as part of the organisation's governance framework. The Board then considered the accompanying single-tender proposal to appoint Fortesium as the supplier for the e-portfolio system under the newly agreed policy. JL confirmed that the proposal addressed all the elements required by the policy, including contract value and duration, the case for value for money, the benefits of working with an existing, trusted supplier who understood UKPHR's requirements, and the mitigation of staff resource pressures during the implementation phase. She reaffirmed that no conflicts of interest had been identified.

The Chair asked members to confirm that they were satisfied the policy and associated proposal provided adequate assurance around the use of single-tender actions. With no objections or abstentions raised, the Board unanimously approved the single tender approval policy in principle, subject to minor amendments to; (1) reserve decisions over £20,000 for Board

approval; (2) clarify that thresholds relate to total contract value; (3) add provision for clearly defined emergency decisions by the Chair and (4) include clear role definitions and review arrangements.

The Board also approved a single-tender award to Fortesium for the development of an SRbPA e-portfolio system, in accordance with the newly adopted policy and for the reasons set out in the supporting paper.

The Chair noted his relief that the decision had been taken collectively by the Board rather than under Chair's action, emphasising that this approach provided stronger collective ownership, governance and assurance, and would support any future emergency decisions that a successor Chair might need to make under the agreed policy framework.

9. To note

2026-2027 Financial forecast and draft budget

The Chair reminded members that the remaining financial items were for noting only and that the Board was not being asked to set the budget at this meeting. He confirmed that decisions taken earlier on priorities and specific initiatives would be incorporated into the draft budget ahead of formal approval at a future meeting.

JL presented a draft budget for 2026/27, explaining that its primary purpose was to demonstrate that a balanced budget could be achieved while delivering the strategic priorities agreed earlier on the agenda. She noted that the 2025/26 figures did not include one-off dilapidation and office-move costs, meaning that the positive net result shown for that year would not directly reflect the final outturn for the current financial year, which would be considered separately alongside the year-end accounts. She reported that forward projections prepared indicated an improving net result over the subsequent years as the financial benefits of the office move were realised, enabling a gradual and healthy replenishment of reserves.

JL highlighted key assumptions in the draft budget, including: increased projected expenditure for Registration Online (the Fortesium product), within which provision had been made for an SRbPA e-portfolio development; general cost-of-living uplifts, based on best estimates from past trends; and a modest allocation for web hosting and development. She indicated that the organisation did not expect to require significant external web development spend in the coming year due to the potential use of new AI-based tools to support website improvements in a cost-effective way. She also noted that the fee income forecasts in the draft were slightly below the levels implied by the fee uplifts (3% and 5%) agreed earlier, and that the budget would be re-forecast to reflect the Board's decisions before being brought back for approval.

JL stressed that this presentation was intended to give the Board a general picture ahead of a more detailed discussion when the final budget is presented for approval at the April meeting. HF welcomed the broadly positive trajectory and asked that future iterations show the reserves position alongside these projections so that the Board could see how long it would take to rebuild reserves on the basis of the current forecasts.

The Chair invited questions and comments on the draft budget. No further substantive issues were raised. The Board noted the draft 2026/27 budget and medium-term projections, including the intention to re-forecast for agreed fee uplifts and to present a final budget for approval at the April meeting.

ACTION	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
	JL	Update draft 26/27 budget in line with agreed 26/27 fees and present final budget in April	Next Board meeting

10. Office move update

PJ reported that the organisation had successfully completed its office move earlier in the week. The lease on the former premises at the McLaren Building ended on the day of the meeting, and all relocation activities had proceeded smoothly.

It was confirmed that a deed of dilapidation had been signed and returned to the landlord, and that, once countersigned, the organisation would have 14 days in which to settle the agreed amount. A refund was expected in respect of rent and service charges already paid for the full month of March. The registered address had been updated across relevant platforms and records, and staff were settling in well to the new office space.

The Chair thanked PJ and colleagues for their work in delivering the move and expressed the Board's hope that staff would be very happy in the new premises.

11. Q3 2025-26 accounts

Turning to the in-year position, JL presented the quarter 3 (2025/26) accounts, noting that the ARRC had already reviewed the same figures. To aid understanding, red/green variance indicators had been added to show areas of under- and over-spend and forecast variances. She reported that, while there were some minor variances at line level, the overall net variance was very small and broadly in line with expectations, providing reassurance that the organisation's approach to budgeting and financial management was operating effectively.

The Board noted the Q3 2025-26 accounts and the small net variance from budgeted figures.

12. Registration reports

The Board acknowledged work of the RP and RAC in previous agenda items and acknowledged the minutes of the RAC.

13. Audit, Risk and Remuneration Committee report – including Risk Register

The Chair invited DV as Chair of the ARRC, to highlight any items for escalation to the Board. DV confirmed that there were no additional matters to raise, noting that the key issues discussed by the Committee had already been covered during the course of the meeting.

The Chair observed that one of the red risks from the corporate risk register (relating to the e-portfolio) had been drawn out and considered in detail by the Board at this meeting. He recommended that the full risk register be brought to the April Board meeting to enable a broader review of all red-rated risks, including scrutiny of the mitigations for the new e-portfolio risk and ongoing oversight of other significant risks. The Board agreed that the updated risk register would be scheduled for consideration at the April meeting.

ACTION	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
	JL	Bring the organisational risk register to the next Board meeting for consideration	Next Board meeting

14. Education and Standards Committee report

The Board received and acknowledged the Education and Standards Committee minutes.

15. Minutes from private meeting of the Board on 26 November 2025

Discussed in private meeting

16. Chief Executive's report & diary

Discussed in private meeting

17. Any other business

Discussed in private meeting

18. Date, time and venue of next meeting

Action points from this meeting

ACTIONS	WHO	WHAT	BY WHEN
	JL	Update and publish the 26 November 2025 public Board minutes on website	ASAP
	JL	Consider impact of quality and availability of data within the organisations Risk Register	Next ARRC
	JL	Update the mitigation table in the report in line with recommendations and proceed to work on the agreed mitigations and partner engagement for the SRbPA route	ASAP
	JL	Communicate and implement 2026/27 fees	ASAP
	JL	Update the 26-27 priorities to include management and protection of reserves	ASAP
	JL	Confirm arrangements for a virtual 2026 practitioner conference	ASAP
	JL	Update draft 26/27 budget in line with agreed 26/27 fees and present final budget in April	Next meeting Board
	JL	Bring the organisational risk register to the next Board meeting for consideration	Next meeting Board

The Chair closed the meeting at 13.15 hours.