

Minutes of a meeting of Legal Services Board (LSB) on 28 March 2012

Date: 28 March 2012
Time: 9.30am – 1.30pm
Venue: Victoria House, Southampton Row, London WC1B 4AD

Present: David Edmonds Chairman
(Members) Chris Kenny Chief Executive
 Steve Green
 Bill Moyes
 Ed Nally
 Barbara Saunders
 Andrew Whittaker
 David Wolfe

Apologies: Nicole Smith (who had submitted detailed written comments on the agenda items in advance)

In attendance: Chris Baas Project Manager (item 5)
 Nicolas Baré Business Planning Associate (item 10)
 Jessica Clay Legal Adviser (except item 20)
 Rob Cross Project Manager (item 9)
 Elisabeth Davies Chair, Consumer Panel (to item 12)
 Elizabeth France Chair, Office for Legal Complaints (except item 20)
 Fran Gillon Director of Regulatory Practice (except item 20)
 Nick Glockling Legal Director (except item 20)
 Paul Greening Regulatory Associate (item 10)
 Chris Handford Project Manager (item 4)
 Edwin Josephs Director of Finance and Services (except item 20)
 Emily Lyn Project Manager (item 5)
 Julie Myers Corporate Director
 Crispin Passmore Strategy Director (except item 20)
 Holly Perry Corporate Governance Manager (minutes)
 Abigail Plenty Deputy Director, Ministry of Justice (except item 20)
 Dawn Reid Head of Statutory Decisions (item 6)
 Alex Roy Head of Development and Research (items 4, 9, 10)

Item 1 – Welcome and apologies

1. The Chairman welcomed those present and in attendance to the meeting. In particular, he welcomed Elisabeth Davies, Chair of the Consumer Panel, Elizabeth France, Chair of the Office for Legal Complaints (OLC), Abigail Plenty, Deputy Director Civil Justice and Legal Services Division, Ministry of Justice (MoJ), and Jessica Clay, who had joined the LSB as Legal Adviser on 19 March 2012.

2. Nicole Smith had sent apologies for the meeting and had submitted detailed written comments on the substantive papers in advance.

Item 2 – Declarations of interests etc

3. There were no new declarations of interests.
4. Board Members were reminded to notify the Corporate Governance Manager about hospitality extended and/or received in the course of their LSB work. In addition, Board Members were asked to submit their expenses claims as soon as possible in light of the financial year end.

Item 3 – Paper (12) 13: Office for Legal Complaints (OLC) Budget 2012/13

5. A sub group of the Board had met on 29 February 2012 to consider the paper, following which the Chairman had written to the OLC Chair requesting an assurance response in connection with expenditure on developing a voluntary jurisdiction. The Chief Executive provided a verbal update on the latest position.
6. The LSB had been concerned that the assurance provided in subsequent correspondence between the Chairman and OLC Chair did not necessarily provide adequate comfort, particularly in light of a recent communication from NAO in relation to the LSB's governance and oversight of the OLC which the LSB would need to report in its Governance Statement (in its annual report). Some issues had remained open after a meeting between the Chief Executive and the Chief Ombudsman on 22 March.
7. However, following further discussion between the OLC Chair and Chief Executive, it had been confirmed that the Chief Ombudsman had assured his Board as Accounting Officer on the legality of the spend and the fact that it would be accounted for separately when it was above a *de minimis* level. This would be confirmed in the minutes of both Boards.
8. The Board noted that the Accounting Officer's view that this assurance was sufficient for the LSB's purposes.
9. **The Board resolved to note the agreed budget for the OLC for the period 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013.**

Item 4 – Paper (12) 14: Investigation into the regulation of will-writing, probate and estate administration services – initial proposals and draft impact assessment for consultation

10. Crispin Passmore, Strategy Director introduced the paper and accompanying draft consultation document and impact assessment, which aimed to reflect the direction provided by the Board at its meeting on 25 January 2012 (Paper (12) 03 refers) . The cover paper drew attention to particular issues raised by the Board in January and subsequently by the nominated non-executive directors consulted.
11. Discussions had begun with the SRA about their plans to review the effectiveness of regulation of will-writing and estate administration, as well as on activity authorisation open to non-solicitors. Meetings with current and prospective Approved Regulators would be arranged as part of the consultation process.

Discussions had been held with MoJ economists, which had assisted with the drafting of the impact assessment in particular. The Legal Ombudsman (LeO) had also been briefed in advance about the proposals and in particular about potential impacts on any plans to develop voluntary jurisdictions in these areas.

12. The Board noted:

- the detailed written comments which had been circulated by a Board Member in advance of the meeting, which had focused on the style of engagement with key stakeholders and the tone of the drafting in the consultation paper
- there was a need to tighten the drafting in a number of places, to ensure that there was a full explanation of why the Board was putting forward proposals for liberalisation of the market and a different regulatory approach
- there was a need for clarity in the document on what was meant by ‘reservation’, ‘regulation’, and ‘outcomes focused’, and also what the LSB would expect of frontline regulators in both the immediate future and in the longer term
- there needed to be discussion on the pros and cons of whether a decision to reserve should also cover related areas such as Powers of Attorney and Trusts particularly as these often came in a ‘package’ alongside will writing
- there needed to be fuller discussion of whether reservation should cover the production of software as well as its use in the preparation of wills and where liability on the latter issue should lie. Other analogous areas involving regulation and the use of software would also be reviewed. The need for definition and consistency in relation to use of the terms ‘consumer education’ and ‘consumer information’ was also discussed
- SRA were understood to be undertaking work to produce a model for the regulation of non-solicitors, but other regulators and some of the professional bodies in the sector were also active in this area of work. Otherwise, there had been no substantive response from SRA as yet on the quality issues raised by the research or targeted supervision and enforcement activity
- the need to be mindful of the considerable degree of work that would be required for a smooth passage of the proposals through the MoJ, OFT, BIS and the Regulatory Policy Committee. Ensuring that the impact assessment was robust and rigorous would be helpful in this regard, and considerable time would be invested on understanding and articulating the benefits
- the OLC Chair recommended a dovetailing of the consultation with LeO’s work on third party complaints, to ensure opportunities were maximised.

13. **The Board commended Alex Roy and Chris Handford for the hard work to date, and resolved to:**

- a) **approve the consultation and impact assessment subject to the preparation of final drafts which reflected the points raised in discussion**
- b) **delegate final sign off to the Chief Executive and Chairman for publication in mid-April, alongside the decision paper on the LSB’s general approach to assessing the boundaries of regulation which the Board had considered in January (Paper (12) 02 refers)**
- c) **note that a proactive media handling strategy would be undertaken on publication, and that significant interest was anticipated.**

Item 5 – Paper (12) 15: Regulation of special bodies – consultation paper

14. Fran Gillon, Director of Regulatory Practice introduced the consultation paper, which had developed considerably following the Board's thorough discussion at its 25 January 2012 meeting (Paper (12) 05 refers) about regulation of non-commercial bodies once the current transitional protection was removed.
15. The Board noted:
- its agreement in principle that there should be a delay to the lifting of transitional protection, particularly on the basis that there was no readily available approved regulator, and that to prepare guidance for any new approved regulator would take time. It was, however, confirmed that the protection was only transitional and discussions were ongoing with MoJ regarding timing
 - there were some points raised in the January discussion that needed further reflection in the consultation including the issues around scale, commerciality, and managing the politics of extending regulation to the voluntary sector
 - the Cabinet Office had been helpful and challenging in assisting the LSB develop its thinking on the cost and sustainability of a sector-led regulator
 - explicit reference had been made in the draft consultation to the view that the current SRA prohibition on special bodies charging was inappropriate because it was not risk-based, and that blanket restrictions on business structures (ie the separate business rule) were particularly inappropriate for this part of the market on the basis that they inhibited commercial developments which might secure access to justice
 - the Consumer Panel would take an active interest in the outputs of the consultation. There were concerns in particular around a delay to the transitional arrangements adversely impacting on consumer vulnerability. The LSB needed to be upfront about risks and controls
 - the links to the potential future study on reservation of general legal advice would be made clearer in the drafting
 - the accompanying impact assessment would be published alongside the consultation document. Given the makeup of the workforce and client base in the sector, references to diversity issues would be added to the main body of the consultation document
 - there was strong MoJ interest in avoiding anything that added further resourcing pressure on bodies subject to legal aid cuts. This was particularly relevant to non-commercial bodies given the funding cuts they are currently experiencing and the plans by some to provide a wider range of legal work. A proportionate approach to the regulation of the sector was therefore vital
 - however light touch the approach, regulation would bring matters into OLC's jurisdiction and therefore the LSB and OLC needed to work together
 - there was likely to be some sensitivity in the SRA to the fact that the LSB had placed emphasis in the paper on regulation by activity.
16. **The Board resolved to delegate authority to the Chairman and Chief Executive to agree publication of the consultation paper and draft impact assessment, subject to the Board's comments being reflected in a revised version of the draft consultation paper. As the issues raised by the consultation were closely linked to the papers on will writing and scope of regulation, all three documents would be published in parallel in mid April.**

Item 6 – Paper (12) 16: Council for Licensed Conveyancers' designation application

17. Dawn Reid, Head of Statutory Decisions introduced the paper, which followed discussion of CLC's designation application at the 25 January 2012 meeting of the Board (Paper (12) 08 refers). At the January Board meeting, there had been detailed discussion on the legal issue and it had reached the initial conclusion that CLC did not have the legal powers to not make rules for entities and so the application should be declined. Further work had been undertaken on the application since January to enable a final decision.
18. The Board noted:
- the application for designation as an approved regulator and licensing authority for the reserved legal activities of conduct of litigation and the exercise of rights of audience would need to be refused on the basis of the completion of the executive's legal and technical assessment
 - an assessment of the regulatory arrangements and capability and capacity had been completed. In any future application, CLC would need, in particular, to articulate clearly its understanding of the risks associated with this activity and had started work on a draft implementation plan. The LSB would advise CLC frankly about the extent of the investment required to advance in these areas
 - on the basis of the extent of the shortcomings on capability and capacity, the decision notice would need to reflect reference to these wider areas in addition to the technical and legal reasons. It was important to communicate the rounded picture of the grounds for refusal
 - the CLC had been made aware of the decision – the CLC's Interim Chief Executive and its Director of Policy and Standards had been briefed in the week beginning 19 March. CLC were likely to focus now on the work required to secure approval of the application.
19. **The Board resolved to refuse the application from the CLC for a recommendation for designation as an approved regulator and licensing authority for the reserved legal activities of conduct of litigation and the exercise of rights of audience on grounds of both legal incapacity and the wider issues of capability referenced in the paper. Authority was delegated to the Chairman and Chief Executive to agree the final decision notice.**

Item 7 – Paper (12) 17: Final Draft LeO Strategy 2012-15 and Business Plan 2012-13

20. Elizabeth France, OLC Chair, presented the final draft Legal Ombudsman strategy and business plan, which had been approved at the OLC Board meeting earlier in the week. Subject to any final points raised in discussion with the LSB Board, the strategy and business plan would be published later on 28 March.
21. The Board noted:
- planned expenditure was £17m in 2012/13, reflecting a significant reduction on the figure consulted upon
 - the publication – for the first time – of targets against key performance indicators was planned. The OLC Chair thanked the respective chairs of the LSB and OLC's Audit and Risk Committees for their joint work on these
 - a consultation on some revisions to OLC's Scheme Rules had been published

on 25 March 2012. These included options on case fees, time limits, compensation limits and who could complain. The OLC had made a public commitment to review the Scheme Rules after 18 months. Any changes would require LSB consent

- the LSB remained committed to the principle that the parties responsible for the most complaints should be responsible for paying for the work created. The OLC Chair noted the sentiment and would progress work on an approach in the context of the work on Scheme Rules, but wished to avoid a scheme which might result in arguments about charging regimes
- in terms of claims management, OLC was in the process of assessing the implications of commencing section 161 and was in discussion with MoJ on developing a business case for approval. The OLC had the capacity to progress the work, and would keep the LSB updated on progress
- the first meeting of a Redress and Regulation Working Group, comprising OLC, MoJ and LSB, was scheduled for 30 March. The working group would help to ensure – at a strategic policy level - that the moves planned by the OLC and LSB to explore changes to the edges of redress and regulation in legal services did not conflict
- the OLC Chair reported receipt of the LSB's Section 120 notice requiring a report about complaints received by the Ombudsman scheme that were not within its jurisdiction. Advance notice was requested for future notices, so that the OLC could programme the data requirements into its planning
- the Consumer Panel took a particular interest in quality and fairness of decisions, and would look further at the Ombudsman's relationship with consumers and the public going forward
- the LSB had welcomed LeO's thematic report on costs and customer service in the legal services market, which had been published on 5 March. Media coverage had been positive, and LeO planned to continue publishing reports on a bi-annual basis – the OLC Chair welcomed feedback on areas to cover.

22. The Board resolved to note the final draft Legal Ombudsman Strategy 2012-15 and Business Plan 2012/13.

Item 8 – Briefing from the Ministry of Justice on the Triennial Review

23. Abigail Plenty, Deputy Director Civil Justice and Legal Services Division, Access to Justice Directorate, MoJ provided the Board with a verbal update on the Triennial Review of the LSB and also feedback on the parallel review of the OLC.
24. There were two parts to the review: the first stage was an assessment of the LSB's functions, and whether or not these needed to continue; the second stage was a review of governance arrangements, including an analysis of the relationship between LSB and the OLC. There was an element of independence in the process, with a 'critical friends' group - comprising NAO, Cabinet Office and BIS - meeting to critique the MoJ's approach. The deadline for the submission of responses to MoJ was 30 March, and the Stage One report was expected to be submitted to Ministers in early May. MoJ would share the findings of the Stage One report with the LSB. The final report would be published externally before summer recess.
25. The Board noted:

- subject to points raised in any further responses received by the deadline of 30 March, MoJ was of the initial view it was too early to consider any radical changes. The conclusion was likely to be that the LSB should continue to exist in its current form but should be ready to move from ‘implementation stage’ to ‘steady state’, with acknowledgement that the dynamic state of the market – including ABS, the Jackson reforms, legal aid changes – was likely to significantly impact the regulatory environment in the short to medium term
- challenges that had been raised in the workshops included: whether the boundaries of regulation were right; whether there were flaws in the founding legislative architecture; the potential for micro management by the LSB; duplication of the roles of the LSB and the approved regulators; the future landscape and what it would mean for the LSB
- as regards the OLC, the position was similar although there had been questions about the OLC’s boundaries, and also discussion in the workshops regarding whether there remained a need for an OLC Board as distinct from the LSB Board. On further probing, the criticism around resourcing two separate Boards had fallen away
- in relation to the Consumer Panel, the reaction was positive, although there were issues around the Panel’s visibility and the question of BIS’s proposals to transfer most consumer advocacy functions to Citizen’s Advice.

26. The Board thanked Abigail Plenty and her team at MoJ for their hard work to date, acknowledging that relations with MoJ were very positive as a result of the open and constructive ways of working, and resolved to:

- a) note the MoJ’s update on the Triennial Review of the LSB, and the next steps and timescales**
- b) note that the Chief Executive and Corporate Director would prepare a response for submission to MoJ, reflecting the points raised in MoJ’s feedback and in discussion.**

Item 9 – Paper (12) 18: Market Impacts of the Legal Services Act – Interim Report

27. Rob Cross, Project Manager presented the interim report on the Market Impacts of the Legal Services Act, emphasising that a significant amount of data was expected to emerge over the coming six months, prior to publication of a final report in October. The report would continue, after that, to be a ‘live’ document.

28. The Board noted:

- the report was clearly being labelled as an interim report, to invite debate, views and input from a broad range of stakeholders, especially evidence or data that may have been over looked. The aim was to improve the picture over time. The ideal response would be for stakeholders to begin to collecting and publishing more data than they did at present
- owing to a lack of information, the LSB had had to draw tentative conclusions from incomplete evidence. There was scope for challenge and constructive debate on these issues
- discussions were underway with senior level staff at MoJ to consider the extent to which the report could help them in tracking the impact of Government policy
- the drafting in the report around the connection between quality and complaints would be reviewed, as would the drafting around quality assurance
- some work would be done on the graphs, to increase their visibility

- a media launch to take specialist journalists through the report was planned for 3 April.

29. The Board resolved to approve the Market Evaluation Report for publication alongside the Business Plan in April 2012. A seminar style session of the Board would be held in the autumn to discuss the outputs.

Item 10 – Paper (12): 19 Final Strategic Plan 2012/15, Business Plan 2012/13, Equality Strategy and Research Plan 2012/13

30. Julie Myers, Corporate Director presented the papers, which followed public consultation between December 2011 and March 2012. The LSB was committed to publishing a Business Plan, agree a budget, and publish a research plan on an annual basis. As regards equality, the LSB was required under the Equality Act to publish its equality duties by 6 April. Not every approved regulator had responded to the consultation and, as in previous years, no responses had been received from consumer groups.

31. The Board noted:

In relation to the Strategic Plan 2012 to 2015 and Business Plan 2012/13:

- the paper set out the main themes emerging from consultation and the suggested LSB response - it was agreed that some redrafting was necessary in places to smooth the tone, but balancing this with robust responses to the points proposed in consultation responses with which the LSB did not agree
- the revised Consumer Panel advice requests were noted, which had been shared with the Consumer Panel Chair in advance and had been met with broad agreement
- on budget, there were no proposed changes. The Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee confirmed that the Committee had met immediately before the Board and had agreed the budget for endorsement to the Board, subject to minor drafting changes in the supporting narrative. The point was made that underspends in a particular financial year were discounted from the levy in the following financial year.

In relation to the Equality Objectives:

- the consultation exercise had been broadly supportive of the LSB's aspirations albeit some respondents remained visibly critical of the LSB's approach to transparency. Consultation responses had been helpful in improving the drafting of the objectives and the drafting of objective 2 would be reconsidered in the light of the discussion.

In relation to the Research plan:

- the plan was principally for the Board's endorsement
- there were risks associated with the proposals in the paper to reduce research spend on the basis that others would fill research gaps
- Nicole Smith had submitted helpful comments which would also be reflected in the final version.

32. The Board resolved to:

- a) approve the Strategic Plan for 2012-15 and draft Business Plan for 2012/13 subject to the drafting changes proposed and the further points**

raised in discussion

- b) agree the proposed budget of £4,498k subject to formal MoJ approval**
- c) delegate authority to approve the sign-off of the Plan to the Chairman and the Chief Executive**
- d) agree the equality objectives for 2012/13**
- e) agree the research plan for 2012/13.**

Item 11 - Paper (12) Draft Consumer Panel Work Programme 2012/13

33. Elisabeth Davies, Chair of the Consumer Panel presented the draft work programme to the Board for endorsement. The programme had been the subject of considerable debate within the Panel, reflecting the challenging context of the wider changes impacting on the landscape presently, and a strong commitment to consumers with vulnerable backgrounds in particular. In this context, it had been a particular challenge for the Panel to determine on which areas to focus.

34. The Board noted:

- the draft programme allowed sufficient space for the specific advice requests the LSB planned to make, as referenced in the LSB's Business Plan 2012/13
- the Chair highlighted the importance of partnership working with the OLC
- the programme was ambitious, but original and innovative and reflected work that was not being undertaken anywhere else
- in terms of the issues raised in the Triennial Review around the Panel's visibility and transparency, it was acknowledged that given the limited budgetary resource made available to the Panel, the range of its activity was extremely broad. The Panel Chair acknowledged in particular the benefit of the two secretariat staff resourced by the LSB, and their significant contribution to the work of the Panel
- there was strong relationship between the LSB Chairman and the Chair of the Panel, who met regularly to discuss issues of mutual interest and the adequacy of resourcing.

35. The Board thanked the Panel Chair for attending to present the work programme and resolved to endorse the Work Programme.

Item 12 – Minutes – 25 January 2012

36. The Board resolved to agree the minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2012 and to submit them for signing as an accurate record to the Chairman.

Item 13 – Report of action points

37. The Board resolved to note the Report of action points.

Item 14 – Paper (12) 21: Chief Executive's progress report: March 2012

38. The Chief Executive presented his progress report for the month of March.

39. The Board noted:

- on staffing changes, Vincent McGovern would be joining the LSB on 10 April as Communications Manager, succeeding Craig Jones, who would be

leaving on 5 April. Wendy Harris, Project Manager would be leaving her interim role with the LSB on 28 March

- on directors liability insurance, the Board noted this was now in place, and thanked Abigail Plenty for facilitating this
- the Education and Training workshops were so far progressing well
- on QASA, the Chairman had met the Chairs of both SRA and BSB in the last week and although the work remained challenging, progress was being made
- the Chief Executive had written to approved regulators on 23 March in regard to action plans submitted in response to the LSB's s162 guidance on gathering and the evidence base about diversity across the legal workforce and promoting transparency at entity level. The Board would be presented with a progress report on the implementation of guidance at its April meeting
- the SRA were announcing the first three ABS licenses later on 28 March, with Ministerial involvement. The Executive continued to monitor the SRA's activities closely in this area, in particular being alert to potential staffing constraints
- amongst a number of other SRA issues which had been discussed frankly at both CEO and Chairman level, IT difficulties were causing significant concern following the deeply unsatisfactory practising certificate renewal process for 2011/12. Resolving IT functionality in time for the next round of practicing certificate renewals in October 2012 was now a priority for the SRA. The Law Society's Budget and Oversight Board had agreed phased resourcing for the work at its last meeting and the LSB would be requesting sight of SRA's critical path between now and October 2012 and details of what arrangements were being put in place to facilitate delivery of the regulatory functions in the period before the full system functionality was available
- in relation to the Compensation Fund, progress was being made on what form the Statutory Instrument should take and the timing of a review – the Chief Executive thanked Abigail Plenty for her assistance
- in relation to the BSB, the Chair of the ARC and the Chief Executive were meeting with their counterparts at BSB later on 28 March to follow up on the joint meeting of the LSB and BSB boards held on 9 February
- in terms of the BSB issue around the Council of the Inns of Court (COIC) panel members, the BSB has confirmed a timetable for assessing the impact of past reappointment procedures for COIC tribunal members after it found that not all members had been formally reappointed for their second terms following their initial appointment
- the Chief Executive reported back on a useful visit to Brussels with the SRA on 26 and 27 March. Further discussions would take place with MoJ and SRA as to how best to take forward the work.

40. The Board resolved to:

- a) **note the Chief Executive's progress report**
- b) **confirm it would now receive SDT performance information on an annual basis, with quarterly reporting on an exception basis**

Item 15 – Paper (12) 22: Revised Scheme of Delegations

41. Holly Perry presented the Terms of Reference for LSB executive groups and proposed revisions to the LSB Scheme of Delegations which emerged as a consequence of changes in organisation structure that took effect in December

2011. The Audit and Risk Committee had seen and approved the proposals at its meeting on 29 February, and had endorsed them to the Board.

42. The Board resolved to:

- a) **note the Terms of Reference for the LSB's executive groups**
- b) **approve revisions to the LSB Scheme of Delegations**

Item 16 – Paper (12) 23: Minutes of 29 February Audit and Risk Committee

43. Steve Green, Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee presented the key outputs from the 29 February meeting of the Committee.

44. The Board resolved to:

- a) **note the ARC's approval of the retention of the external adviser to the Committee, Philip Lindsell, to April 2013 with succession plans to be discussed at the October 2012 meeting of the Committee**
- b) **agree the retention of the services of KPMG LLP for a period of three years from 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2015**
- c) **note the draft minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting held on 29 February 2012**

Item 17– Paper (12) 24: LSB Corporate Risk Register: Six Monthly Review

45. Julie Myers, Corporate Director introduced the paper and draw the Board's attention to the fact that that the refreshed risk register was the result of a request made by the Audit and Risk Committee at its 10 October 2011 meeting to analyse and manage the risks posed by the delivery of the new 2012-15 strategy and the supporting business plan for 2012/13. The register had been considered in detail at the ARC's 29 February meeting, and subject to the detailed points raised in discussion being reflected, endorsed the refreshed register to the Board for approval and adoption.

46. The Board noted:

- while the register was created from scratch through a thorough and detailed analysis, many of the risks from the former register were identified, updated and included in the new register to reflect the changing nature of the LSB's corporate activity and its relationships. Alongside these, new risks had also been added
- the analysis of the former and proposed register was felt to be helpful
- the Board noted that the governance process in place around the risk register was very robust.

47. The Board thanked Julie Myers and Nicholas Baré for their work on the issue and resolved to adopt the refreshed corporate risk register as recommended by the Audit and Risk Committee.

Item 18 – Paper (12) 25: Finance Report for February 2012

48. The Board resolved to note the Finance Report, particularly the £300k underspend, which had resulted from a restructuring of activity ahead of the reductions planned in 2012/13.

Item 19 – Any other business

49. There was no other business.

**Item 20 – Private session – Paper (12) 26 – Minutes of 30 November 2011
Remuneration and Nomination Committee (RNC)**

50. The Chairman of the RNC presented the draft minutes of the 30 November meeting for noting and updated the Board on his discussions with the Chairman of the LSB about the Terms of Reference of the RNC and some further work that was now underway. The Board noted that MoJ had raised a query regarding Chief Executive succession planning, which the Chairman had responded to by explaining the Board’s internal arrangements.

51. The Board resolved to note the draft minutes of the Remuneration and Nomination Committee’s 30 November 2011 meeting.

Item 21 – Date of next meeting

52. The Board would next meet on 25 April 2012, 09.30 – 13:00 followed by a joint Board meeting with OLC, 13:30 – 16:00. The venue would be LSB’s offices at Victoria House, Southampton Row, London WC1B 4AD.

HP, 02/04/12

Signed as an accurate record of the meeting

.....
Date

.....