<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper/Ref</th>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Welcome and Introductions</strong>&lt;br&gt;The CCC members each introduced themselves and confirmed papers had been received. PEB GB welcomed all attendees to the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>To note the Terms of reference of the Committee</strong>&lt;br&gt;No changes to ToRs.</td>
<td>NO ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Conflicts of Interest</strong>&lt;br&gt;The PEB GB advised that this item was to note any Conflicts of Interests that the PEB GB may have with any participants of this meeting.&lt;br&gt;There were no conflicts to be recorded.&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;Conflicts of Interest Register&lt;/em&gt;&lt;br&gt;No changes to the conflict of Interest Register</td>
<td>NO ACTION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **PEB Examiner vacancies**

PEB informed the committee that FC3 and FD4 vacancies have been advertised and progress has been made.

Informals asked what was the plan if the PEB did not find someone to fill the vacancies.

The PEB GB responded that the PEB would call on previous examiners if needed and there was a brief discussion regarding training and experience required to fill the roles.

The PEB GB highlighted that vacancies have been filled in recent months.

The Informals asked if the same person that led the team of examiners also wrote the paper.

The PEB responded that it worked better for a person to do both. However, it was not impossible to have separate people but it could present difficulties.

PEB said that the Informals could be assured that exams will be delivered in October and scripts would be marked.

| No Action |

5. **PEB Invigilator Instructions**

The Informals mentioned that they raised the issue about suggested amendments to the PEB invigilators’ instructions regarding giving verbal warnings to candidates in the last CCC meeting. This was due to some of the 2022 FD candidates not uploading before the PEB given deadline.

The PEB mentioned that when the FC candidates sat their exams through ProctorExam they managed to do it without any prompts to upload. However, PEB had taken the feedback on board and it had been included in the PEB invigilator instructions. The PEB highlighted that time management was the candidate’s responsibility.

The PEB GB asked if candidates are starting to upload at the correct time.

PEB responded that most of the candidates left it until the last minute to upload which the PEB can see from the PEBX audit trail. The PEB still accepted the exam upload even if the candidates uploaded in the last minute. So essentially candidates had an extra ten minutes to work on their answers which was why the PEB was very strict if the answers were not uploaded within the 10-minute upload time.

The PEB GB said that if the candidates gamble with the upload time, it was a question of their personal and professional responsibility.

The PEB mentioned that if the candidates also had an Invigilator announcement this year and still missed the upload time, the exam would be classed as void.

The PEB GB suggested it should be well known by candidates that the PEB can see what time uploading starts by the candidate.

There was a brief discussion about scanning claims and drawings for the FD exams and the Informals agreed that ten minutes was ample time for a candidate to upload their answer scripts.

There was further discussion regarding candidates who uploaded their answer scripts prematurely and then did not upload their final answer script.

| No Action |
PEB clarified that if a candidate did this, there was still some answer script saved that would be marked. PEB said that in PEBX, a new upload of an answer script by a candidate replaces the previous upload the candidate had made.

The Informals asked about the format of the invigilation for the exams. PEB responded that the FDs would be invigilated by PEB trained Invigilators and the FCs would be proctored. Candidates should refer to the essential information for candidates on the PEB website.

The PEB GB mentioned that the invigilators could not force candidates to upload but could warn candidates that the upload time had started. The PEB said that if a candidate had requested the use of earphones during the exam as a reasonable adjustment, the onus was on the candidate to ensure they heard the invigilator announcements and managed their time.

It was decided that the Informals will produce a blog post which would be sent to the PEB for approval before publication to ensure the facts are correct. The Informals raised a concern regarding multiple document names and said that the file name did not automatically get replaced as you save it.

PEB suggested that this could be practiced during the trial as computers can vary.

The PEB reassured the Informals that staff went through all the candidates that sat the examinations on PEBX to check that the most recently saved document was showing and that it was sent to for marking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informals</th>
<th>6.  IPReg Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informals feedback on IPReg Requirements 3, 6, 7, 14, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement 3:</strong> Review roles of each committee and TOR for this committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Informals discussed candidate representation on the PEB CCC and said that there is a high turnover when people qualify. It was suggested that newly qualified candidates would attend one more meeting for the sake of continuity. It was also suggested that recruiting FC candidates was preferable going forward as their term would be longer on the committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEB GB mentioned that these were sensible suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Informals said they were happy to manage membership of the committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PEB asked whether the TOR of the committee needed updating and the Informals responded that it did not because there is a risk of not being able fill the vacancies of committee members if the terms are more specific. The informals mentioned that the broad approach in the TOR worked well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informals asked whether the timings of the two CCC meetings a year could be altered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO ACTION**
The PEB explained that the timings fit in with the PEB workload and schedule and unfortunately there was no opportunity to have the meetings between January to May.

It was agreed that Informals would raise any proposed changes in June to be considered in September at the GB meeting and approved in the December GB meeting. This would allow enough time to communicate any changes to candidates when information was posted on the website for the upcoming exam session in April. Anything forwarded after September will not be considered in December GB.

**Requirement 6**

There were no specific responses addressing this broad question so the PEB suggested reverting to the Informals regarding this requirement further down the line. There was a discussion regarding the value of receiving a breakdown of marks and the PEB explained that Professional Exam candidates were treated as grown-ups and did not operate in the same way Universities do in terms of feedback on failed papers. However, the PEB had considered what kind of feedback would be appropriate for the future exam sessions (return of marked scripts, report of failed scripts for a fee etc.)

This requirement would be put on the agenda of the June 2024 PEB CCC meeting

**Requirement 7**

The Informals provided two specific suggestions, a) returning marked failed scripts or b) returned marked failed scripts with comments from Examiner.

The PEB explained to the committee that it was difficult to find examiners willing to undertake this work. The Informals expressed concern as to why examiners were not willing to undertake this work, implement the mark scheme and queried how it was additional work for the examiner.

PEB responded that it depended on what the examiner was marking. For example, in FD4 the examiner was pulling together the strands of information throughout the paper which was not as straightforward as the FC papers. The Informals queried whether a partial breakdown would be possible? The PEB responded to say it could be considered when the formal assessment is reviewed.

PEB GB said they could ask around and see what other exam boards did and why.

There was a discussion regarding the annotated sample scripts that are published on the website.

The Informals stressed how useful it would be a candidate were able to receive the script with ticks. The Informals asked whether there could be a page total mark given to candidates.

The PEB responded that this was difficult because there were two markers for the FD exams and the way in which the sub-total box was used was different depending on the examiner.
However, the PEB said this point would be taken into consideration when re-designing the FD assessment model and would raise it for further discussion at the June 2024 CCC Meeting.

**Requirement 14**
The Informals suggested there was more emphasis on the guidance regarding prior experience. It did exist but it was not known by candidates and the Informals requested statistics.
The PEB questioned whether this was within their remit or was this a training issue/concern.
The PEB GB advised that there were statistics to hand that one of the Patent Attorney members of the GB prepared (although it was difficult to rely on these because candidates changed firms).
There was further discussion regarding candidates’ success rates which were higher after three years’ experience. This did not need to be highlighted to candidates but to firms as it seemed apparent that firms were pressuring candidates to sit exams when they may not necessarily be ready to do so. However, the PEB mentioned that it could not dictate to the firms but maybe work with CIPA to get message out to firms at training events.

**Requirement 19**
There was agreement that collectively the committee worked quite well.
There was discussion regarding negative cycle between PEB and the candidates and how the cycle could be broken.
The PEB GB suggested that candidates read information produced by the PEB and used an appropriate tone.
The Informals suggested the PEB reported candidates to their employers, the PEB responded that this approach would add to the candidate’s exam stress and it was out of courtesy that the PEB did not report candidates to their employers.
The PEB highlighted that the candidates were particularly unpleasant regarding Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration requests.

### 7. 2023 Qualifying Examinations

The Informals said they were happy to act as conduit for questions about the examinations.

One of the questions that had been asked was in relation to using a phone to scan. Can a phone be in the room and off or out of the room and the candidate could retrieve it when it comes to scanning?
The PEB responded that they would need to think that through and provide an answer.
The PEB informed the committee that there had been an unusual request from a candidate asking whether the door could be open during the exam to leave the cat in and out?
There was a discussion and it was decided that the PEB will respond to this query. Room must be suitable for the exam with or without the cat.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th>AOB</th>
<th>Informals (done post meeting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | The PEB congratulated candidate members of the Committee who had recently qualified as Patent Attorneys’.  
The informals said that the names of new committee members to be sent to the PEB. |                               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.</th>
<th><strong>Future meetings and agenda items</strong></th>
<th>PEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A doodle poll would be sent out to members of the CCC committee to schedule the next meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>