

Standards Committee

Agenda for the meeting to be held on 3 December 2025 at 10am

1.	Apologies for absence, declarations of interest. Minutes from the meeting of 22 October 2025	
2.	Matters for discussion	
	a. UCOOH - discussion and Vet Compass presentation - confidential	Paper attached
	b. Artificial intelligence - confidential	Paper attached
	c. Revision of Chapter 13	Paper attached
	d. CMA provisional remedies - confidential	Paper to follow
3.	Matters for decision	
	a. Certification subcommittee – annual review (Chair of the Certification Subcommittee to attend)	Paper attached
4.	Matters for report	
	a. Disciplinary Committee Report	Paper in library
5.	Risk and equality	Verbal update
6.	Any other business and date of next meeting on 11 February 2026	Verbal update

Standards Committee 2025/2026

Chair

Dr Olivia Cook MRCVS

Vice Chair

Dr Sinéad Bennett MRCVS

Members

Miss Linda Belton MRCVS (Officer Observer)

Dr Sam Bescoby MRCVS

Dr David Black FRCVS

Professor Derek Bray

Dr Abbie Calow MRCVS

Ms Linda Ford

Professor Christopher Loughrey FRCVS

Mr Matthew Rendle RVN

Mr Tim Walker

Terms of reference

The Standards Committee shall provide advice and guidance on the professional conduct of veterinary surgeons and veterinary nurses, including, but not limited to:

- a. Publishing a Code or Codes of Professional Conduct, subject to the approval of the Council;
- b. Publishing as necessary advice on professional conduct;
- c. Responding to professional conduct issues raised by the RCVS Council, Veterinary Nurses' Council or any committee of the RCVS;
- d. Responding to requests for advice from members of the profession and the public, as agreed by the chair; and,
- e. Overseeing the development of the RCVS Practice Standards Scheme by the Practice Standards Group, making recommendations to Council as appropriate, and considering appeals from the Practice Standards Scheme Review Group.

Summary

Meeting	Standards Committee
Date	22 October 2025
Title	Standards Committee Minutes
Summary	<p>Minutes of the Standards Committee meeting held remotely on Wednesday 22 October 2025, at 09.30am</p> <p>The Committee's attention is drawn to paragraphs 1-10 of the classified appendix.</p>
Attachments	Classified appendix
Author	<p>Annelise Samuels</p> <p>Senior Standards and Advice Officer</p> <p>a.samuels@rcvs.org.uk / 0207 856 1032</p>

Classifications

Document	Classification ¹	Rationales ²
Minutes	Unclassified	n/a
Classified appendix	Confidential	1

1Classifications explained

Unclassified	Papers will be published on the internet and recipients may share them and discuss them freely with anyone. This may include papers marked 'Draft'.
Confidential	Temporarily available only to Council Members, non-Council members of the relevant committee, sub-committee, working party or Board and not for dissemination outside that group unless and until the relevant committee or Council has given approval for public discussion, consultation or publication.
Private	The paper includes personal data which should not be disclosed at any time or for any reason, unless the data subject has agreed otherwise. The Chair may, however, indicate after discussion that there are general issues which can be disclosed, for example in reports to committees and Council.

2Classification rationales

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others 2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation 3. To protect commercially sensitive information 4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. To protect information which may contain personal data, special category data, and/or criminal offence data, as listed under the General Data Protection Regulation

Minutes of the Standards Committee meeting held in-person and remotely on 22 October 2025 at 9.30am

Members: Olivia Cook (Chair)
Sinéad Bennett
Derek Bray
Linda Ford
Christopher Loughrey
Matthew Rendle
Tim Walker
David Black
Sam Bescoby
Abbie Calow
Linda Belton

In attendance:

RCVS	Lizzie Lockett	CEO
	Gemma Kingswell	Head of Legal Services (Standards)
	Beth Jinks	Standards and Advisory Lead
	Annelise Samuels	Senior Standards and Advice Officer
	Bri McLachlan	Standards and Advice Administrator

AI 1 Apologies for absence, declarations of interest, minutes of the meeting of 16 September 2025

1. Apologies were noted from Christopher Loughrey.
2. The minutes of the meeting of 16 September 2025 were agreed by the Committee. It was again noted that the September meeting was unfortunately not quorate.

Matters for decision/discussion

AI 2 (a) Anaesthesia free dentals – Confidential

3. The minutes of this agenda item can be found in the classified appendix at paragraphs 1 – 2.

AI 2 (b) Chapter 13: Clinical and client records review

Derek Bray joined the meeting

4. The paper was summarised, and the Committee was informed that Chapter 13 of the Supporting Guidance to the *Code of Professional Conduct* ('the Guidance') had been reviewed to ensure it remains fit for purpose and reflects current practice. The paper proposed several revisions to the Chapter, particularly regarding its structure and content, taking into account the approaches of other regulators. The review also considered the sections relating to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), with the aim of refining the content and removing information no longer necessary.
5. The Committee was also asked to consider a suggestion from the PIC/DC Liaison Committee that Chapter 13 be amended to include a requirement that clinical records be kept electronically via an auditable system, or a requirement that if clinical records are kept electronically, the

electronic system is auditable. The purpose of the amendment would be to address concerns regarding the quality of paper and handwritten records and to make it easier to establish whether records had been retrospectively amended.

6. The Committee discussed the request from PIC/DC Liaison committee; however it concluded that the guidance already includes sufficient information on the level of detail required when keeping records, and on how to amend records where necessary. Further, it would place an increased burden on the profession, in particular sectors that tend to work remotely, such as farm and equine, and for those who do not have a practice management system already in place. The latter request would create a disproportionate requirement on those using electronic systems when electronic systems are not mandatory. Instead, the Committee agreed that the emphasis should remain on ensuring that clinical and client records are accurate, appropriately detailed and auditable. The Committee directed the Head of Legal Services (Standards) communicate its decision to the PIC/DC Liaison Committee.
7. Regarding the broader Chapter 13 amendments, the Committee suggested that the language be further refined to make the Guidance more accessible to the wider profession and to align it with higher-level, principle-based standards. In particular it was suggested that:
 - a. Guidance reiterating the GDPR requirements could be cut down, the retained sections reiterating GDPR requirements be streamlined (e.g. para 13.5 re client personal information), and relevant references to the ICO be added.
 - b. Reference to RVNs having responsibility around keeping clinical records should be added.
 - c. Consideration be given to whether guidance on record retention periods and commentary on the use of Artificial Intelligence in this context should be included.
8. The Committee directed that further amendments be made in line with its comments.

Action: Head of Legal Services (Standards) / Senior Standards and Advice Officer

Matters for discussion

AI 3 (a) Under care review update and next steps – confidential

9. The minutes of this agenda item can be found in the classified appendix at paragraphs 3 – 5.

AI 3 (b) Competition and Markets Authority provisional findings – Confidential

10. The minutes of this agenda item can be found in the classified appendix at paragraphs 6 – 10.

AI 4 Matters for report

AI 4(a) Disciplinary Committee Report

11. The report was noted. It was clarified for the benefit of new Committee members that the report is sent to the Committee for review only as a communication link between the Standards Committee and PIC / DC Liaison Committee.

AI (5) Risk and equality

12. No new risks were reported.

AI 6 Any other business and date of next meeting

13. Two members nominated themselves for consideration as Vice Chair, Sam Bescoby and Sinéad Bennett. The Committee voted Sinéad Bennett as Vice Chair.
14. The next meeting will be held on 3 December 2025, in person with remote attendance capabilities.

Table of actions

Paragraph	Action	Responsibility
6	Communicate the Committee's decision on amendments to Chapter 13 to the PIC / DC Liaison Committee.	Head of Legal Services (Standards)
8	Further amend the proposed revised Chapter 13 in line with the Committee's comments.	Senior Standards and Advice Officer

Summary	
Meeting	Standards Committee
Date	3 December 2025
Title	Review of Chapter 13 Clinical and client records
Summary	This paper follows on from that submitted in October 2025 and seeks further direction from the Standards Committee (the 'Committee') as to the key areas in which guidance is required in Chapter 13, for the purposes of the review.
For discussion	<p>The Committee is invited to discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Whether the points set out in paragraph 5 accurately reflect the areas in which guidance is required. b. Whether any additional matters should inform the structure and content of this chapter.
Author	<p>Annelise Samuels</p> <p>Senior Standards and Advice Officer</p> <p>a.samuels@rcvs.org.uk / 020 7856 1032</p>

Classifications

Document	Classification ¹	Rationales ²
Paper	Unclassified	NA

¹Classifications explained

Unclassified	Papers will be published on the internet and recipients may share them and discuss them freely with anyone. This may include papers marked 'Draft'.
Confidential	Temporarily available only to Council Members, non-Council members of the relevant committee, sub-committee, working party or Board and not for dissemination outside that group unless and until the relevant committee or Council has given approval for public discussion, consultation or publication.
Private	The paper includes personal data which should not be disclosed at any time or for any reason, unless the data subject has agreed otherwise. The Chair may, however, indicate after discussion that there are general issues which can be disclosed, for example in reports to committees and Council.

²Classification rationales

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others 2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation 3. To protect commercially sensitive information 4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. To protect information which may contain personal data, special category data, and/or criminal offence data, as listed under the General Data Protection Regulation

Introduction

1. At its meeting in October 2025, the Standards Committee ('Committee') reviewed a paper proposing several revisions to [Chapter 13](#) of the supporting guidance to the Code of Professional Conduct ('the Guidance'). The proposed revisions focused on three areas:
 - a. The structure and content of the Chapter.
 - b. The content as it relates to the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) – full discussion can be found at paragraph 19 onwards.
 - c. Suggestions from the PIC/DC Liaison Committee.
2. The Committee reviewed the proposed amendments and whilst it agreed with the direction of travel, it felt further consideration was required. The Committee therefore provided specific recommendations including:
 - a. The Committee declined to action the suggestions from the PIC / DC Liaison Committee to introduce a requirement that clinical and client records should be kept electronically, and/or that electronic records (where they are kept) must be capable of being audited for retrospective changes.
 - b. Guidance reiterating the GDPR requirements could be cut down, the retained sections reiterating GDPR requirements be streamlined (e.g. para 13.5 re client personal information), and relevant references to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) be added.
 - c. Reference to RVNs having responsibility around keeping clinical records should be added.
 - d. Consideration be given to whether guidance on record retention periods and commentary on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in this context should be included.
3. The purpose of this paper is to seek further direction from the Committee as to the key areas in which guidance is required in Chapter 13.

For discussion

4. Before further drafting proceeds, we ask that the Committee first identify the key areas in which the profession requires guidance. Establishing these core areas will provide a solid basis for developing a coherent and accessible chapter.
5. At a high level, we propose that the Committee consider these areas to be:
 - a. **Definition and scope of the clinical record:** What information forms part of the record.
 - b. **Rules applying to different categories of information:** The difference between client information and personal data held under GDPR, and clinical information relating to the animal and how rules differ for management, access and disclosure of each.
 - c. **Amending the clinical record:** How the amendments should be recorded, the circumstances in which they are appropriate, and the standards of transparency and auditability expected.
 - d. **Professionalism in recorded comments about clients:** A reminder that client records are disclosable. Accordingly, entries must remain factual and professional.

6. Note in relation to paragraph 2(d) above, given the wider work currently underway to develop a framework to support the responsible use of AI by veterinary professionals, we propose that detailed consideration of AI-related matters in this chapter be deferred until the broader position has been discussed.
7. The Committee is invited to discuss:
 - a. Whether the points set out in paragraph 5 accurately reflect the areas in which guidance is required.
 - b. Whether any additional matters should inform the structure and content of this chapter.

Summary	
Meeting	Standards Committee
Date	3 December 2025
Title	The Certification Subcommittee (Subcommittee) update
Summary	This paper provides an update in relation to the work of the Subcommittee, including a broad overview, summary of current expertise, and the Subcommittee's proposed format and processes going forwards.
Decisions required	The Standards Committee is asked to discuss and agree to the Subcommittee's proposed format and processes as set out in Annex A , with or without comment.
Attachments	Annex A – Minutes of the Certification Subcommittee's Annual Meeting
Author(s)	Ky Richardson Senior Standards and Advice Officer/Solicitor and Secretary to the Certification Subcommittee k.richardson@rcvs.org.uk

Classifications		
Document	Classification ¹	Rationales ²
Paper	Unclassified	N/A
Annex A	Unclassified	N/A

1Classifications explained	
Unclassified	Papers will be published on the internet and recipients may share them and discuss them freely with anyone. This may include papers marked 'Draft'.
Confidential	Temporarily available only to Council Members, non-Council members of the relevant committee, sub-committee, working party or Board and not for dissemination outside that group unless and until the relevant

	committee or Council has given approval for public discussion, consultation or publication.
Private	The paper includes personal data which should not be disclosed at any time or for any reason, unless the data subject has agreed otherwise. The Chair may, however, indicate after discussion that there are general issues which can be disclosed, for example in reports to committees and Council.

2Classification rationales

Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others 2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation 3. To protect commercially sensitive information 4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. To protect information which may contain personal data, special category data, and/or criminal offence data, as listed under the General Data Protection Regulation

Introduction

Broad overview of the Certification Subcommittee

1. The Subcommittee provides subject matter expertise in relation to queries about veterinary certification to assist the Standards and Advice Team in its advisory function, as well as to inform the Standards Committee/Council, where necessary.
2. Certification queries submitted to the Standards and Advice Team are typically raised by veterinary surgeons, including Official Veterinarians (OVs), veterinary nurses, and members of the public. Queries vary and include those relating to preventative health care plans/biosecurity plans for licensed establishments or activities (riding/breeding/boardings), tail docking, pet travel and animal imports/exports, and other matters relating to official controls.
3. Queries are also raised by competent authorities such as the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), the Food Standards Agency (FSA), Food Standards Scotland (FSA), and The Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA).

Routine matters for report

Certification queries

4. The Standards and Advice Team continue to receive a steady number of certification queries. In the last calendar year, 86 queries have been received. The majority were routine and so were dealt with by the Standards and Advice Team, with occasional input from the Subcommittee.

5. These queries typically relate to conflicts of interest and the language of a particular certificate a veterinary surgeon is presented with in general practice, that may not be compliant with the 10 Principles of Certification.

Proposed format and processes

6. At the Standards Committee's April 2025 meeting, it was asked whether the current format and processes of the Subcommittee were working and whether it had all the right expertise to inform the Standards Committee.
7. During those discussions, it was noted that due to external time constraints, recent matters that would have usually been considered by the Subcommittee in the first instance had been presented directly to the Standards Committee for decision. Feedback has been provided to external stakeholders with regards to the preferred procedure for seeking advice in the first instance, and they have been advised that where practicable, the Subcommittee should be approached with plenty of time to consider the query. The Subcommittee will then escalate matters to the Standards Committee/Council where appropriate.
8. The Standards Committee requested that the Subcommittee discuss the following at its next annual meeting:
 - a. The current expertise each Subcommittee member has, including relevant areas of veterinary practise/discipline/industry, species, and roles in veterinary related bodies, institutions, or similar.
 - b. Whether the current format and processes are working or whether they should be changed and if so, what new format/processes are proposed.
 - c. What additional expertise the Subcommittee considers useful to seek out.
9. The Subcommittee's Annual Meeting took place on 13 October 2025. Please see **Annex A** for the relevant minutes, which sets out in detail the Subcommittee's current expertise and new format and process.
10. The minutes at **Annex A** can be summarised as follows:
 - a. Subcommittee members will serve as a contact person to scope out and field in queries from their respective areas of expertise/professional communities as topical issues arise or are anticipated.
 - b. Rather than recruiting in relation to hypothetical gaps in expertise, it is proposed that experts be approached on an ad hoc basis to provide subject matter expertise where required.
 - c. Biannual meetings will be set up between the Secretary to the Certification Subcommittee and an appropriate contact in DEFRA/APHA/FSA/FSS as a way of raising routine certification issues or questions for discussion, relevant not only to official controls, but also to certificates required under other legislation, for example, activities that require a licence such as breeding/boarding.

- d. The Subcommittee agreed that a full proactive review of Chapter 21 of the supporting guidance is due, which should focus on refinement, ensuring that the language is accurate and up to date, and to make it more inclusive of certification challenges in day-to-day practice, as it is currently largely focused around OVs.
- e. The Subcommittee agreed with the Standards Committee's comments in its April 2025 meeting that an RCVS Academy course would be a useful way to empower veterinary surgeons to say no to certifying when it would be non-compliant with Chapter 21 of the supporting guidance. An initial plan and potential scenarios for a new course was made.

Decisions required

- 11. The Standards Committee is asked to discuss and agree to the Subcommittee's proposed format and processes as set out in **Annex A**, with or without comment.

Summary	
Meeting	Certification Subcommittee (Subcommittee)
Date	13 October 2025
Title	Certification Subcommittee Annual Meeting Minutes
Summary	Minutes of the Subcommittee Annual Meeting held in person on Monday 13 October 2025, at 11am
Author	<p>Ky Richardson</p> <p>Senior Standards and Advice Officer/Solicitor and Secretary to the Certification Subcommittee</p> <p>k.richardson@rcvs.org.uk / 0207 202 0757</p>

Classifications		
Document	Classification ¹	Rationales ²
Minutes	Unclassified	n/a

1Classifications explained	
Unclassified	Papers will be published on the internet and recipients may share them and discuss them freely with anyone. This may include papers marked 'Draft'.
Confidential	Temporarily available only to Council Members, non-Council members of the relevant committee, sub-committee, working party or Board and not for dissemination outside that group unless and until the relevant committee or Council has given approval for public discussion, consultation or publication.
Private	The paper includes personal data which should not be disclosed at any time or for any reason, unless the data subject has agreed otherwise. The Chair may, however, indicate after discussion that there are general issues which can be disclosed, for example in reports to committees and Council.

2Classification rationales	
Confidential	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow the Committee or Council to come to a view itself, before presenting to and/or consulting with others 2. To maintain the confidence of another organisation 3. To protect commercially sensitive information 4. To maintain public confidence in and/or uphold the reputation of the veterinary professions and/or the RCVS
Private	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. To protect information which may contain personal data, special category data, and/or criminal offence data, as listed under the General Data Protection Regulation

Minutes of the Certification Subcommittee Annual Meeting held in person on Monday 13 October 2025, at 11am

Members:

Kate Richards FRCVS (Chair)
David Black FRCVS
Linda Belton MRCVS
Danielle Greenberg MRCVS

In attendance:

Ky Richardson, *Senior Standards and Advice Officer/Solicitor, Secretary to the Certification Subcommittee*
Annelise Samuels, *Senior Standards and Advice Officer*

AI 1 Expertise within the Subcommittee

1. The Subcommittee was referred to the relevant paper and asked to explore its current expertise and whether further expertise should be sought.
2. The Subcommittee confirmed the following:
 - a. Danielle Greenberg:
 - i. Small animal veterinary surgeon and Official Veterinarian (OV).
 - ii. Experience with pet passports and animal health certificates (AHCs) for pet and equine travel.
 - iii. Past experience in meat hygiene.
 - iv. Can serve as the contact person to field in queries/issues from the pet passports/pet travel AHC OV community.
 - b. David Black:
 - i. Farm animal veterinary surgeon and OV.
 - ii. Experience with export health certificates (EHCs) relating to cattle, including lamb and beef being exported into the European Union (EU) and Canada.
 - iii. Past experience sitting on the board of the Veterinary Defence Society (VDS).
 - iv. Current President of the British Cattle Veterinary Association (BCVA).
 - v. Experience in abattoirs and meat hygiene.
 - vi. Can serve as the contact person to field in queries/issues from the BCVA membership and in relation to the cattle EHC OV community.

c. Linda Belton:

- i. Equine veterinary surgeon.
- ii. Experience with equine identification (ID), including in relation to horse sports and competition.
- iii. Past President of the RCVS and current Junior Vice President.
- iv. Past experience relating to abattoirs, Tuberculosis (TB), AHCs for pets and horses.
- v. Can serve as a contact person to field in queries from the equine community with a particular focus on equine ID.

d. Kate Richards:

- i. Portfolio of non-executive directorships in the veterinary, agricultural, food and education sectors.
- ii. Past experience as an OV and farm animal veterinary surgeon.
- iii. Past President of the RCVS and BCVA.
- iv. Comprehensive experience in the pharmaceutical and agricultural industries.
- v. Ten years' experience in the civil service, five as a senior civil servant.
- vi. Can serve as the contact person to field in queries/issues from the Department for Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), Food Standards Scotland (FSS), and the Association of Government Veterinarians (AGV).

3. The Subcommittee agreed that rather than recruiting additional members, it would be useful to develop a bank of professionals to field queries/issues into the Subcommittee, i.e., certification related questions that are presenting challenges for the profession and/or may benefit from advice. These would be sent into the Standards and Advice Team as routine queries in the first instance and escalated to the Subcommittee (and Standards Committee) where required. If a particular issue required escalation to the Standards Committee and a professional within this bank of expertise was required to speak on the matter, it is proposed that they would be compensated as a consultant.
4. The Subcommittee agreed that the best way to develop this bank of professionals was to consult initially with relevant bodies to assist in identifying an appropriate individual who might be keen to build an ongoing mutually beneficial relationship in the interests of preserving the integrity of the veterinary signature and understanding how to apply Chapter 21 of the supporting guidance. It was agreed that once approved by the Standards Committee, the president (or equivalent) of each of the following bodies would be contacted and asked to assist the Subcommittee in identifying that appropriate individual and making the necessary introduction:

- a. The British Horse Association (BHA).
- b. The British Horse Society (BHS).
- c. The Fédération Équestre Internationale (FEI).
- d. Veterinary Public Health Association (VPHA).
- e. Riding Establishments List of Inspectors (Inspectorate) - in relation to inspections performed alongside riding establishments relating to breeding/boarding licences of small animals.
- f. The Pig Veterinary Society (PVS).
- g. The British Veterinary Poultry Association (BVPA).
- h. The British Veterinary Zoological Society (BVZS).
- i. The Fish Veterinary Society (FVS).

Action: Secretary to the Certification Subcommittee (Secretary)

5. As a general point, the Subcommittee agreed to meet in-person once a year for annual meetings and when any new Subcommittee member joins but will otherwise meet remotely.

AI 2 Development of an RCVS Academy course on professional responsibilities relating to veterinary certification

6. The related paper was briefly summarised and the Secretary expanded on the potential scenarios that might be included in an RCVS Academy course on veterinary certification, namely, scenarios that are unrelated to OV work in an attempt to offer examples of application of the chapter to contexts beyond exports/imports, scenarios relating to conflicts of interest which are a large part of the questions presented to the Standards and Advice Team, and a scenario relating to preventative health care plans provided as part of a licencing inspection for breeders/boarders, which is often a question that arises as there is no standard form available to veterinary surgeons undertaking this work.
7. The Subcommittee made the following comments in relation to the development of a course:
 - a. If it is to be inclusive and industry wide, learners will need to be able to skip certain sections that are not relevant to their practise areas.
 - b. Scenarios should be discipline and species specific.
 - c. The value of the veterinary signature should be adequately articulated as the Subcommittee has noticed that veterinary surgeons newer to the profession do not appear to appreciate this as much as they should and can be easily pressured into certifying where they ought not to.
 - d. Other scenarios to consider are those relating to:
 - i. Signing shotgun certificates for farmers.
 - ii. Signing passports, including for relatives – veterinary surgeons seem to not understand that they are signing in a professional capacity and so do not consider the usual rules, especially in relation to conflicts of interest.

- iii. Certifying the prescribed tail docking form, but only after raising this issue with DEFRA. A current live issue relating to this form is that if the client has the dog microchipped by a lay person after the dog's tail has been docked by a veterinary surgeon, a veterinary surgeon is unable to then certify the form as a whole based on the current prescribed wording (as it states only that the veterinary surgeon or a nurse under their direction has implanted the microchip). This leaves owners in a potentially legally vulnerable position without the required certificate. It was agreed that this will be raised with DEFRA before being included in a course scenario.
 - iv. Riding establishments related certification – to include one of the Riding Establishments Subcommittee (RESC) members to assist with this.
 - v. Certifying vaccinations – it would be useful to include the future contact person found via the BHS to assist with this.
- e. The Subcommittee agreed that if a scenario includes a comparison between a correct/incorrect certificate, we ought to check it first with the author of that certificate to ensure accuracy.

Action: Secretary and Senior Standards and Advice Officer

AI 3 (a) Any other business (AOB) – licensing inspections for breeders/boarders

- 8. The Subcommittee was informed that in April's meeting of the Standards Committee, the RESC Chair, also a member of this Subcommittee, explained the role of the RESC and reported on topical matters worthy of note.
- 9. One part of the RESC's role is to develop forms for riding establishment inspections that comply with relevant regulations, the *Code of Professional Conduct*, and Chapter 21 of the supporting guidance, for veterinary inspectors to use. Local authorities and inspectors are then encouraged to use these forms in the interests of promoting consistency in the standards of inspections.
- 10. This contribution by the RESC was celebrated and a question followed in relation to whether more support can be provided to veterinary surgeons inspecting premises in relation to companion animals. To decide whether there is a need and what that need looks like, this Subcommittee was asked to respond to the following questions:
 - a. Is the inspecting of premises for the purposes of licensing under relevant regulations (breeders/boarders/dangerous animals) a workstream that small animal veterinary surgeons are involved in or are keen to explore?
 - b. If so, does this Subcommittee know of any reported barriers to this workstream, i.e., non-compliant forms drafted by local authorities or those applying for licenses? And what kind of support could this Subcommittee offer, if any?

11. The Subcommittee was not aware of whether this is a desirable workstream for small animal veterinary surgeons and so it was decided in the first instance that a question would be asked of the Riding Establishment Inspector List (the Inspectorate), who appears to be assisting in this respect to some degree, ancillary to their riding establishments engagements by local authorities. If confirmation that it is a desirable workstream can be obtained, the Subcommittee will consider relevant barriers and what support this Subcommittee can offer in further detail at a future meeting.

Action: Secretary

AI 3 (b) AOB - Update on RCVS representative at UKECP meetings

12. The Subcommittee was asked if any member was currently attending the UK Export Certification Partnership (UKECP) meetings and if not, whether it considered it necessary to have a representative attend.
13. The UKECP is a DEFRA and industry partnership that liaises with the UK livestock and livestock products industries to establish export market priorities. It also provides a forum to discuss the use of DEFRA agents to negotiate export health certificates on behalf of the UK and assists in the drafting of export health certificates.
14. The Secretary explained that this was a standing item that was historically reported to the Standards Committee, but it did not often result in questions being submitted to the Subcommittee, rather, it appeared to be about trade at a higher level.
15. The Subcommittee asked to see previous minutes from the UKECP meetings and how it has been reported to the Standards Committee so a decision can be made about whether it might be a useful source of intelligence.

Action: Secretary

16. The Subcommittee asked whether it would be possible for the Secretary to meet regularly with DEFRA, the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA), FSS, and Food Standards Agency (FSA), in part, to ensure that ample notice is provided about potential matters for the Subcommittee/Standards Committee but also to focus specifically on matters that have arisen or are anticipated in relation to the application of Chapter 21 of the supporting guidance. A good example of the potential issues that might be discussed in such meetings is the issue relating to the tail docking certificate mentioned at paragraph 7. d. iii. above.
17. It was agreed that this would be explored further with the Head of Legal Services (Standards), with the proposal being to meet biannually to begin with.

Action: Secretary

AI 3 (c) AOB – Full review of Chapter 21 of the supporting guidance to the *Code of Professional Conduct*

18. The Subcommittee discussed the merits of a full review of Chapter 21 of the supporting guidance, as it has not been reviewed as a whole for some time and language has evolved.
19. The Subcommittee asked the Secretary whether they were aware of any particular sections of concern and what a review process would look like. The Secretary commented as follows:
 - a. Generally speaking, the direction of travel of the Standards Committee in relation to the supporting guidance is to scale it back, keep it as principles-based as possible, and to make it clearer what is a legal requirement/regulatory requirement of another regulator, and/or an expectation set by the RCVS. There might therefore be some scope to refine and reorganise the chapter in line with this general direction of travel.
 - b. The Chapter's primary focus is certification in an official capacity, i.e., OV's. It is often overlooked by those seeking advice in general practice as it is not immediately obvious that it applies to certification outside of an official capacity. It could therefore be made more inclusive both in language and with additional context by including guidance for certification outside of an official capacity. The Subcommittee's assistance would be required in this respect to give the Standards and Advice Team a fuller picture of how certification arises in general practice.
 - c. A full review of a chapter typically begins with research into what other regulators are doing and what common queries are raised with the RCVS. A first draft is then prepared, with assistance from the relevant subcommittee where relevant, and proposed changes will then be presented to the Standards Committee for approval, with or without comment.
20. The Subcommittee agreed that it would be useful to conduct this review although would prefer that it did not delay the RCVS Academy course, if possible.

Action: Secretary

Table of actions

Paragraph	Action	Responsibility
4	Contact the relevant bodies to request assistance.	Secretary
6-7	Begin considering the timeline for an RCVS Academy course on veterinary certification.	Secretary and Senior Standards and Advice Officer
11	Make enquiries of the Inspectorate in relation to whether assisting with breeding/boardings licensing or other non-	Secretary

	riding establishment licencing was a desirable workstream and if so, whether any certification barriers currently exist.	
15	Send the Subcommittee an example update on UKECP provided to the Standards Committee, including UKECP minutes.	Secretary
17	Discuss with Head of Legal Services (Standards) and set up biannual meeting with relevant stakeholders.	Secretary
20	Begin considering the timeline for a review of Chapter 21 of the supporting guidance and how this fits with an RCVS Academy course.	Secretary and Senior Standards and Advice Officer