

Council meeting 11 June 2015

15.06.C.01

Public business

2015 fees rules and consultation analysis

Purpose

To provide the Council with a final draft of the 2015 fees rules and an analysis of the fees rules consultation.

Recommendations

The Council is asked to:

- i. **note the analysis of the fees rules consultation (appendix 1);**
- ii. **approve the changes to fees summarised at section 5; and**
- iii. **make The General Pharmaceutical Council (Registration and Renewal Fees) Rules 2015 (appendix 2) and agree that the GPhC's corporate seal be affixed to these rules.**

2. Introduction

- 2.1 The Council approved draft fees rules for consultation in February. The consultation closed on 15 May 2015. We received 1,073 completed responses from a range of individuals and organisations. The analysis of responses is attached at appendix 1. This paper highlights how the analysis has been taken into account in amending the proposed fees rules.
- 2.2 The rules which the Council is now asked to make (appendix 2) would come into force on 15 October 2015. It is necessary to consult on and make the fees rules well in advance as our governing legislation requires us to send out renewal notices at least three months before registration is due to expire.

3. Background

- 3.1 At its February 2015 meeting, Council agreed budget proposals for 2015/16. In setting the proposed budget, a range of factors were considered, including:
 - i. the principle that we wish to ensure a fair and proportionate distribution of the costs of regulation between registrant groups
 - ii. our ongoing desire to avoid significant fluctuations in fee levels in future years to any or all registrant groups

- iii. the allocation of resources required for the first year of the new GPhC corporate plan
 - iv. the budget required for 2015/16 and necessary fee changes to enable us to deliver on our three year strategy, so that the organisation achieves a balanced budget by 2017/18
 - v. our commitment to improve our effectiveness and efficiency across all areas of the GPhC, and drive down costs wherever possible.
- 3.2 In developing those proposals, we also undertook a fees and costs allocation review to ensure that our fees reflect, as far as possible, the underlying costs of regulating pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and pharmacy premises. Attempting to allocate costs in such a way requires a detailed and in depth understanding of what drives our activities. We are confident that the approach allocates costs as fairly as possible for the current year, recognising that we have had to make a number of assumptions.
- 3.3 At the same meeting, Council also agreed to consult on proposals to increase renewal fees for pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and pharmacy premises.
- 3.4 The consultation gave us an opportunity to seek views on our proposals to increase fees, but it also allowed respondents to challenge our thinking, and highlight areas that we had not considered. It is important therefore to review the consultation analysis alongside our understanding of the external and internal context for fee-setting, to identify any potential changes to our proposals.

4. Discussion of consultation responses

- 4.1 In total 1,073 completed responses to the consultation were analysed. By comparison, 309 responses were received for 2012 fees rules consultation.
- 4.2 In summary:
- i. 42.1% agreed or strongly agreed with the GPhC's approach to setting fees
 - ii. 59.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposed £250 fee for pharmacists
 - iii. 65.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposed £118 fee for pharmacy technicians
 - iv. Responses were relatively balanced between agreement and disagreement on the proposed £241 fee for pharmacies, with slightly more respondents (34.6%) remaining neutral on this proposal.
- 4.3 A detailed analysis of responses is attached at appendix 1. The analysis shows the extent to which different registrant groups agreed or disagreed with different proposals, and includes a summary of additional comments

raised by respondents. Council may also want to consider organisational responses which are available on the website.

4.4 Respondents raised a range of issues, broadly in five categories:

- i. Fees for different kinds of registrants
- ii. Fees for part-time registrants
- iii. External pressures
- iv. GPhC costs and value for money
- v. Direct debits.

Fees for different kinds of registrants

4.5 Respondents were invited to give their views on all the proposed fees, not just the fees they would pay. Consequently, respondents queried why fees for other groups were not higher in comparison to their own. Notably, some questioned why the increase for pharmacy technicians is higher in percentage terms than for other groups. Others remarked that the proposed fees for pharmacists are higher than for pharmacy premises.

4.6 As highlighted in the February 2015 budget paper, the fees and costs allocation exercise has sought to attribute the cost of regulation to different registrant groups as fairly as possible. This work showed that the direct cost of regulating pharmacy professionals continues to be relatively high compared to the cost of regulating pharmacy premises. It also suggested that the fee for pharmacy technicians should increase more than for pharmacists in percentage terms over the coming years. This is necessary to better reflect the increasing costs of regulating this group, notwithstanding the continuing disparity in rates of pay between pharmacists and pharmacy technicians, and external pressures on wages.

4.7 Across regulators, fitness to practise activity is a key contributor to the overall cost of regulation. Investigations, hearings space and panels represent a significant proportion of the cost of regulating professionals. In setting fees, these costs have been attributed based on cases closed in the last year involving pharmacy professionals (90.5% of cases) and pharmacy technicians (9.5%).

4.8 In relation to pharmacy premises, the inspectorate is one of the most visible parts of the GPhC's work. It is likely that the costs of regulating pharmacy premises may increase, as the GPhC moves out of the current prototype phase, and gains and begins to use its enforcement powers. As the approach to regulating registered pharmacies is fully implemented, the costs associated with regulating pharmacies will be kept under review.

4.9 Further refinements to the distribution of fees across registrant groups may be possible as more and better quality data is available. The balance of fees

between pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and pharmacy premises may therefore change in future years. Fees for pharmacy technicians and for pharmacies are likely to continue to increase, to ensure these groups bear the costs of regulation more proportionately. Council has previously been mindful to avoid large fluctuations in fee levels, so these increases are likely to be phased in over time.

Fees for part-time registrants

- 4.10 The possibility of reduced fees for registrants working part-time was mentioned by respondents.
- 4.11 The 2013 registrant survey found that 27% of pharmacists and 30% of pharmacy technicians work part-time. Across the register, pharmacists work on average 35.7 hours a week, while pharmacy technicians work on average 32.5 hours a week. 13% of pharmacists and 3% of pharmacy technicians also reported having two or more jobs.
- 4.12 Although the registrant survey did not collect data on salaries, it is reasonable to assume that part-time workers will on average earn less than those working full-time. Consequently they will be more greatly affected by an increase in fees. This assumption was reflected in the equality impact assessment, published in March 2015.
- 4.13 It is a principle adopted by most regulators that the cost of regulation should be spread across groups, rather than attributed to individuals. The costs of regulation – quality assuring education, handling registration, setting standards, and investigating fitness to practise concerns – are not affected by the hours an individual registrant works, or their pay, which varies widely across the pharmacy sector in particular.
- 4.14 Introducing a system based on earnings or hours worked would be complex and costly to administer. The fees rules therefore reflect a straightforward fee structure for each registrant group.

External pressures

- 4.15 Respondents challenged the fee rise in the context of external pressures, particularly on pay.
- 4.16 The NHS, which employs 29% of pharmacists and 45% of pharmacy technicians in hospitals and primary care, has experienced a prolonged period of pay restraint. Latest figures from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) state that public sector pay, excluding bonuses, rose by 0.9% in the three months to March 2015.
- 4.17 Changes to pay in community pharmacy are more difficult to ascertain. ONS figures for wholesaling and retailing suggest that pay, excluding bonuses, rose by 3.1% over the same period, although there will be wide variation between different businesses.

- 4.18 Against this background, many respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposed 4.2% increase for pharmacists and 9.3% increase for pharmacy technicians.
- 4.19 It should also be highlighted that the proposed fee of £250 for pharmacists is 6.4% lower than the 2011 fee of £267. The proposed fee of £118 for pharmacy technicians is 1.7% less than the 2011 fee of £120.

GPhC costs and value for money

- 4.20 Respondents to the consultation sought greater clarity on how the GPhC spends its income, and whether government funding could be sought to underpin the costs of regulation.
- 4.21 The fees consultation document set out a summary of the organisation's projected income and expenditure for 2015/16, and highlighted the proportion of spending on each department. In terms of providing clarity to registrants on the spending of their fees, this goes some way, but further work could be done to more clearly explain the costs borne by different registrant groups.
- 4.22 The work undertaken on the fees and costs allocation exercise has gone some way to describing how the GPhC's central support services contribute to the delivery of our regulatory functions. While we acknowledge that further work can be done to refine this model, we are proposing that from October, registrants renewing their registration will be able to access clearer information on the website about how their fees are spent, in a similar way to information provided by local councils.
- 4.23 In terms of government funding, the GPhC's legislation is explicit that the costs of regulation should be borne by registrants. Changes in this approach would be a matter for parliament.
- 4.24 More specifically, respondents challenged the organisation's approach to office accommodation, efficiency and reserves.
- 4.25 The organisation's relocation to offices in Canary Wharf was raised. Following the landlord's decision to terminate the lease on the organisation's principal office space, in 2013 Council carefully considered the organisation's future accommodation needs and decided that the best option was for the GPhC to move to new offices.
- 4.26 Part of our requirements was to find office space where staff could be accommodated in one building and on a single floor. After carefully reviewing the organisation's accommodation needs, and considering a number of options, including accommodation both outside London and in other parts of the capital, Council decided that the relocation to 25 Canada Square was the best option for the GPhC, and offered good value for money.
- 4.27 The increased area for the new hearing centre is being shared with other regulators where possible, to maximise its use and to cover its costs. The

relocation has also removed the need for us to regularly hire rooms externally.

- 4.28 In light of a challenging economic environment, particularly in the NHS, respondents also questioned the extent to which the GPhC had sought to make efficiency savings.
- 4.29 We have already delivered significant efficiencies in the way we work. For example, we have undertaken a lean review of our fitness to practise processes, and we have also moved many of our communications online. There is further scope for improvement in this area, and we are starting an organisation wide review of our effectiveness and efficiency.
- 4.30 Questions were also raised by respondents about the Council's reserves. It is prudent to hold reserves so that unforeseen events can be dealt with, for example the expenditure arising from a major investigation, responding to an emergency situation or dealing with a high court challenge to a GPhC decision. Although insurance is held in relation to fixed assets, spending from reserves would be necessary in the short term to meet these challenges.
- 4.31 The Council's reserves target is £12.5m. During the 2013/14 financial year, Council agreed to spend from reserves, which were above the target level, in order to fund a deficit budget and mitigate the need for a fee rise. As at March 2015, reserves were £13.8m.
- 4.32 Spending from reserves should not be used to fund recurring costs, and is therefore not a sustainable way of avoiding increases in fees. Council regularly reviews its reserves policy, and will need to take into account the issues raised in this consultation when it next does so.

Direct debits

- 4.33 The issues of monthly payment by direct debit, and the charge for quarterly payments, were raised by respondents.
- 4.34 The GPhC's registration rules allow for the Registrar to offer "the option of paying a prescribed fee ... by way of direct debit in instalments or otherwise." Currently:
- i. 7,815 pharmacists pay by direct debit (4,820 annually and 2,995 quarterly)
 - ii. 1,640 pharmacy technicians pay by direct debit (1,144 annually and 496 quarterly)
 - iii. The majority of payments continue to be made by card.
- 4.35 A monthly direct debit scheme would be an attractive option for many registrants, but its implementation would be complex, requiring substantial changes both to registration and financial systems. We will look at the feasibility of monthly direct debits as part of our work to further develop our

- customer relationship management (CRM) system, but changes will not be possible for when the new fees are introduced in October this year.
- 4.36 Changes in relation to quarterly direct debit are more straightforward. In response to the consultation, we are proposing to remove the £15 administration fee for quarterly direct debits. The fees rules at appendix 2 have been updated to reflect this.
- 4.37 The administration fee was initially introduced to cover the cost of a quarterly direct debit system implemented alongside a rolling register, with direct debit cycles spread irregularly across the year. In the last financial year, £62,235 was generated through the quarterly charge. Investment in the CRM system over the same period has significantly simplified registration and financial processes, and reduced the need for this additional income on an ongoing basis. However, Council should be aware that, while it represents only 0.3% of expected income for the coming year, projections would need to be updated if a decision were made to remove this fee from the rules.
- 4.38 In addition to the charge for quarterly direct debits, the fees rules contain a provision for a £20 re-processing fee, in the event that an arrangement to pay is not honoured. If a quarterly direct debit payment fails because of lack of funds or some other action by the registrant, the remainder of the year's fee becomes due, and the £20 fee is added.
- 4.39 While only 50 payments were affected in this way in the last financial year, the additional work involved in recovering the fee can be significant. Non-payment can lead to administrative removal from the register. A new "retry process" for direct debits was introduced by high street banks in September 2014, which is likely to have a beneficial effect in ensuring that more direct debit payments are honoured. All registrants paying by quarterly direct debit are given a schedule of dates on which their payments become due, and the customer services team are considering introducing an email reminder system to further improve compliance.
- 4.40 While we expect to use it less frequently, we are therefore proposing to retain this re-processing fee, and will keep the costs incurred and income received under review.
- 4.41 These proposals will ensure that registrants who set up and maintain quarterly direct debits are able to do so at no additional cost, while those whose quarterly direct debits fail will bear the cost of recovering the remainder of the fee.
- 4.42 It is difficult to predict how the removal of the administration fee will affect the uptake of quarterly direct debits. We consider pharmacy technicians, particularly the 39% who work in hospitals, and whose fees are rarely subsidised by their employer, to be most likely to take up this option.

- 4.43 For pharmacists and pharmacy technicians already paying by quarterly direct debit, the net effect of the proposed fee increase and removal of the administration fee is a reduction of £5 for the cost of registration for the coming year.
- 4.44 We will continue to track changes in preferred payment methods, and report back to Council at a future date.

5. Summary of changes to fees rules

- 5.1 While respondents to the survey largely agreed with our proposed approach, many disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposed fees levels.
- 5.2 However, our income from fees must ensure that we can continue to work effectively as a regulator in the long term. Effective regulation benefits not only patients and the public, but also registrants. Being a registered professional, or providing services from a registered pharmacy, means that patients can have confidence in the safety and effectiveness of pharmacy services.
- 5.3 We also take seriously our duty to keep challenging our costs to make sure that we work as efficiently and effectively as possible. As a result, even taking into account the small increases, the new fees for pharmacists and pharmacy technicians, if agreed, would be lower than those charged in March 2011.
- 5.4 Having considered the consultation responses, we would propose the following fee structure, to come into force on 15 October 2015.
- i. We propose to increase the yearly renewal fee for pharmacists by £10, from £240 to £250.
 - ii. We propose to increase the yearly renewal fee for pharmacy technicians by £10, from £108 to £118.
 - iii. We propose to increase the yearly renewal fee for pharmacy premises by £20, from £221 to £241.
 - iv. We propose to remove the £15 administration fee associated with quarterly direct debits.
 - v. We propose to increase other fees by various amounts, at rates slightly above inflation, as detailed in the proposed fees rules.

6. Equality and diversity implications

- 6.1 An equality impact assessment of the draft rules was published on 2 March 2015. This highlighted particular issues in relation to part-time workers, who are more likely to be female. The removal of the administration fee for quarterly direct debit will have some beneficial effect for this group in particular, as they will be able to spread the cost of registration at no additional charge.

7. Communications

- 7.1 The consultation analysis and the final version of the 2015 fees rules will be published on the GPhC's website and highlighted to the pharmacy media. The fees will be set out clearly in relevant communications with registrants, prospective registrants and pharmacy owners, including application and renewal forms.

8. Resource implications

- 8.1 As an independent regulator, the GPhC must set fees to cover the costs of its activities. It should also be able to cover fluctuations in expenditure, and maintain a reasonable level of reserves.
- 8.2 The setting of fees is integral to the management of the GPhC's resources.
- 8.3 The resource implications for 2015/16 were fully laid out in the budget paper that Council considered in February.

9. Risk implications

- 9.1 The most significant risk for patients and the public is if the GPhC does not have sufficient resources to carry out its regulatory functions appropriately.
- 9.2 As described within the fees consultation and earlier in this paper, there are additional risks if we are unable to achieve our strategic aims successfully.
- 9.3 We recognise the responsibility that the GPhC has to maintain the confidence of all our stakeholders, including registrants.
- 9.4 Failure to set fees in an appropriate way, or failure to communicate any recommended changes in an open and transparent manner, could create reputational risks for the organisation.
- 9.5 Failure to consult adequately on the fees rules would mean that the GPhC would not be complying with its statutory duties. There were some technical problems with the ability to respond online as described in the consultation report. However, the actions taken to mitigate the issue and the significant volume of responses received means that we can have confidence in the consultation process.

10. Monitoring and review

- 10.1 The fees rules will come into force in October this year. The income generated as a result of the new rules will be reported in the Council performance monitoring report.
- 10.2 We will monitor the uptake of quarterly direct debit compared to other payment methods, and the costs involved in recovering failed direct debit payments.
- 10.3 We will also continue to review our approach to fees and costs allocation.

Recommendations

The Council is asked to:

- i. note the analysis of the fees rules consultation (appendix 1);
- ii. approve the changes to fees summarised at section 5; and
- iii. make The General Pharmaceutical Council (Registration and Renewal Fees) Rules 2015 (appendix 2) and agree that the GPhC's corporate seal be affixed to these rules.

Duncan Rudkin, Chief Executive & Registrar
duncan.rudkin@pharmacyregulation.org

26 May 2015

2015 fees rules: consultation analysis

June 2015

The text of this document (excluding the logo and branding) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium, providing that it is reproduced accurately and not in a misleading context. This material must be acknowledged as General Pharmaceutical Council copyright and the document title specified. Where third party material has been identified, permission from the respective copyright holder must be sought.

© General Pharmaceutical Council 2015

25 Canada Square London E14 5LQ

2015 fees rules: consultation analysis

1	Summary	4
2	Introduction	5
3	Responses to the consultation	7
4	Our approach	9
5	Renewal fees for pharmacists	10
6	Renewal fees for pharmacy technicians	11
7	Renewal fees for registered pharmacies	12
8	Our fees policy	13
9	Application for entry and annotations fee categories	14
10	Further comments	15
	Annex 1: Respondents to the consultation	19

1 Summary

- 1.1 The General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) consulted from 6 February to 15 May 2015 on changes we proposed to our fees. These proposals primarily cover the renewal fees paid by pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and pharmacy owners, but also affect other fees paid by smaller numbers of people such as first-time applicants for registration. This report analyses the responses we received, and provides a summary of respondents' comments on our proposals.
- 1.2 We asked respondents for their views on ensuring that the costs of regulation are more proportionately met by pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and pharmacy premises. 42.1% agreed or strongly agreed with this approach to setting fees. More detail is provided in section 4.
- 1.3 We proposed increasing the renewal fee for pharmacists by £10, from £240 to £250. 59.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this proposal. More detail is provided in section 5.
- 1.4 We proposed increasing the renewal fee for pharmacy technicians by £10, from £108 to £118. 65.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this proposal. More detail is provided in section 6.
- 1.5 We proposed increasing the renewal fee for pharmacy premises by £20, from £221 to £241. Responses were relatively balanced between agreement and disagreement, with slightly more respondents (34.6%) remaining neutral on this proposal. More detail is provided in section 7.
- 1.6 We asked if our proposals were in line with our fees policy. 48.4% neither agreed nor disagreed with this question. More detail is provided in section 8.
- 1.7 We proposed to change the application for entry and annotations fee categories. 51.1% neither agreed nor disagreed with our proposal. More detail is provided in section 9.
- 1.8 We also invited any other comments on our proposals. A summary of these responses is included in section 10.

2 Introduction

- 2.1 The General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) is the regulator for pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and pharmacy premises in Great Britain. It is our job to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and wellbeing of members of the public, and in particular those members of the public who use or need the services of pharmacy professionals or the services provided at a registered pharmacy.
- 2.2 Our main roles include:
- approving qualifications for pharmacists and pharmacy technicians, and accrediting education and training providers
 - maintaining a register of pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and pharmacy premises
 - setting standards for conduct, ethics and performance, proficiency, education and training, and continuing professional development
 - setting and promoting standards for the safe and effective practice of pharmacy at registered pharmacies
 - establishing fitness to practise requirements, monitoring pharmacy professionals' fitness to practise, and dealing fairly and proportionately with complaints and concerns.

About the consultation

- 2.3 At its February 2015 meeting, the council agreed to consult on its proposed fees. The consultation sought views on the proposals, but it also allowed respondents to challenge the organisation's thinking, and highlight areas that had not been considered.
- 2.4 The consultation ran for a 12-week period between 6 February and 15 May 2015. During this time we asked for feedback from individuals and organisations. We sent the consultation document to a range of stakeholder organisations, including professional representative bodies and employers, as well as patients and their representative bodies.
- 2.5 In early May, a technical error was identified in the survey. This error meant that some users responding as individuals were taken to a page requiring information about organisations. This led to a higher-than-normal drop-off rate in completing the surveys; up to the point the error was fully resolved, the survey received 432 responses with only 127 respondents answering at least one of the consultation questions.
- 2.6 The error was rectified in advance of the consultation closing, and we took steps to mitigate the impact of this error. This resulted in a large increase in responses. The following actions were taken to improve the rate of completed responses to the fees consultation survey:

- A follow-up email was sent on 6 May 2015 to all visitors to the survey who left an email address, but who didn't then complete the survey, advising that the error had been fixed, leading to around 40 additional completed responses
- An email was sent to an updated list of all pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and pharmacy owners, encouraging them to respond to this consultation, as well as highlighting other matters with which they could become involved
- 'Last chance' posts were placed on social media
- A story was included in Regulate, our online newsletter
- Media coverage was secured.

2.7 At the point the consultation closed, 2,011 responses had been received, of which 1,073 addressed one or more of the consultation questions. We have categorised these 1,073 responses as completed, and percentages in this report are based on that number.

2.8 We recommend that the statistical information on the responses is read in conjunction with the commentary.

3 Responses to the consultation

- 3.1 Overall, we received 1,073 completed responses to the consultation. Within those completed responses, some respondents did not answer every question. However, for consistency, we have indicated the number of individuals who skipped specific questions. Percentages may not always add up to 100% due to rounding.
- 3.2 For each question, we have included a breakdown of responses from pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and organisations, where they have identified themselves as such. Because answers to these questions were not mandatory, these totals will vary.

Table 1

Total respondents			
Individuals		780	72.7%
<i>Of which</i>	Pharmacists	468	43.6%
	Pharmacy technicians	289	26.9%
	Other pharmacy professionals	4	0.4%
	Members of the public	11	1.0%
	Other	5	0.5%
Organisations		12	1.1%
<i>Of which</i>	Pharmacy organisations	11	1.0%
	Non-pharmacy organisations	1	0.1%
Skipped question		281	26%
Total		1,073	100%

Table 2

Individual respondents by country		
England	635	59.2%
Scotland	84	7.8%
Wales	42	3.9%
Northern Ireland	2	0.2%
Other	14	1.3%
Skipped question	296	27.6%
Total	1,073	100%

Table 3

Pharmacy professionals – areas of practice		
Community pharmacy	268	<i>24.9%</i>
Hospital pharmacy	346	<i>32.2%</i>
Pharmacy education and training	15	<i>1.4%</i>
Primary care organisation	69	<i>6.4%</i>
Pharmaceutical industry	22	<i>2.1%</i>
Other	36	<i>3.4%</i>
Skipped question	317	<i>29.5%</i>
Total	1,073	100%

4 Our approach

- 4.1 We asked if our approach ensures the costs of regulation are appropriately met by pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and pharmacy premises.
- 4.2 The largest group of respondents (42.1%) were those who either agreed or strongly agreed with this approach.

Table 4

Q1 In calculating fees, the GPhC has undertaken a review to ensure that the costs of regulation are appropriately met by pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and pharmacy premises. Do you agree with this approach?	
Agree or strongly agree	452 (42.1%)
Neither agree nor disagree	261 (24.3%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	317 (29.5%)
Skipped question	43 (4.0%)
Total	1,073 (100%)

Of those who identified themselves as a pharmacist, a pharmacy technician or as responding on behalf of an organisation, the breakdown is as follows.

Table 5

	Pharmacist	Pharmacy technician	Organisation
Agree or strongly agree	250 (23.3%)	88 (8.2%)	11 (1.0%)
Neither agree nor disagree	106 (9.9%)	86 (8.0%)	1 (0.1%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	101 (9.4%)	97 (9.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Skipped question	3 (0.3%)	7 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	460 (42.9%)	278 (25.9%)	12 (1.1%)

5 Renewal fees for pharmacists

- 5.1 We proposed an annual renewal fee for pharmacists of £250. This would represent a 4.16% increase against the current fee of £240.
- 5.2 The largest group of respondents (59.7%) were those who disagreed or strongly disagreed with this proposal.

Table 6

Q2 Do you agree with our proposal to increase the renewal fee for pharmacists by £10, from £240 to £250?	
Agree or strongly agree	187 (17.4%)
Neither agree nor disagree	209 (19.5%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	641 (59.7%)
Skipped question	36 (3.4%)
Total	1,073 (100%)

Of those who identified themselves as a pharmacist, a pharmacy technician or as responding on behalf of an organisation, the breakdown is as follows.

Table 7

	Pharmacist	Pharmacy technician	Organisation
Agree or strongly agree	102 (9.5%)	47 (4.4%)	6 (0.6%)
Neither agree nor disagree	64 (6.0%)	102 (9.5%)	1 (0.1%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	299 (27.9%)	113 (10.5%)	5 (0.5%)
Skipped question	0 (0.0%)	14 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	465 (43.3%)	276 (25.7%)	12 (1.1%)

6 Renewal fees for pharmacy technicians

- 6.1 We proposed an annual renewal fee for pharmacy technicians of £118. This would represent a 9.26% increase against the current fee of £108.
- 6.2 The largest group of respondents (65.1%) were those who disagreed or strongly disagreed with this proposal.

Table 8

Q3 Do you agree with our proposal to increase the renewal fee for pharmacy technicians by £10, from £108 to £118?	
Agree or strongly agree	166 (15.5%)
Neither agree nor disagree	182 (17.0%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	698 (65.1%)
Skipped question	27 (2.5%)
Total	1,073 (100%)

Of those who identified themselves as a pharmacist, a pharmacy technician or as responding on behalf of an organisation, the breakdown is as follows.

Table 9

	Pharmacist	Pharmacy technician	Organisation
Agree or strongly agree	93 (8.7%)	28 (2.6%)	3 (0.3%)
Neither agree nor disagree	102 (9.5%)	29 (2.7%)	2 (0.2%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	255 (23.8%)	228 (21.2%)	7 (0.7%)
Skipped question	7 (0.7%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	457 (42.6%)	287 (26.7%)	12 (1.1%)

7 Renewal fees for registered pharmacies

- 7.1 We proposed an annual renewal fee for registered pharmacies of £241. This would represent a 9.05% increase against the current fee of £221.
- 7.2 Responses were relatively balanced between agreement and disagreement, with slightly more respondents (34.6%) remaining neutral on this proposal.

Table 10

Q4 Do you agree with our proposal to increase the renewal fee for pharmacy premises by £20, from £221 to £241?	
Agree or strongly agree	284 (26.4%)
Neither agree nor disagree	371 (34.6%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	360 (33.6%)
Skipped question	58 (5.4%)
Total	1,073 (100%)

Of those who identified themselves as a pharmacist, a pharmacy technician or as responding on behalf of an organisation, the breakdown is as follows.

Table 11

	Pharmacist	Pharmacy technician	Organisation
Agree or strongly agree	152 (14.2%)	52 (4.8%)	3 (0.3%)
Neither agree nor disagree	141 (13.1%)	139 (13.0%)	1 (0.1%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	156 (14.5%)	70 (6.5%)	8 (0.7%)
Skipped question	10 (0.9%)	14 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	459 (42.8%)	275 (25.6%)	12 (1.1%)

8 Our fees policy

- 8.1 We asked if our proposals were in line with our fees policy.
- 8.2 The largest group of respondents (48.4%) were those who neither agreed nor disagreed that they were.

Table 12

Q5 Do you agree that our proposals are in line with our fees policy?	
Agree or strongly agree	220 (21.0%)
Neither agree nor disagree	519 (48.4%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	269 (25.1%)
Skipped question	65 (6.1%)
Total	1,073 (100%)

Of those who identified themselves as a pharmacist, a pharmacy technician or as responding on behalf of an organisation, the breakdown is as follows.

Table 13

	Pharmacist	Pharmacy technician	Organisation
Agree or strongly agree	127 (11.8%)	53 (4.9%)	4 (0.4%)
Neither agree nor disagree	218 (20.3%)	150 (14.0%)	5 (0.5%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	95 (8.9%)	67 (6.2%)	2 (0.2%)
Skipped question	12 (1.1%)	7 (0.7%)	1 (0.1%)
Total	452 (42.1%)	277 (25.8%)	12 (1.1%)

9 Application for entry and annotations fee categories

- 9.1 We proposed including more categories of application fees to give us the flexibility to vary fees in future. This means we could better reflect the different costs associated with assessing different kinds of application.
- 9.2 We have proposed a separate fee for application for an annotation that has previously been removed, for example because of non-compliance with requirements for continuing professional development. This reflects the approach taken in the current fees rules to fees for application for restoration of an annotation.
- 9.3 The largest group of respondents (51.1%) were those who neither agreed nor disagreed.

Table 14

Q6 Do you agree with our proposals to change the application for entry and annotations fee categories?	
Agree or strongly agree	210 (19.6%)
Neither agree nor disagree	548 (51.1%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	234 (21.8%)
Skipped question	81 (7.5%)
Total	1,073 (100%)

Of those who identified themselves as a pharmacist, a pharmacy technician or as responding on behalf of an organisation, the breakdown is as follows.

Table 15

	Pharmacist	Pharmacy technician	Organisation
Agree or strongly agree	109 (10.2%)	45 (4.2%)	9 (0.8%)
Neither agree nor disagree	236 (22.0%)	169 (15.8%)	1 (0.1%)
Disagree or strongly disagree	90 (8.4%)	53 (4.9%)	2 (0.2%)
Skipped question	15 (1.4%)	10 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	450 (41.9%)	277 (25.8%)	12 (1.1%)

10 Further comments

- 10.1 We asked for any further comments about the draft 2015 fees rules. Respondents were given space to provide their views at various points in the survey, and 556 individuals and organisations took this opportunity. To simplify the analysis, these comments were collated from different questions and reviewed together.
- 10.2 Respondents to the consultation on the draft 2015 fees rules provided rich feedback on the proposals. In relation to the fees there was a range of opinion expressed. While there was some support for the proposals, much of the feedback provided was opposed to the proposed changes. This feedback is addressed thematically below.

Fees for different kinds of registrants

- 10.3 Among the responses there was broad support for the GPhC's approach to working out the proposed fees through a review, to ensure the costs of regulation are distributed proportionately between pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and premises.
- 10.4 However, consultation feedback highlighted perceived unfairness in the setting of fees for different kinds of registrants. Significant feedback focused on the proposed increase in fee for pharmacy technicians, making the point that the increase was not proportionate in relation to either premises or pharmacists. Pharmacists expressed concern regarding how the proposed increase in fees would affect pharmacy technicians on a low salary.
- 10.5 Other respondents suggested the setting of fees should be proportionate to the time spent on regulating pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and premises.
- 10.6 A number of pharmacists suggested the implementation of a flat registration fee for both pharmacists and pharmacy technicians. Other comments made by pharmacists included a suggestion that the increase should be the same, as a percentage, for both pharmacists and pharmacy technicians.
- 10.7 Some pharmacists raised the point that in certain circumstances, pharmacy technicians can be paid more than pharmacists. One pharmacist stated that junior pharmacists' salaries can compare unfavourably with some pharmacy technicians'; another pharmacist stated that new roles are being created for pharmacy technicians which can lead to improved pay over community pharmacists, in specific instances. It should be noted that this was a minority view, however, in comparison with the respondents who disagreed with the proposed fee rise for pharmacy technicians.
- 10.8 Pharmacy technicians also commented that the proposed change to the pharmacy technicians' fee was not proportionate. The reasoning set out echoed that made by pharmacists, focusing on a lack of proportionality and unfairness, on the basis that pharmacy technicians typically earn less than pharmacists.

- 10.9 A number of pharmacists argued that premises should pay a higher fee in comparison with pharmacists and pharmacy technicians. Many pharmacists viewed the proposed fees framework as disproportionate, stating it to be too heavily weighted on pharmacists and pharmacy technicians, rather than pharmacies.
- 10.10 Some pharmacists argued that premises, as businesses and commercial enterprises, should pay a significantly higher share of regulatory costs. A number of pharmacists asserted that inspecting pharmacies is one of the main activities of the GPhC and likely to be a high cost for the organisation, therefore placing the onus on premises to pay more. A further point made was that many premises are owned by large corporations, and that they should pay more as a matter of fairness.
- 10.11 Some pharmacists suggested that premises should be the only group to pay regulatory costs, meeting the costs of fees for their employees. One respondent suggested that the premises fee should be set to a level where it would effectively subsidise pharmacists and pharmacy technicians.
- 10.12 Pharmacy technicians also suggested that premises should pay higher fees compared to individual registrants. Again the point was raised that as visiting and inspecting premises likely includes high costs, the fee should be higher.

Fees for part-time registrants

- 10.13 A further manner in which respondents thought fees should potentially be distinguished was according to number of hours worked, with a reduced fee for part-time registrants. Numerous respondents stated that they thought it unfair and disproportionate for those working part-time to pay the full fee. This was an issue raised by both pharmacists and pharmacy technicians.

External pressures

- 10.14 Another issue which arose frequently in the consultation feedback was how the proposals were not in line with salary trends experienced by registrants over the last few years, and were therefore not in line with the wider economic context. Both pharmacists and pharmacy technicians drew attention to the disparity between static or reducing salaries, and increasing fees.
- 10.15 Some respondents argued that the fee should be based on salary rather than job type. A substantial number of pharmacists and pharmacy technicians pointed out that NHS salaries have been frozen or raised at a level below inflation over the last few years, and as a result, those working in a hospital setting would be penalised by the proposals to a greater extent.
- 10.16 Some respondents highlighted the hourly rate earned by locums, drawing attention to what were static or falling rates of pay received.
- 10.17 Pharmacists made the point that the proposed fee increases for both pharmacists and pharmacy technicians are not in line with the broader economic climate, and therefore unwarranted. A number of pharmacists drew attention to the rate of

inflation, arguing that any increase in fees should not exceed it. Pharmacists suggested that going forward, there should be a cap on any annual increases to fees, and that the rate of inflation would serve as a good measure on which to base this cap. Pharmacy technicians also objected to the proposed increase to their fee on the basis that it is above the level of inflation.

- 10.18 More broadly, the overall economic context was raised by both pharmacists and pharmacy technicians as an issue that should be taken into consideration when setting their respective fees. This was a point made by pharmacists and pharmacy technicians unhappy with the proposals.
- 10.19 A number of respondents argued that the fees were too high overall and not justified. Some respondents made the point the fees were more burdensome in light of the Royal Pharmaceutical Society's membership costs, which, when combined, exact a high financial toll on pharmacy professionals. However, some respondents stated that they viewed the proposals as reasonable. Further comments suggested that in return for a good regulatory service, registrants were willing to pay a little more than in previous years.
- 10.20 Some respondents expressed concern that the increase would be repeated again next year, and potentially on an annual basis going forward.
- 10.21 Linked to the wider external pressures faced by pharmacy professionals, some respondents made the point that there is currently an oversupply of pharmacists in relation to available posts, and that new schools of pharmacy that have opened have led to a saturation of the job market.
- 10.22 There were comments that argued the fee cost was not proportionate to other professional bodies' with nursing mentioned as a comparator group who did not have to pay such high fees.

GPhC costs and value for money

- 10.23 A number of respondents drew attention to the GPhC's recent change of office location to Canary Wharf, and the costs associated with this. Respondents suggested that the organisation's headquarters could be situated outside London in order to reduce expenses.
- 10.24 Some pharmacists made the point that they would like further information on precisely what their fee is spent on, and questioned what the extra benefits would be, in light of the proposed fee increase for pharmacists. Some feedback on the specific proposals to change the applications for entry and annotations fee categories suggested that greater explanation would be welcome.
- 10.25 Furthermore, a number of respondents suggested that the organisation should seek to raise extra revenue through in-house savings, rather than through increasing fees. Potential cut-backs were proposed including on IT, facilities management and inspection.

- 10.26 As a further funding alternative, a number of pharmacists argued that government should contribute to the cost of regulating the profession.

Direct debit

- 10.27 A number of respondents expressed frustration with the payment system employed by the GPhC to collect the fee from registrants. Both pharmacists and pharmacy technicians stated that the direct debit charge is unnecessary and in particular found the recurring charge to be burdensome. Respondents also expressed disappointment regarding the costs included in quarterly payments.

Organisational responses

- 10.28 Among the organisations that responded to the consultation there was broad support for the approach set out in the consultation document, in terms of carrying out a review to ensure that the costs of regulation are met proportionately by pharmacists, pharmacy technicians and premises.
- 10.29 However, the proposals relating to specific fees were broadly met with disapproval. Feedback provided by organisations echoed that submitted by individual registrants; stating the proposals to be inconsistent with the economic context. It was put forward that community pharmacy is facing substantial pressure and the proposals would worsen their circumstances. The proportionally high increase to pharmacy technicians' fees, in comparison with pharmacists', was highlighted.
- 10.30 Multiple organisations questioned the costs involved with the performance of inspections and expressed concern that individual pharmacists and pharmacy technicians may be unfairly shouldering these costs. To this point, it was expressed that a further breakdown of the specific costs involved with the GPhC's regulatory activities would be welcome, and guidance on how fees are set out accordingly.
- 10.31 Furthermore, organisations' responses, as with those of individual registrants, called on the GPhC to apply itself to improved efficiency and productivity.

Annex 1: Respondents to the consultation

We received 1,073 responses to the consultation. 780 were received from individuals, and 12 from organisations. 281 skipped this question and declined to identify themselves. Below is a list of the organisations that responded to the consultation.

Boots, the Guild of Healthcare Pharmacists, the Pharmaceutical Services Negotiating Committee and Pharmacy Voice supplied written responses, rather than directly responding to the consultation survey.

Responses from organisations

Ashington Central Limited

Association of Pharmacy Technicians UK

Boots Pharmacy Association

Boots UK

Community Pharmacy Scotland

Guild of Healthcare Pharmacists

Guys and St Thomas NHS Trust

M Farren Limited

Magawell Limited

Pharmaceutical Services Negotiating Committee

Pharmacy Voice

Scottish Government

The General Pharmaceutical Council (Registration and Renewal Fees) Rules 2015

CONTENTS

PART 1

General

1. Citation and commencement
2. Interpretation
3. Revocation

PART 2

Registered Pharmacists

Fees in respect of Register entries or annotations

4. Application for entry in Part 1 of the Register
5. Entry in Part 1 of the Register following grant of an application
6. Determining certain qualifications and experience
7. Application for an annotation to an entry in Part 1 of the Register
8. Voluntary removal of an entry or an annotation from Part 1 of the Register

Fees in respect of renewal of Register entries

9. Renewal of an entry in Part 1 of the Register

Fees in respect of restoration of Register entries or annotations

10. Application to restore an entry to Part 1 of the Register
11. Restoring an entry to Part 1 of the Register following grant of an application
12. Restoring an annotation to an entry in Part 1 of the Register

Other fees

13. Notices and specified certificates
14. Administration

PART 3

Registered Pharmacy Technicians

Fees in respect of Register entries

15. Application for entry in Part 2 of the Register
16. Entry in Part 2 of the Register following grant of an application
17. Determining certain qualifications and experience
18. Voluntary removal of an entry from Part 2 of the Register

Fees in respect of renewal of Register entries

19. Renewal of an entry in Part 2 of the Register

Fees in respect of restoration of Register entries

20. Application to restore an entry to Part 2 of the Register
21. Restoring an entry to Part 2 of the Register following grant of an application

Other fees

22. Notices and specified certificates
23. Administration

PART 4

Premises

Fees in respect of Register entries or annotations

24. Application for entry in Part 3 of the Register
25. Application for entry in Part 3 of the Register following removal of previous entry
26. Entry in Part 3 of the Register following the grant of an application
27. Application for an annotation to an entry in Part 3 of the Register
28. Voluntary removal of an entry or an annotation from Part 3 of the Register

Fees in respect of renewal of Register entries

29. Renewal of an entry in Part 3 of the Register

Fees in respect of restoration of Register entries or annotations

30. Application to restore an entry to Part 3 of the Register
31. Restoring an entry to Part 3 of the Register following grant of an application
32. Restoring an annotation to an entry in Part 3 of the Register

Other fees

33. Administration

The General Pharmaceutical Council has made these Rules in exercise of the powers conferred by articles 36(1) and 66(1) of the Pharmacy Order 2010(a).

In accordance with article 66(3) of that Order, the General Pharmaceutical Council has consulted such persons and organisations as it considered appropriate including the persons and organisations listed in sub-paragraphs (a) to (d) of article 36(6) and in sub-paragraphs (a) to (h) of article 66(3) of that Order(b).

PART 1

General

Citation and commencement

1.—(1) These Rules may be cited as the General Pharmaceutical Council (Registration and Renewal Fees) Rules 2015.

(2) These Rules come into force on [date].

Interpretation

2.—(1) In these Rules—

“the Act” means the Medicines Act 1968;

“credit card” means a card—

(a) which is a credit-token falling within section 14(1)(b) of the Consumer Credit Act 1974(c); or

(b) which would be a credit-token falling within that enactment were that card to be given to an individual;

“former registrant” has the meaning given in paragraph (2);

“the Order” means the Pharmacy Order 2010;

(a) S.I. 2010/231.

(b) Article 66(3)(a) was amended by S.I. 2013/235.

(c) 1974 c.39.

“Registration Rules” means the rules contained in the Schedule to the General Pharmaceutical Council (Registration Rules) Order of Council 2010(a);

“relevant person” has the meaning given in paragraph (3);

“specified certificate” means a certificate of good standing or current professional status which is issued by the Council in respect of a person and which contains the information referred to in rule 10(6)(a) to (f) of the Registration Rules.

(2) For the purposes of these Rules, a person is a “former registrant” if—

- (a) the person is no longer entered in Part 1 or 2 of the Register; and
- (b) the person’s name was removed from that Part of the Register otherwise than by virtue of a direction given by the Council’s Fitness to Practise Committee under article 54(2)(c) or (3)(a)(i) or (b)(iv) of the Order (consideration by the Fitness to Practise Committee); and
- (c) the person is not, or is no longer, capable of being restored to the Register on an application for restoration pursuant to article 37(1) of the Order(b) (restoration to the Register of persons or premises removed from the Register).

(3) For the purposes of these Rules, a person is a “relevant person” if—

- (a) the person’s name was—
 - (i) by virtue of a direction under section 8 of the Pharmacy Act 1954(c) (direction of unfitness by Statutory Committee) removed from the register maintained under section 2(1) of that Act; or
 - (ii) by virtue of a direction under article 52 of the Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians Order 2007(d) (determination as to fitness to practise by Disciplinary Committee) removed from the register of pharmacists maintained under article 10(1) of that Order or from the register of pharmacy technicians maintained under article 21(1) of that Order; and
- (b) immediately before 27th September 2010, the person was not registered in either of the registers referred to in sub-paragraph (a)(ii); and
- (c) the person has not been entered in Part 1 or 2 of the Register.

Revocation

3. The General Pharmaceutical Council (Registration and Renewal Fees) Rules 2012 are revoked.

PART 2

Registered Pharmacists

Fees in respect of Register entries or annotations

Application for entry in Part 1 of the Register

4.—(1) The fees specified in this rule are payable in respect of an application for the entry of a person in Part 1 of the Register.

- (2) Except as mentioned in paragraph (3) or (4), the fee is £ .
- (3) Where the application is made in respect of a relevant person the fee is £ .
- (4) Where the application is made in respect of a former registrant—

(a) These Rules are contained in the Schedule to S.I. 2010/1617.

(b) Article 37(1)(f) was amended by S.I. 2014/1887.

(c) 1954 c.61. The Act was repealed by paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 to the Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians Order 2007 (S.I. 2007/289).

(d) S.I. 2007/289. The Order was revoked by paragraph 58 of Schedule 4 to the Pharmacy Order 2010 (S.I. 2010/231).

- (a) the fee is £ if the removal of the former registrant's entry from the Register was voluntary;
 - (b) the fee is £ if the removal of that entry was done under or by virtue of any provision listed in paragraph (5);
 - (c) the fee is £ in any case not within sub-paragraph (a) or (b).
- (5) For the purposes of paragraph (4)(b) and rule 15(4)(b), the listed provisions are—
- (a) article 37(1)(c) of the Order (fraudulent or incorrect entries);
 - (b) article 37(1)(d) of the Order (fitness to practise matters before entry or renewal of an entry);
 - (c) article 37(1)(f) of the Order (failure to comply with requirements as to indemnity arrangements); or
 - (d) article 37(1)(g) of the Order (failure to comply with continuing professional development framework or the making of a false declaration as to compliance).
- (6) Paragraph (4)(b) does not apply to the removal of an incorrect entry for non-payment of the whole or any part of any fee required by article 20(1)(b) or (2)(b) of the Order (entitlement to entry in Part 1 or 2 of the Register).
- (7) The whole of the fee specified in any of paragraphs (2) to (4) is payable irrespective of whether the application for registration is granted.

Entry in Part 1 of the Register following grant of an application

5. Where an application is granted in respect of which a fee specified in rule 4 is payable, the fee for making an entry in Part 1 of the Register in respect of the person to whom the application relates is £.

Determining certain qualifications and experience

6.—(1) The fee in respect of the initial scrutiny of an application for entry in Part 1 of the Register to determine whether an exempt person is appropriately qualified pursuant to article 21(1)(b) of the Order (pre-entry requirements in respect of qualifications and additional education, training or experience: pharmacists) is £.

(2) The fee in respect of assessing whether an exempt person is appropriately qualified pursuant to article 21(1)(c) or article 21(1)(d)(ii)(aa) of the Order is £.

(3) Where a determination described in paragraph (1) is made to the effect that a person is not appropriately qualified and it is followed by the making of an assessment described in paragraph (2), the fee specified in each of those paragraphs is payable.

(4) The fees specified in this rule are payable in addition to the fees specified in rules 4 and 5.

Application for an annotation to an entry in Part 1 of the Register

7.—(1) The fees specified in this rule are payable in respect of an application to have an annotation to an entry in Part 1 of the Register in respect of a specialisation.

(2) Except as mentioned in paragraph (3), the fee is £.

(3) The fee is £ where—

- (a) the application is made by a registrant or former registrant who has previously had an annotation in respect of the same specialisation, and
- (b) that annotation was removed under rules made by virtue of article 27(1)(c) of the Order (which includes provision for rules to be made as to the circumstances in which annotations to an entry may be removed).

(4) The whole of the fee specified in paragraph (2) or (3), as the case may be, is payable irrespective of whether the application to have the annotation is granted.

Voluntary removal of an entry or an annotation from Part 1 of the Register

8. No fee is payable in respect of an application for the voluntary removal from Part 1 of the Register of—

- (a) an entry in that Part; or
- (b) an annotation to an entry in that Part in respect of a specialisation.

Fees in respect of renewal of Register entries

Renewal of an entry in Part 1 of the Register

9.—(1) The fee for renewal of an entry in Part 1 of the Register is £.

(2) A person (“P”) may enter into an arrangement with the Registrar to delay payment of part of the renewal fee under paragraph (1).

(3) Where such an arrangement is entered into—

- (a) the renewal fee is to be paid by P in instalments by way of direct debit; but
- (b) the outstanding balance of an amount equal to the aggregate of the renewal fee and any additional fee due under rule 14 becomes payable immediately if the Registrar gives P a notice under paragraph (4).

(4) The Registrar may give P a notice under this paragraph in any case where P—

- (a) fails to make a payment which has fallen due under the arrangement referred to in paragraph (2); or
- (b) fails to comply in any other respect with the terms and conditions referred to in rule 4(2) of the Registration Rules (payment of fees by instalments); or
- (c) makes an application for the voluntary removal of P’s entry from Part 1 of the Register.

(5) Nothing in paragraphs (2) to (4) affects P’s liability to pay the whole of the renewal fee and any additional fee due under rule 14.

Fees in respect of restoration of Register entries or annotations

Application to restore an entry to Part 1 of the Register

10.—(1) The fees specified in this rule are payable in respect of an application for restoration of an entry to Part 1 of the Register.

(2) Where the application is made following the voluntary removal of an entry—

- (a) the fee is £ if the application is made before the end of the period of 1 month starting with the date of the voluntary removal; and
- (b) the fee is £ in any other case.

(3) The fee is £ where the application is made following the removal of an entry under or by virtue of a provision specified in—

- (a) article 37(1)(a) of the Order (the Registrar’s refusal to renew an entry); or
- (b) article 37(1)(b) of the Order (failure to discharge duties with regard to the registrant’s entry).

(4) Where the application is made following the removal of an entry under or by virtue of the provision specified in article 37(1)(c) of the Order (fraudulent or incorrect entries)—

- (a) the fee is £ if an incorrect entry was removed because of non-payment of the whole or any part of a fee required by article 20(1)(b) or (2)(b) of the Order (entitlement to entry in Part 1 or 2 of the Register); and
- (b) the fee is £ in any other case.

(5) The fee is £ where the application is made—

- (a) following the removal of an entry under or by virtue of a provision specified in—
 - (i) article 37(1)(d) of the Order (fitness to practise matters before entry or renewal of an entry); or
 - (ii) article 37(1)(f) of the Order (failure to comply with requirements as to indemnity arrangements); or
 - (iii) article 37(1)(g) of the Order (failure to comply with continuing professional development framework or the making of a false declaration as to compliance); or
 - (b) following the grant by the Council's Fitness to Practise Committee of an application under article 57 of the Order (restoration of names to the Register: fitness to practise).
- (6) The whole of the fee specified in any of paragraphs (2) to (5) is payable irrespective of whether the application for restoration of an entry is granted.

Restoring an entry to Part 1 of the Register following grant of an application

11.—(1) Where an application is granted in respect of which a fee specified in rule 10 is payable, the fee for restoring an entry to Part 1 of the Register in respect of the person to whom the application relates is £.

(2) The whole of the restoration fee is payable irrespective of the date on which the entry is restored to Part 1 of the Register.

Restoring an annotation to an entry in Part 1 of the Register

12.—(1) The fees specified in this rule are payable in respect of an application for restoration of an annotation made to an entry in Part 1 of the Register.

(2) The fee is £ if the application is made following the voluntary removal of the annotation.

(3) The fee is £ if the application is made following the removal of the annotation under rules made by virtue of article 27(1)(c) of the Order (which includes provision for rules to be made as to the circumstances in which annotations to an entry may be removed).

(4) The whole of the fee specified in paragraph (2) or (3), as the case may be, is payable irrespective of whether the application for restoration of an annotation is granted.

Other fees

Notices and specified certificates

13.—(1) The fee for the replacement of a notice of entry in Part 1 of the Register is £.

(2) The fee for issuing a specified certificate in respect of a person entered in Part 1 of the Register is £.

Administration

14.—(1) The fee for re-processing a payment which has not been honoured by the bank or card-issuer of a person paying a fee specified in any of the preceding provisions of this Part is £.

(2) The fee for processing an application for entry in Part 1 of the Register where the application has been returned to the applicant for additional information more than once is £ and that fee is payable in addition to the fee payable under rule 4.

(3) Where a credit card is used to pay a fee ("the primary fee") specified in any of the preceding provisions of this Part—

- (a) an additional fee for processing the payment shall be added to the primary fee; and
- (b) the amount to be added is to be determined as 2 per cent. of the amount of the primary fee.

PART 3

Registered Pharmacy Technicians

Fees in respect of Register entries

Application for entry in Part 2 of the Register

15.—(1) The fees specified in this rule are payable in respect of an application for the entry of a person in Part 2 of the Register.

(2) Except as mentioned in paragraph (3) or (4), the fee is £ .

(3) Where the application is made in respect of a relevant person, the fee is £ .

(4) Where the application is made in respect of a former registrant—

(a) the fee is £ if the removal of the former registrant's entry from the Register was voluntary;

(b) the fee is £ if the removal of that entry was done under or by virtue of any provision listed in rule 4(5);

(c) the fee is £ in any case not within sub-paragraph (a) or (b).

(5) Paragraph (4)(b) does not apply to the removal of an incorrect entry for non-payment of the whole or any part of any fee required by article 20(1)(b) or (2)(b) of the Order (entitlement to entry in Part 1 or 2 of the Register).

(6) The whole of the fee specified in any of paragraphs (2) to (4) is payable irrespective of whether the application for registration is granted.

Entry in Part 2 of the Register following grant of an application

16. Where an application is granted in respect of which a fee specified in rule 15 is payable, the fee for making an entry in Part 2 of the Register in respect of the person to whom the application relates is £.

Determining certain qualifications and experience

17.—(1) The fee in respect of the initial scrutiny of an application for entry in Part 2 of the Register to determine whether an exempt person has a right to practise as a pharmacy technician pursuant to article 22(1)(b) or (1)(c)(ii)(aa) of the Order (pre-entry requirements in respect of qualifications and additional education, training or experience: pharmacy technicians) is £.

(2) The fee in respect of the initial scrutiny of an application for entry in Part 2 of the Register made by a person ("T") to determine whether T—

(a) has completed elsewhere than in the United Kingdom education and training as a pharmacist or pharmacy technician which leads to a qualification entitling T to practise as a pharmacy professional in a country other than the United Kingdom; and

(b) meets Conditions 1 and 2,

is £.

(3) Condition 1 is that, for the purposes of article 20(1)(a) of the Order, T is appropriately qualified pursuant to article 22(1)(c)(i) or (1)(c)(ii)(bb) of the Order.

(4) Condition 2 is that T has undertaken in the United Kingdom a minimum amount of relevant work experience of not less than 14 hours a week either whilst T was training to be qualified as described in Condition 1 or post-qualification.

(5) No fee is payable in respect of the initial scrutiny of an application for entry in Part 2 of the Register where, for the purposes of article 20(1)(a) of the Order, the person is appropriately qualified pursuant to article 22(1)(a) of the Order (approved qualification awarded in Great Britain).

(6) The fees specified in this rule are payable in addition to the fees specified in rules 15 and 16.

Voluntary removal of an entry from Part 2 of the Register

18. No fee is payable in respect of an application for the voluntary removal of an entry from Part 2 of the Register.

Fees in respect of renewal of Register entries

Renewal of an entry in Part 2 of the Register

19.—(1) The fee for renewal of an entry in Part 2 of the Register is £.

(2) A person (“T”) may enter into an arrangement with the Registrar to delay payment of part of the renewal fee under paragraph (1).

(3) Where such an arrangement is entered into—

- (a) the renewal fee is to be paid by T in instalments by way of direct debit; but
- (b) the outstanding balance of an amount equal to the aggregate of the renewal fee and any additional fee due under rule 23 becomes payable immediately if the Registrar gives T a notice under paragraph (4).

(4) The Registrar may give T a notice under this paragraph in any case where T—

- (a) fails to make any payment which has fallen due under the arrangement referred to in paragraph (2); or
- (b) fails to comply in any other respect with the terms and conditions referred to in rule 4(2) of the Registration Rules (payment of fees by instalments); or
- (c) makes an application for the voluntary removal of T’s entry from Part 2 of the Register.

(5) Nothing in paragraphs (2) to (4) affects T’s liability to pay the whole of the renewal fee and any additional fee due under rule 23.

Fees in respect of restoration of Register entries

Application to restore an entry to Part 2 of the Register

20.—(1) The fees specified in this rule are payable in respect of an application for restoration of an entry to Part 2 of the Register.

(2) Where the application is made following the voluntary removal of an entry—

- (a) the fee is £ if the application is made before the end of the period of 1 month starting with the date of the voluntary removal; and
- (b) the fee is £ in any other case.

(3) The fee is £ where the application is made following the removal of an entry under or by virtue of a provision specified in—

- (a) article 37(1)(a) of the Order (the Registrar’s refusal to renew an entry); or
- (b) article 37(1)(b) of the Order (failure to discharge duties with regard to the registrant’s entry).

(4) Where the application is made following the removal of an entry under or by virtue of the provision specified in article 37(1)(c) of the Order (fraudulent or incorrect entries)—

- (a) the fee is £ if an incorrect entry was removed because of non-payment of the whole or any part of a fee required by article 20(1)(b) or (2)(b) of the Order (entitlement to entry in Part 1 or 2 of the Register); and
- (b) the fee is £ in any other case.

(5) The fee is £ where the application is made—

- (a) following the removal of an entry under or by virtue of a provision specified in—

- (i) article 37(1)(d) of the Order (fitness to practise matters before entry or renewal of an entry); or
 - (ii) article 37(1)(f) of the Order (failure to comply with requirements as to indemnity arrangements); or
 - (iii) article 37(1)(g) of the Order (failure to comply with continuing professional development framework or the making of a false declaration as to compliance); or
 - (b) following the grant by the Council's Fitness to Practise Committee of an application under article 57 of the Order (restoration of names to the Register: fitness to practise).
- (6) The whole of the fee specified in any of paragraphs (2) to (5) is payable irrespective of whether the application for restoration of an entry is granted.

Restoring an entry to Part 2 of the Register following grant of an application

21.—(1) Where an application is granted in respect of which a fee specified in rule 20 is payable, the fee for restoring an entry to Part 2 of the Register in respect of the person to whom the application relates is £.

(2) The whole of the restoration fee is payable irrespective of the date on which the entry is restored to Part 2 of the Register.

Other fees

Notices and specified certificates

22.—(1) The fee for the replacement of a notice of entry in Part 2 of the Register is £.

(2) The fee for issuing a specified certificate in respect of a person entered in Part 2 of the Register is £.

Administration

23.—(1) The fee for re-processing a payment which has not been honoured by the bank or card-issuer of a person paying a fee specified in any of the preceding provisions of this Part is £.

(2) The fee for processing an application for entry in Part 2 of the Register where the application has been returned to the applicant for additional information more than once is £ and that fee is payable in addition to the fee payable under rule 15.

(3) Where a credit card is used to pay a fee ("the primary fee") specified in any of the preceding provisions of this Part—

- (a) an additional fee for processing the payment shall be added to the primary fee; and
- (b) the amount to be added is to be determined as 2 per cent. of the amount of the primary fee.

PART 4

Premises

Fees in respect of Register entries or annotations

Application for entry in Part 3 of the Register

24.—(1) Except as mentioned in rule 25, the fee in respect of an application for the entry of premises in Part 3 of the Register is £.

(2) The whole of the fee specified in paragraph (1) is payable irrespective of whether the application for registration is granted.

Application for entry in Part 3 of the Register following removal of previous entry

25.—(1) The fees specified in this rule are payable in respect of an application for the entry of premises in Part 3 of the Register where—

- (a) the previous entry in respect of the premises was removed from the Register; and
- (b) the person making the application is the person who was carrying on the retail pharmacy business at the premises immediately before the entry was removed.

(2) The fee is £ where the previous entry was removed by virtue of section 74A(7) of the Act (a) (registration of premises: Great Britain) and is no longer capable of being restored to the Register on an application for restoration under section 74C of the Act (supplementary provision in respect of registration of premises: Great Britain).

(3) The fee is £ where the previous entry was removed by virtue of an application under section 74G of the Act (voluntary removal from the Register: Great Britain) and is no longer capable of being restored to the Register on an application for restoration pursuant to article 37(2) of the Order.

(4) The fee is £ where the previous entry was removed by virtue of a direction under section 80 of the Act (power to disqualify and direct removal from Register) and that direction is revoked under section 83 of the Act (revocation of disqualification).

(5) The fee is £ where the previous entry was removed under article 14(4)(a) of the Order (non-compliance with improvement notices) and is no longer capable of being restored to the Register on an application for restoration pursuant to article 37(2) of the Order.

(6) Where the previous entry was removed pursuant to article 29(3)(b) of the Order (fraudulent or incorrect entries)—

- (a) the fee is £ if an incorrect entry was removed because of non-payment of the whole or any part of a fee required by section 74B(3) of the Act (conditions for registration: Great Britain); and
- (b) the fee is £ in any other case.

(7) The whole of the fee specified in any of paragraphs (2) to (6) is payable irrespective of whether the application for registration is granted.

Entry in Part 3 of the Register following the grant of an application

26. Where an application is granted in respect of which a fee specified in rule 24 or 25 is payable, the fee for making an entry in Part 3 of the Register in respect of the premises to which the application relates is £.

Application for an annotation to an entry in Part 3 of the Register

27. The fee in respect of an application to have an annotation to an entry in Part 3 of the Register in respect of a specialisation is £.

Voluntary removal of an entry or an annotation from Part 3 of the Register

28. No fee is payable in respect of an application for the voluntary removal from Part 3 of the Register of—

- (a) an entry in that Part; or
- (b) an annotation to an entry in that Part in respect of a specialisation.

(a) 1968 c.67. Sections 74A to 74L were inserted by paragraph 1(1) and (8) of Schedule 4 to the Pharmacy Order 2010 (S.I. 2010/231).

Fees in respect of renewal of Register entries

Renewal of an entry in Part 3 of the Register

29.—(1) The fee for renewal of an entry in Part 3 of the Register is £ if the renewal is for a period of one year beginning with the date on which the entry would otherwise have ceased to be valid.

(2) If the Registrar renews an entry in Part 3 of the Register for a period exceeding one year^(a), the fee for renewal of the entry is to be increased proportionately.

Fees in respect of restoration of Register entries or annotations

Application to restore an entry to Part 3 of the Register

30.—(1) The fees specified in this rule are payable in respect of an application for restoration of an entry of premises to Part 3 of the Register.

(2) The fee is £ where the application is made following the voluntary removal of an entry.

(3) The fee is £ where the application is made following the removal of an entry under or by virtue of a provision specified in—

- (a) article 37(2)(a) of the Order (failure to comply with improvement notice);
- (b) section 74C(1) of the Act (non-renewal of an entry); or
- (c) section 74I(1) of the Act (non-notification of change of ownership of retail pharmacy premises).

(4) The whole of the fee specified in paragraph (2) or (3), as the case may be, is payable irrespective of whether the application for restoration of an entry is granted.

Restoring an entry to Part 3 of the Register following grant of an application

31.—(1) Where an application is granted in respect of which a fee specified in rule 30 is payable, the fee for restoring an entry to Part 3 of the Register in respect of the premises to which the application relates is £.

(2) The whole of the restoration fee is payable irrespective of the date on which the entry is restored to Part 3 of the Register.

Restoring an annotation to an entry in Part 3 of the Register

32.—(1) The fee in respect of an application for restoration of an annotation to an entry in Part 3 of the Register is £.

(2) The whole of the fee specified in paragraph (1) is payable irrespective of whether the application for restoration of an annotation is granted.

Other fees

Administration

33.—(1) The fee for re-processing a payment which has not been honoured by the bank or card-issuer of a person paying a fee specified in any of the preceding provisions of this Part is £.

(a) The Registrar's power to renew an entry for a period exceeding one year is conferred by section 74A(6) of the Medicines Act 1968. See also rule 24(8) of the Rules contained in the Schedule to the General Pharmaceutical Council (Registration Rules) Order of Council 2010 (S.I. 2010/1617).

(2) The fee for processing an application for the entry of premises in Part 3 of the Register where the application has been returned to the applicant for additional information more than once is £ and that fee is payable in addition to the application fee payable under rule 24.

(3) The fee for making an alteration to an entry in Part 3 of the Register to record a change of ownership of a retail pharmacy business carried on at premises entered in that Part of the Register is £.

(4) Where a credit card is used to pay a fee (“the primary fee”) specified in any of the preceding provisions of this Part—

- (a) an additional fee for processing the payment shall be added to the primary fee; and
- (b) the amount to be added is to be determined as 2 per cent. of the amount of the primary fee.

Given under the official seal of the General Pharmaceutical Council this [insert] day of [insert] 2015.



Chair

Registrar