

INSTITUTE AND FACULTY OF ACTUARIES

COUNCIL MEETING

MINUTES

18 March 2026, 09:00 – 16:30 GMT

19 March 2026, 09:00 – 12:30 GMT

Surgeons' Quarter, Edinburgh and by videoconference

Council Members Present:

Paul Sweeting (President and Chair)			
Nico Aspinall	Riekie Gordon	Hugh McNeill	David Shaffer
Oliver Bettis	Dermot Grenham (Day 2)	Kholeka Mdluli	Malcolm Slee
Akshay Dhand	Clara Hughes	Janet Moss	Peter Tompkins
Philip Doggart	Simon Jones	Mukami Njeru	Mark Williams
Matthew Edwards	Jyotsna Kaushik	Matthew Pearlman	Masimba Zata
Matthew Ford	Mohammad Khan	Melanie Puri (Day 2)	
Norbert Fullerton	Cathy Lyn	Alan Rae	

In Attendance:

Thomas Evans	Deputy Corporate Secretary
Paul Lewis	Chief Executive Officer
Ana Barco	Chief Membership Officer
Firouz Thompson	EA to the CEO, Board Chair and President
David Currie	Chair of IFoA Board (Day 1, up to item 4)
Sam Younger	Chair of the Regulatory Board (Day 1)
Anne Moore	Chief Operating Officer (Day 1, from item 5)
Emma Faulder	Director of Business Transformation (Day 1, from item 5)
Lisa Davidson	Director of People and Culture (Day 1, from item 5)
Sheila Kumar	IFoA Board member (Day 2, item 12)

Apologies:

Alex Waite (proxy to Paul Sweeting)

Katie Sokolowski

	CLOSED SESSION – Council members only
	The meeting commenced with a closed session.
1.	Welcome, apologies and declarations of interest
1.1	The President welcomed all present to the meeting, noting the apologies and proxies. No declarations of interest were declared.
2.	Key reports and updates
2.1	<u>IFoA Board Chair update</u> The Board Chair emphasised the importance of the meeting at what he described as a pivotal moment for the IFoA. Nearly two years into his tenure, he noted that the organisation is now well-positioned to accelerate transformation, having appointed a strong Board, a highly effective Chief Executive, and a fully established Executive Leadership Team. The recent March Board meeting was the first attended by the complete team and marks a significant milestone. He highlighted that organisational redesign will now progress rapidly and that the IFoA is ready to “motor” ahead with the Qualifications Initiative (QI) programme, the organisation’s most extensive transformation initiative, supported by rigorous planning and oversight from the Board, Audit and Risk Committee, and the Executive. He also noted continued delivery of existing exams during this

	transition. Finally, he confirmed Board approval of the 2026–29 strategy, corporate plan, and budget, and advised that contract extensions for three non-executive directors on the IFoA Board will soon come to Council for ratification.
2.2	<u>CEO update</u> The CEO reported strong progress on organisational design, confirming that the Executive Leadership Team is now fully in place and meeting to plan the next phase of organisational redesign. Legal services have been moved under the Chief Operating Officer to strengthen commercial and contract management processes, and a new Head of Governance will join at the end of April. REDACTED On exams, he highlighted encouraging increases in candidate entries and successful testing of the remote invigilation system. Market-trend analysis continues, including a fall in certain regions linked to tighter exam controls. He also mentioned rising access-arrangement requests and reduced employer support. REDACTED
2.3	In the following Q&A session, Council members raised a number of questions relating primarily to the IFoA's relationship with the AAE, organisational changes, research governance, member engagement platforms, and the evolving interaction between the Board and Council. REDACTED Questions were also raised about the purpose and functioning of the Research and Thought Leadership Committee (RTLTC), with some members noting that certain practice boards appear unaware of its work. The President pointed out that all practice boards have representatives on the RTLTC, with whom the boards will need to liaise. Clarification was sought on how the RTLTC intersects with other research structures, such as the Mortality Research Steering Committee, and how duplication or gaps will be avoided. In parallel, members questioned how the ongoing organisational redesign might affect practice board support and the wider coordination of research and thought-leadership activity. REDACTED Council also revisited the relationship between the Board and Council, seeking greater clarity on the division of responsibilities and how the two bodies should interact on decisions of strategic or member significance. Concerns were expressed about whether increased consultation might slow decision-making, and whether structured opportunities—such as observing each other's meetings—could strengthen mutual understanding and improve governance oversight. Additional questions addressed aspects of the strategic plan, including the need for clearer stretch measures for member retention and volunteer experience. Members also queried exam-related trends, such as the apparent rise in entries driven primarily by withdrawals and resits rather than new candidates. They asked whether sufficient analysis has been conducted to understand variations across different markets. Finally, clarification was sought on the meaning of “moving beyond traditional exams” in the context of new technology procurement, and whether the IFoA has sufficient clarity about future assessment models to avoid investing in a platform that may not meet long-term needs. An explanation of the term was given with the addition that it would not be currently possible given budgetary constraints.
3.	Regulatory and disciplinary deep dive
3.1	Council received an in-depth presentation on the IFoA's regulatory and disciplinary framework, led by the Chair of the Regulatory Board and supported by Council's representative to the Board. The session aimed to review the current structure, examine areas for improvement, and gather Council's views ahead of upcoming developments, including the renewal of the Memorandum of

	Understanding (MoU) with the FRC and the two-year post-implementation review of the disciplinary scheme. The Regulatory Board Chair outlined his early observations since taking up the role, noting that, while the IFoA remains a self-regulating profession, the broader public-interest environment requires a clear degree of regulatory independence. He emphasised the importance of strong engagement between the Regulatory Board and Council, and highlighted the value of recent volunteer input on regulatory materials—including the “regulatory grid,” which maps differential regulatory obligations across diverse categories of members. Council members welcomed the tool but encouraged further refinement to address complex career paths, emerging fields, and distinctions between technical and non-technical roles. Council raised questions around maintaining proportionality in regulation, avoiding unintended barriers to entry in newer actuarial fields, and ensuring that lessons from past contentious updates—such as the revisions to the Actuaries’ Code—are incorporated into future processes. There was broad agreement that clearer guidance may be needed on issues such as “speaking up,” to avoid ambiguity or over-reach in politically sensitive contexts. On the disciplinary framework, members noted that the new scheme has substantially reduced the volume of cases requiring full investigation, while still allowing for robust outcomes where appropriate. However, concerns were expressed about the separation between assessment-related misconduct and the main disciplinary process, particularly in cases involving deliberate examination cheating. Several Council members suggested that the most serious exam-related offences should be brought within the core disciplinary regime, given their implications for professional integrity. In discussing the relationship with the FRC, the Regulatory Board Chair reported that engagement remains constructive on supervisory matters, though discussions around technical standards are more challenging. He advised that the IFoA will seek clearer definition and boundaries within the MoU to prevent unnecessary expansion of the FRC’s remit, while maintaining a cooperative and value-adding relationship. Council members reflected on the UK’s unique position—where actuarial technical standards are set by an external regulator rather than the profession—and discussed the impact this has on proportionality, international members, and work undertaken outside traditional actuarial domains. Council also noted the importance of communicating regulatory developments clearly to members, including those in overseas markets, and of maintaining a balance between professional standards and the realities of varied employment contexts. The Regulatory Board Chair agreed to continue close engagement with Council, including through the established volunteer group, and welcomed ongoing input as the regulatory framework and disciplinary scheme continue to evolve.
4.	IFoA Foundation
4.1	Masimba Zata presented an update regarding the future direction, financial model, and operational structure of the IFoA Foundation. The paper and ensuing discussion revisited the foundation’s strategy after an in-depth conversation at the previous Council meeting, with emphasis on reducing the organisation’s dependency on IFoA resources while maintaining its charitable impact. A central element of the proposal is a request for £60,000 per year (index linked) from the IFoA over the next five years. This funding is intended to support the Foundation through a transition toward operational independence. Historically, the Foundation has relied heavily on IFoA’s internal services—including finance, audit, and marketing—which, while helpful, created an unsustainable level of indirect support for what is a relatively small charity. The new strategy seeks to remove or significantly reduce non-monetary support provided by the IFoA, replacing it with volunteer contributions and professional services procured only when required. Meanwhile, the Foundation will continue expanding its own recurring income streams—currently around £80,000 annually from corporate donors—and will work to diversify revenue further through individual gifts, legacies, and additional partnerships.

	The Foundation plans to prioritise low cost, high impact initiatives that do not overlap with IFoA activities. Examples include: • Partnerships such as “Metric Girls,” enabling outreach to tens of thousands of students for relatively low expenditure. • Creating digital content that can reach large audiences with minimal resource requirements. • Selective, strategically valuable events like the inaugural patrons’ dinner—useful for corporate engagement but recognised as resource intensive. The Foundation aims to become financially self-sufficient over time by building reserves steadily, though this will be gradual. The £60k request is therefore framed as a medium-term support mechanism during this transition. Council members offered broad support for the proposal but emphasised several areas requiring further clarification or strengthening before presentation to the IFoA Board: Members requested explicit statements of what will be different in 2–5 years—both in financial independence and strategic clarity. There is concern that its role is not well understood by IFoA members or clearly differentiated from other bodies such as the Worshipful Company of Actuaries. Awareness levels remain low, even among Council. Council encouraged closer scrutiny of the cost/benefit balance of different charitable activities, ensuring the Foundation concentrates on those with substantial reach relative to administrative burden. Members suggested exploring whether staffing could be based in lower cost countries. However, as a Scottish registered charity, the Foundation must consider regulatory and tax implications. The new Inclusion and Access Committee flagged the importance of aligning the Foundation’s work with broader professional outreach efforts (e.g., summer schools), ensuring a coherent approach. Masimba thanked Council for its support, noting its comments and requests to update the paper before presenting it to the IFoA Board for a decision on funding.
5.	QI briefing session
5.1	Following introductions to the new Executive Leadership Team, Council received a brief introduction to the Qualifications Initiative (QI) Project with Emma Faulder providing a comprehensive overview.
5.2	In the discussion that followed, Council’s questions coalesced into the following themes. 1. Engagement and Role of Practice Boards There was concern about insufficient engagement of practice boards in syllabus review and curriculum design with assurance sought that practice boards will be properly involved, consulted, and given adequate time to review material. Clarification was sought on how endorsements from practice boards will be recorded and how Council will be informed where alignment or red flags exist. There were also questions over practice boards’ role in shaping early-stage subjects, where ownership is less obviously aligned. 2. Curriculum Content, Learning Outcomes & Syllabus Development Requests were made for more transparency on curriculum development, learning outcomes, subject structure, and content depth. There was some concern about the presentation focussing

more heavily on systems rather than academic substance. Questions were raised about whether timelines for locking down learning outcomes, redesigning content, and developing materials are realistic. Council also asked about the balance between actuarial input and education specialists, and whether the right people will be making decisions on content. Further, Council wished to know how AI content will be incorporated and whether interim updates could be introduced earlier than the full redesign.

3. Project Timeline, Resourcing & Practical Feasibility

Several concerns were raised about the ambitious overall timeline for the programme, particularly in relation to the depth of work required to redesign the syllabus, create new learning content, and produce large banks of exam questions. Members questioned whether current resource planning adequately reflects the scale of the undertaking, noting the likely need for additional examiners, question setters, curriculum specialists, and other domain experts. These resourcing demands prompted queries about how the organisation will continue delivering business-as-usual exam activity while simultaneously running a major transformation programme. Council members sought reassurance that the organisation has sufficient bandwidth—both in staffing and external support—to manage these parallel demands effectively. They also invited consideration of whether a staged or phased implementation approach might mitigate operational risk and reduce pressure at critical points in the programme.

4. Technology, Systems Integration & Platform Risks

Questions were raised regarding the technological dependencies of the programme, including the risks associated with integrating multiple suppliers and the potential accumulation of technical debt. There was explicit concern about the need to avoid a repeat of past exam platform procurement failures, and Council asked for clarity on what safeguards and due-diligence processes are now in place. Members sought further detail on how the programme intends to ensure future-proofing, maintain system stability, and manage complex data migration requirements, alongside assessments of supplier capability and maturity. They also queried how the digital systems would support operational realities such as running multiple exam diets, delivering varied question sets, and ensuring robust integrity controls across global time zones.

5. Assessment Model, Exam Structure & Integrity

Council members highlighted fairness and integrity as core concerns for the new assessment model. They questioned how the organisation plans to address the challenges posed by global time zones, the reliance on single exam sittings versus staggered start times, and the heightened risk of cheating in digital or remote settings. In addition, they asked for more clarity on how many exam diets should be offered each year, how these should be sequenced, and whether the emerging model risks disadvantaging particular groups—such as candidates who balance study with caregiving responsibilities. There were also queries about the feasibility of using different question sets to uphold exam integrity and about whether the size and density of certain subjects create inequitable barriers to progression. Finally, members questioned whether the IFoA should explore more innovative or “radical” assessment approaches—for example, case-study-based examinations, alternative formats, or even adaptive learning technologies.

6. Governance, Oversight & Council’s Role

A number of questions focused on governance and the respective roles of Council and the delegated Board. Members asked for clearer guidance on which decisions appropriately sit with Council and which should fall to the Board, particularly where proposals involve substantial changes to the exam model or the syllabus structure. There was a strong emphasis on Council’s desire to ensure that the right people—with the appropriate expertise and mandate—are in decision-making roles, even if this means Council does not engage directly with detailed content. Ultimately, Council sought assurance that appropriate oversight mechanisms will be in place while avoiding duplication or unnecessary escalation.

7. Stakeholder Engagement: Employers, Universities & Members

	Council queried how the programme intends to gather, balance, and weigh input from a broad range of stakeholders, including employers, universities, newly qualified actuaries, examiners, and markers. Members stressed the importance of ensuring that international markets—many of which represent strategic growth opportunities—are engaged early and meaningfully. Questions were also raised about how exemptions will be managed in the redesigned qualification, including whether alignment with external bodies such as the CFA Institute will continue or evolve. 8. Budget, Costs & Financial Risk Management The absence of a fixed budget prompted questions about financial control and risk management. Some members expressed concern that without a defined cost envelope, the programme may be more vulnerable to scope creep or overspending. They also sought further information on the costs associated with technology integration and how these will be controlled. More broadly, Council asked how the programme intends to prevent cost overruns and ensure strong financial discipline while still retaining enough flexibility to make necessary strategic choices. 9. Communication, Change Management & Launch Planning Questions were also raised about the approach to communication and change management, given the scale of the proposed transformation. Members asked how major changes will be communicated in a timely and accessible manner to students, employers, universities, and other stakeholders. They also emphasised the need to prepare the entire ecosystem for transition, recognising that universities, tuition providers, and employers will require substantial lead time to adapt. Council encouraged the use of diverse communication formats—including podcasts, video content, and online resources—to reach different audiences effectively. Overall, there was a shared view that the sequencing of communications must be carefully managed to ensure clarity, minimise confusion, and build confidence throughout the transition.
5.3	The President thanked Emma Faulder for the presentation, ELT for their participation in the item and Council for its engagement.
6.	PIR Group update
6.1	Simon Jones introduced the item, noting that the PIR group is continuing its review of the effectiveness of the recent governance reforms, focusing on operational governance, delegation structures, and the balance of responsibilities between Council, the IFoA Board, and the Executive. Once the Group concludes its work and presents its recommendations, Council will have several possible routes forward. 1. Maintain the Current Governance Arrangements (Status Quo) A key option discussed is for Council to simply continue with the current arrangements if the review concludes they are functioning well in practice. • Several members noted that the reforms appear to be bedding in and operating effectively. • Under this option, no constitutional changes would be made, and therefore no member vote would be required. 2. Amend the Governance Structure Within Current Delegations (No Constitutional Change) Council could choose to adjust or refine: • Delegations • Boundaries between bodies • Committee responsibilities ...without altering the formal governing documents. This would avoid the complexity, cost, and risk associated with a member vote. 3. Proceed to Formal Constitutional Change (Requires Member Vote) If the PIR group concludes that: • Certain reforms require embedding in the Charter or Bye-laws

	• Or the current arrangements are not stable long-term under delegated authority ...then Council may need to initiate a formal constitutional amendment process, which would require: • Drafting changes to governing documents • Engaging with Privy Council • Managing associated communications and engagement This is the most resource-intensive option and must be considered carefully, given the potential to trigger member concern or resistance. 4. Reverse Some or All of the Previous Governance Reforms This option was explicitly noted: Council could decide to revert to pre-reform arrangements if the review concludes the current model is not effective. • This would also likely require constitutional changes and possibly a member vote. • It would represent a significant backward step and appears unlikely unless the review exposes serious issues. 5. Make Selective Rule Refreshes Without Full Structural Change Several smaller items (e.g., Scottish constituency provisions, term lengths, Council member liability) may require discrete rule changes, following the process outlined in #3 as required. Council may opt for a targeted update rather than wholesale reform.
6.2	No decisions were made on the possible options with Council waiting for the group to complete its work and report back in June 2026.
7.	Feedback framework
7.1	The discussion focused on improving the visibility and use of the Council email address as a channel for member feedback. It was noted that very few messages had been received, likely because members are not aware the address exists. Council agreed the email should be made more prominent across IFoA communications, including the website, Council page, post-meeting emails, conference materials, and potentially LinkedIn posts. As part of this, the website wording will be updated so enquiries are directed to the Council inbox rather than to individuals.
7.2	Council also discussed the need to appoint a new volunteer to monitor the inbox, as the initial six-month trial period had effectively ended. A Council member will be confirmed to take this on. Finally, members suggested expanding communication channels by profiling Council members more visibly, re-using existing email content in <i>The Actuary</i> magazine, and sharing updates through multiple platforms to increase engagement and awareness of Council activity. Action: Council
8.	Items for noting
8.1	Noted.
8.2	Regarding the Practice Board updates submitted for noting, there was a discussion which centred on concerns about the relationship between Council, Practice Boards (PBs), and volunteers, with several members highlighting a perceived gap between what PBs need and the level of engagement or direction they feel they receive from Council. An issue raised was volunteer dissatisfaction, particularly among some PB Chairs who felt their substantial effort in preparing materials and contributing to the PB system was met with minimal feedback or visible action. They were reported to have expressed frustration that Council had allocated a full day to PB matters previously, but follow-up had been limited, making them question whether their input was valued or impactful. Council members responded by emphasising that “items for noting” are intended for pre-reading and should not consume meeting time unless a decision is required. They stressed that Council does appreciate PB contributions but must avoid overloading agendas with items requiring no

	action. However, they acknowledged the need to improve communication, demonstrate interest more clearly, and avoid creating unnecessary bureaucracy. Members also highlighted the importance of improving executive support, bridging gaps in organisational communication, and ensuring PBs feel connected and aligned with strategy. There was agreement that some issues relate less to governance and more to missing “bridges”. There was recognition that further work is needed to strengthen PB–Council–Executive relationships, agreement that the upcoming PB session should explore these issues more deeply and confirmation that the executive is reviewing wider community and platform needs (REDACTED) and will communicate changes to PBs shortly.
End of Day 1.	
Day 2.	
9.	Welcome
9.1	The President welcomed all to Day 2 of Council’s meeting. He noted the Town Hall and Sessional events of the previous evening and thanked the Scottish Actuaries Club for its hospitality.
10.	Practice Boards
10.1	The President introduced this item noting that the paper focused on a comprehensive review of the IFoA’s Practice Boards (PBs), exploring their purpose, governance, funding, interaction with Council, and the support they require from the executive. The Chief Membership Officer, leading the review from the executive side, reiterated her desire for Council’s input on the six recommendations outlined in the paper. The ensuing discussion covered five main topics. 1. Funding Model Council agreed the current funding arrangements for Practice Boards are opaque and inconsistent. PBs access multiple uncoordinated budget pots, creating inequity and confusion. A more transparent, structured annual planning and budgeting process is required, with improved visibility of total spending. Council emphasised that any new process must avoid unnecessary bureaucracy and retain flexibility for mid-year needs. 2. Purpose, Scope & Governance Council members noted the need for clearer articulation of PB roles, scope, and governance. While PBs should retain autonomy, Council requires assurance that governance structures enable, rather than hinder, PB activity. Updated terms of reference and streamlined processes will be developed to support more consistent functioning. 3. Council Interface Council stressed the importance of maintaining oversight even when operational control is delegated. PB chairs should meet Council regularly (e.g. annually) to share issues, priorities, and concerns. Better two-way communication will ensure alignment between PB activity and IFoA strategy. 4. Research, Thought Leadership & Cross-PB Collaboration There is broad support for linking PB research efforts through the Research & Thought Leadership Committee (RTLCC), while recognising that PBs remain the primary source of technical expertise. Council emphasised improving dissemination of research, coordinating on cross-cutting themes

	(e.g. AI, pensions, sustainability), and ensuring executive support for promotion, policy influence, and events. 5. International Engagement Council identified a gap between the IFoA's international ambitions and the UK-centric nature of PBs. Suggestions included establishing regional PB structures or enabling local members (e.g. in Asia or Africa) to organise regional research and events. PBs need better support to incorporate international perspectives, particularly in cross-border areas such as AI, sustainability, and risk management.
10.2	Although Council was not asked to approve new policies, broad consensus was reached on the need for clearer structures, better budget visibility, improved research coordination, and strengthened international engagement. The executive will incorporate these insights into their six-month review and return to Council with developed proposals in September 2026. Action: Executive
11.	AIDSET Practice Board
11.1	Matthew Edwards introduced the item, taking the paper as read. Council was asked to and approved the change of name from AI, Data Science and Emerging Technology (AIDSET) to AI and Emerging Technology. Thanking Council, Matthew then provided an update on the Practice Board's activities to date, noting that the first full meeting will be held in April 2026. The Board has been active informally for several months—shaping its remit around AI, data science, quantum computing, and other emerging technologies. Its early work aims to define priority areas, identify where actuarial practice will be most affected by new technologies, and avoid overlap with existing groups. A major theme was coordination with other practice boards. Council emphasised the need for strong collaboration to prevent duplication, manage boundaries, and ensure that specialist knowledge can flow across areas such as finance, investment, pensions, and sustainability. The Board is expected to act partly as a support function, sharing expertise while also horizon-scanning for developments (e.g., quantum computing, generative AI) that may affect all practice areas. Several broader AI concerns were discussed. These included how AI should be reflected in the curriculum, the potential for AI to displace junior actuarial roles, and the importance of focusing on both risks and governance. Council noted growing market interest in actuaries training AI models and raised ethical considerations around commercial use of actuarial expertise.
12.	ERP Phase II
12.1	The President welcomed Sheila Kumar to the meeting to discuss the progress made by the Panel since November 2025. Phase Two of the IFoA exam review is nearing completion, with final inputs received from the external support recruited to carry out the investigation. The panel will now consolidate the findings into an overarching report for the next Council meeting, following the standard governance route. Sheila confirmed the project is on budget and noted that the Phase One summary report—being adapted for external publication and updated with progress on recommendations—is expected to go to Board and Council in May, with publication planned for June. Early Phase Two insights highlight that while the Inappropriate Conduct Panel functions well, the current seven-level cheating structure sets too high a threshold for disciplinary escalation. The panel is likely to recommend lowering this threshold and simplifying the structure. Remote examinations present the greatest integrity challenges, prompting strong support for live proctoring

	and expanded in-person sittings. The panel is also exploring employer notification of cheating sanctions. Council emphasised timely publication, maintaining standards, and alignment with other professions.
13.	Council Appointments Committee
13.1	Dermot Grenham, committee Chair, introduced the item with Council approval being sought for documentation pertaining to the 2026 Council Election and appointments to the Practice Boards.
13.2	Council Election 2026 Council reviewed the council election documents with no major objections raised. Clarification was provided around the Scottish constituency changes. These were described as pre-programmed by existing bylaws, not a new Council decision. Council discussed possible barriers to members standing for election. Multiple members raised concerns that gender diversity among candidates has been low in recent years. Suggestions for addressing this included using current female council members more visibly in communications and promotional materials and posting through internal networks to increase awareness. Some caution was urged to ensure any outreach felt neutral, inclusive, and not unintentionally biased. A significant theme was that time commitment, travel, and expenses may disproportionately deter women, especially those with childcare responsibilities. Council agreed on the need to identify and reduce practical barriers rather than “target” particular groups. Several members noted that the current two-day meeting format is demanding and difficult to balance with work. Concerns included long in-person days and a lack of flexibility for members with less supportive employers. Noting the limitations of length online meetings, suggestions for improvement included a return to one-day meetings (as in past practice) or holding shorter, more frequent sessions. Meetings could also be run more efficiently with, for example, an introduction of time limits on contributions. Members also highlighted the risks of skewing Council membership toward older, semi-retired individuals who can accommodate the time demands. The importance of reviewing barriers holistically, rather than singling out groups, and the opportunity for a broader DEI-led review of volunteer roles, starting with Council, will be conducted ahead of the next election cycle. Action: Council Appointments Committee Council approved: • The suitability criteria for Council members and Suitability Guidance with 26 votes and one abstention. • The Task and Person specification (as amended) with 26 votes and one abstention. • The draft nomination form with 26 votes and one abstention.
13.3	Council was further asked to approve appointments to the Practice Boards. Sophie Wright as Deputy Chair of the Risk Management Board. Approved with 23 votes and one abstention. Asif John as Chair of the AI and Emerging Technology Board. Approved with 23 votes and one abstention. John Ng as Deputy Chair of the AI and Emerging Technology Board. Approved with 24 votes.

14.	Students Committee and observers to Council
14.1	The Council Appointments Committee has approved the paperwork and process for the election of student observers to Council and the formation of a Student Committee. Owing to capacity constraints within the Corporate Secretariat, this work has not been taken forward with business-as-usual taking priority. The Governance Team will be fully populated from May 2026 and in a position to arrange the election with a fuller update coming to Council at its meeting in June 2026.
15.	Approval of November 2025 minutes
15.1	It was highlighted that while several comments were made on the draft minutes—mainly about tone, clarity, and the strength of views expressed—these were not incorporated because voting had already begun (in a previous attempt to approve the minutes) and only comments that alter the broad direction of the discussion are typically added. Members agreed it was too late to reopen or revise the previous (November) minutes, even where detail was felt to be lacking, and instead decided to approve them as they stand while ensuring that any necessary clarifications or stronger affirmations are captured in the minutes of subsequent meetings rather than redrafting the earlier set. Council approved the minutes of its meeting in November 2025 with 25 votes in favour and one abstention. Council approved the write up of the Practice Board workshop held in November 2025 with 20 votes in favour and six abstentions.
16.	Death Announcements
16.1	Council members noted with regret those members who had died recently: • Thomas Andrew Leonard Maylor Wakeling • Jaqueline Cohen • Ernest William Cooper • Christopher Brocksom • Johann Du Toit • Richard Ostime • Morris Bernstein • Paul Wilton • Andrew Christopher Dawrant
17.	Any other business
17.1	The President invited any items of other business. <u>November 2026 Council meeting</u> Planning is underway for the meeting to be held on 17 and 18 November in Birmingham. This will lead into this year's Life conference, to which Council members can avail themselves of a complementary ticket. Dates, location and details will be confirmed as soon as possible. REDACTED <u>Situation in the Middle East</u> There was a brief discussion on the current situation for members in the Middle East. Those sitting exams have been contacted and presented with a variety of options, to best suit their needs. <u>Long-term proxy held by a Council member</u>

	It was confirmed that members of Council remain members until such a time as Council votes to remove them. As such, they are entitled to nominate a proxy to vote on their behalf.
17.2	There being no other business, the President thanked all for attending and closed the meeting.

End.

.....
Chair