

# **National Review of the Representation and Support of Community Pharmacy Contractors in England**

## **Review Steering Group**

### **Notes of the meeting held on Thursday 24th February 2022**

**by Zoom and in-person, The Wesley Euston Hotel, London from 10:00am – 2:45pm**

**Members:** Peter Cattee (AIM), Sandeep Dhami (AIM), Sam Fisher (CCA), Tricia Kennerley (CCA), Adrian Price (CCA), Stephen Thomas (CCA), David Broome - online (independent), Mark Burdon (independent), Mike Hewitson – part meeting online (independent), Aneet Kapoor - online (independent)

**Others:** Sue Killen (Convenor) James Wood (Secretary)  
Zoe Long (PSNC Director of Communications & Public Affairs)  
Deep Sen Gupta (Programme Manager)  
Jamie Gilliam (Minutes)

#### **1. Welcome**

The convenor welcomed members of the Review Steering Group (RSG) to the meeting and outlined the objectives of the meeting which were to agree a way forward on the proposals and steer how the programme should proceed to conclusion.

#### **Apologies**

No apologies were received.

#### **2. Governance**

Members noted the background governance papers including the Terms of Reference and the RSG member personal specification and values. The convenor reflected on the role of RSG at this critical point: steering a programme to end up with proposals to put to contractors for decision for a sector wide change process.

#### **3. Notes of the last meeting and actions**

Outputs of the workshop meeting held on Monday 7th February had previously been circulated and no issues were raised.

#### **4. Programme update**

An update was provided on the status of the programme including critical dates and rebased timings to a contractor vote. It was recognised that the most significant risk facing the programme of work based on the last meeting was the inability to deliver a timely contractor proposal following the expectations set through the process, should the RSG not come to a consensus on substantive structural changes to the current systems for local and national representation at the meeting today, to allow sufficient time for proposals to be drafted and sense-checked with the sector.

At the last RSG meeting, the Independent Review recommendations had been revisited and worked through. There was widespread consensus around ways forward around 28/33 of the recommendations or the issues underpinning them.

#### **5. Programme steer**

*Outstanding questions*

The five recommendations from the Independent Review which still have issues across the sector were outlined (recommendations 4,12, 13,13,15). All have a critical path to implementation which start from the representative council and governing board.

The RSG explored options for significant structural change to national and local representative bodies. Whilst there was support for new governing structures, it was recognised differences remain across the sector on key principles that would be needed to underpin the changes and to flow through the substructure.

The discussion covered the outstanding questions: the basis of the composition of the council and board; the approach to appointments; and the relationship between board and council. All had been subject to significant analysis and discussion over the last few weeks.

- **Detailed role of the council and relationship with the board** – further detail had been provided and this was largely agreed.
- **Basis of the composition** – some parts of the sector wanted representation based on proportionality to contractor ownership in England, with a common approach across local and national structures. However, some parts of the sector were opposed to a move to proportionality. Extensive discussions took place to attempt to reach a consensus on achieving both proportionality and balance within the structure, however consensus could not be reached.

Four different options for a representative Board and Council structure were reviewed. These were put to a vote in order to ascertain support for taking forward, with the following results:

Option	Agreed	Not agreed
Proportional representation of all sectors (Council and Board)	6 (CCA, AIM)	4 (Ind)
Start with 50-50 balance on Board (as current PSNC) and a proportional Council, with a move to proportional Board to an agreed schedule	6 (CCA, AIM)	4 (Ind)
Balanced 50-50 Board (as current PSNC) along with proportional Council	6 (CCA, AIM)	4 (Ind)
No proportional representation, maintain 50-50 balance on CPE committee, but aim to reduce its size from current PSNC	10	0

Differences remained in principle on defining the independent segments of the sector based on the principle of size and contract ownership. In the circumstances, the option to maintain the proportions on CPE committee with an aim to reduce its size was the only one carried by unanimous vote. It was noted that this was a fallback position using existing, established and accepted governance structures

- **Method of appointment** – wide variety of views still exist, such as elected on size of contract; appointed by trade bodies; dual trade body and on basis of size; and status quo.

RSG members agreed that despite significant efforts there wasn't the required consensus needed on the principles that would need to underpin a move to new structures. The group concluded that that major structural changes to representation and support structures nationally will not be possible or realistic in the short-term, with a proviso to review following the implementation of RSG's proposals.

### *Way forward*

The RSG reflected that the programme needs to reach a conclusion to meet the commitments made to put proposals to contractors for a vote. Discussions shifted to the work of the last year to focus on the key areas of agreement, and to consider how else change could be implemented to improve and address the issues with the current system of representation and support. The broad options were noted as:

- a. Put proposals in full (if sufficient progress made)
- b. Put proposals with consensus and agree to continue discussions on 'in progress'
- c. Put proposals with consensus and park other items – move to implementation and consider a review
- d. Do not put proposals

RSG members reviewed a draft way forward document, prepared by the programme team and first circulated in early February. This explored options to address the broad issues in the Wright Review, in a more incremental and practically focused way, rather than relying on a full structural change. The detail behind each of the five areas was reviewed line by line by RSG members with builds and points of clarification captured in the live document.

There was support for progressing changes which solve issues where there is consensus, and it was agreed that:

- Proposals will need to work within existing established and accepted governance structures (with proposed reforms) to introduce changes ;
- A post-implementation review should be committed to – to provide an opportunity to review effectiveness of the changes and determine appetite for further changes after the implementation period of this step; and
- Following the vote, a “lessons learned” exercise would be conducted with RSG to review the process and journey of coming together to deliver the proposals to the sector.

The Convenor checked with each of the RSG members for support for the way forward and a commitment to discuss with the main parts of the sector over the coming weeks to test for broad support. There was unanimous agreement from RSG members present at the meeting.

**Action 1: JW/SK to follow up with Mike Hewitson (part meeting attendance)**

**Action 2: Programme team to further draft up proposals and overall structure based on discussions and circulate to RSG members for comment by early March, date to be confirmed**

**Action 3: RSG members agreed to meet with the trade bodies**

**Action 4: Programme team to continue with actions set out in the programme plan**

## **6. Programme next steps**

RSG members noted the papers and background slides outlining the proposal design, engagement plans, data and electronic voting.

## **7. AOB**

No items were raised.

**8. Date of next meeting**

31st March 2022, an additional meeting may need to be scheduled depending on availability.