

	ramme Board Perfo		
Date	of Programme Boar	d: 01/04/2010	Reporting Period: 02/03/2010 – 01/04/2010
1.	In attendance: Julie Myers (JM) Michelle Jacobs (I	Lucas Ford (LF Chris Baas (CB VJ) Lesley Davies (	Martin Montague (MM)
	Craig Jones (CJ) Alex Roy (ADR) Dawn Reid (DR)	Chris Handford Martin Monta Crispin Passmo	d (CH) gue (MM)
2.		<ul> <li>Progress against project milestones was reported.</li> <li>Bristol ABS forum held – 140 people atter.</li> <li>Work undertaken to respond to consultate document published on 26/03.</li> <li>Joint meeting held with SRA and options from are: (i) Dualist option – ABS and non-ABS under the AJA; (iii) All firms are regulated.</li> <li>Schedule 10 and 11 commencement composite Key deliverables for next reporting period.</li> <li>Start to develop Impact Assessment of April is being primarily used to plan applications and further considerations.</li> </ul>	ted. Areas to note: inded. ion on final guidance for LAs throughout March and approved by Board on 24/03; for resolution of s69 of the Act being developed. The four options being discussed exist but have a different legislative basis for regulation; (ii) All firms are regulated under the Act; (iv) SRA applies to be a new AR without a legislative basis. pleted. : int in preparation for Part 5 commencement (the commencement of ABS). In the next stages of ABS, in particular considering the process for dealing with action of PI Insurance.
	Enforcement – Leslie Davies		creasing number of external engagements.  nce against rules and internal awareness raising of the enforcement process as it
	Access to Justice  – Leslie Davies	<ul> <li>Key deliverables for next reporting period</li> <li>Further work around defining how</li> <li>Work with Research Manager and</li> </ul>	. Feedback resulted in further refinement. Document now likely to be published  :  v A2J will be split to link with other projects.  Strategy Director on Market Review research project. Research will use analysis to understand how the supply side of legal services operates.

First-tier	Continued work with ARs to reach agreement over action plans based on outcomes of self-assessment.
Complaints – Lucas Ford	<ul> <li>Reviewed the implementation of AR complaints signposting rule. In general, the review did not flag up anything unexpected Large ARs submitted good responses and showed that they have the correct structure in place, however, there were still areas that required clarification and due to the AR size and higher risk needed to be addressed imminently. Smaller ARs were less compliant but due to the lower risk posed more flexibility can be afforded to them addressing the issues.</li> <li>Response letters to ARs issued on outcomes of self-assessment. Letters address three areas: 1) LSB view on first-tier</li> </ul>
	complaint handling reviews; 2) General points that have come to light from the self-assessments; 3) Individual responses to AR submissions with a note to what should be addressed for the reviews at the end of 2010.  • Key deliverables for next reporting period:
	<ul> <li>Board paper for discussion on 27/04 highlights key actions.</li> </ul>
Regulatory Reviews – Lucas Ford	<ul> <li>Meeting collectively with 'small' ARs and separately with SRA and BSB about IGRs throughout February, March and April (also see Independence).</li> </ul>
roid	
	Key deliverables for next reporting period:     Continue to scope out AB effectiveness questions and strategy for talking forward assignment.
	<ul> <li>Continue to scope out AR effectiveness questions and strategy for taking forward reviews.</li> <li>Obtaining views from third party and Board Members on approach to review and proposed questions.</li> </ul>
Designation and	Continue to deal with applications within targeted timescales – business as usual.
Regulatory	• 1-2-1s with ARs to discuss content of forward plans to be completed.
Rules – Chris	• 3x rule changes approved (2x BSB and 1x SRA).
Handford	<ul> <li>Plan to feedback lessons learned to ARs after five applications have been received – this will also feedback into plans for enforcement actions.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Met and made good progress with ILEX for rule change application.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Key deliverables for next reporting period:</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Ongoing work on applications – 8x rule change applications expected up to April.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Responding to ICAEW regarding the s69 route not being available to them and therefore the need for them to appl to become an AR.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Planning for 2010/11 – planning rule change calendar to ensure effective resourcing and forward planning.</li> </ul>
Independence –	<ul> <li>Meet with all ARs about practising fees and IGRs throughout February, March and April (also see Regulatory Reviews).</li> </ul>
Chris Handford	

	<ul> <li>Reporting on AR compliance, enforcement issues and risk assessment to SMT following informal meetings.</li> <li>Agreement from SMT on enforcement strategy based on compliance and risk assessment.</li> <li>Budget cycles timetables for every AR.</li> <li>Key deliverables for next reporting period:         <ul> <li>Assessing likely risk around return of AR Certificates of Compliance.</li> <li>Update circular letter to ARs to set terms of 30/04 submission.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Workforce Development – Chris Handford	<ul> <li>Initial report from Diversity research project to be completed. The research has been commissioned to better understand the drivers of the legal careers among women and ethnic minorities. As yet there is no date for publication, which will be launched alongside a research at a seminar after the election.</li> <li>Strategy paper discussed and presented to Board for discussion.</li> <li>Proposed re-planning of communication messages discussed in CEO report paper.</li> <li>Successful diversity forum held on 15/04. Working towards development of clear guidance on transparency on diversity and compendium of current AR initiatives.</li> <li>Key deliverables for next reporting period:         <ul> <li>Handover to new PM, Michael Stacey.</li> <li>Begin to plan what to do with data on routes into the profession.</li> <li>Finalising ECHR report and our plans on establishing a baseline.</li> <li>Planning for next phase of Gateways sub-group 5 in light of survey analysis.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Referral Fees - Leslie Davies	<ul> <li>Initial project brief completed and issued for comment to colleagues.</li> <li>PID being developed for sign-off by SMT on 26/04.</li> <li>Key deliverables for next reporting period:         <ul> <li>Finalisation of Charles River Associates report for publication in May.</li> <li>Liaison with Consumer Panel – report expected 26/05.</li> <li>Planning for 2010/11 with consideration of communications plan with mind to ensuring that the views of stakeholders are carefully communicated and to avoid mis-communication for drafting.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Reserved/Non- reserved – Dawn Reid	<ul> <li>View to put Project Brief together by the end of April.</li> <li>Brief will characterise what each project activity is likely to be and timetable set to deliver Q3 2010/11.</li> <li>Now to use terms reserved/non-reserved, to ensure consistency with the Act.</li> </ul>

	Project likely to consider both when it is appropriate to bring something under the regulated umbrella and also when it will be appropriate to de-regulate an area.
Small ARs – James Meyrick	<ul> <li>It is envisaged that a project brief on this area will be produced by the end of April and a PID for the end of May, although this may slip into early June.</li> <li>Some of the broad aims of this project will be to look at what makes a 'good' smaller AR, to develop a relationship management process for the smaller ARs and to explore the capabilities of smaller ARs and help them to meet the requirements of the Act in a proportionate manner.</li> <li>Key deliverables for next reporting period:         <ul> <li>Arranging meetings with PMs to gather intelligence about colleagues' contact with, and thoughts about, the smaller ARs.</li> <li>Collating information on the smaller ARs into an archive (helped by the Lovells work).</li> <li>Arranging introductory meetings with appropriate contacts at the smaller ARs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Research	<ul> <li>Small firms research published.</li> <li>Consumer Panel referral fees study received (May publication date).</li> <li>Diversity research focus groups and interviews completed.</li> <li>Future of industry reports received.</li> <li>Key deliverables for next reporting period:         <ul> <li>Intended April publication date for Future of the Industry work has been delayed due to 'Purdah' restrictions.</li> <li>CRA Economic Referral fees research report to be completed for publication in May.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Comms (new line)	<ul> <li>Public Affairs:         <ul> <li>More reactive (than pro-active) work in March.</li> <li>Responding to enquiries about reserved/non-reserved and outcomes-based regulation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Bristol Forum on 10/03 – 140 attendees.</li> <li>CK met John Griffiths, Counsel General (equivalent of Leader of the House and Attorney General) from Welsh Assembly.</li> <li>DE gave speech to Association of Partnership Practitioners.</li> <li>FG gave presentation at Lawyers Strategic Risk Management Conference.</li> <li>CK and FG spoke at ICAEW ABS conferences.</li> <li>Continued work on internal style guide.</li> <li>Key deliverables for next reporting period:         <ul> <li>Intelligence gathering in reference to election and possible outcomes.</li> <li>Nailing down internal arrangements.</li> <li>Working with PMs to assist planning, identifying key messages and understanding what is happening when.</li> <li>Developing Joint Corporate Calendar.</li> <li>ABS Forum in Cardiff – 12/05.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

3.	Project Risks: The full project risk register was reviewed and is attached. No new risks were identified.  A new process for reporting project risk will be developed from May. It is intended that all Project Managers will report the number of Project risks that they have and escalate any with a status of 10 or more to the Programme Board. The need to consider the cumulative effect of 'minor' project risks will also be considered.		
	[REDACTED]		