



Bar Council response to the Legal Services Board's (LSB) Draft Business Plan 2024/25

1. This is the response on behalf of the General Council of the Bar of England and Wales ("the Bar Council") to the Legal Services Board's Consultation on its 2024/25 Draft Business Plan ("the Business Plan").
2. The Bar Council represents over 17,500 practising barristers in England and Wales. It promotes the Bar's high quality specialist advocacy and advisory services; fair access to justice for all; the highest standards of ethics, equality and diversity across the profession; and the development of business opportunities for barristers at home and abroad.
3. A strong and independent Bar exists to serve the public and is crucial to the administration of justice. As specialist, independent advocates, barristers enable people to uphold their legal rights and duties, often acting on behalf of the most vulnerable members of society.
4. The Bar makes a vital contribution to the efficient operation of criminal and civil courts and tribunals. It provides a pool of talented people from increasingly diverse backgrounds from which a significant proportion of the judiciary is drawn, on whose independence the Rule of Law and our democratic way of life depend. The Bar Council is the Approved Regulator for the Bar of England and Wales. It discharges its regulatory functions through the independent Bar Standards Board (BSB).

Q1 – Do you agree with our proposed workstreams for the 2024/25 business plan?

5. As a general observation, the Bar Council notes that the LSB's 2024/25 Business Plan has 18 separate workstreams, some of which include multiple strands of work, bringing the total number to 25. While the LSB indicate that they have critically assessed their proposed activities for 2024/25, we consider 25 separate workstreams too ambitious and strongly advise the LSB to once more critically assess its workstreams and to limit its activities to objectively demonstrated failings on the part of front-line regulators before it publishes its final business plan.

Regulatory performance

6. The Bar Council considers the LSB's proposal to strengthen its regulatory oversight a sensible one and agrees this area of work should be a focus for the LSB. However, we strongly urge the LSB to reconsider increasing its capacity in enforcement, investigations and surveillance by six FTE. Instead, the LSB should critically evaluate its workstreams and reprioritise these to free up existing staff to focus on its specified regulatory functions. That way, an ongoing commitment to fund six new salaries and the budget increase associated with this can be avoided.

Statutory decisions

7. The Bar Council does not object to the LSB discharging its statutory approval and decision-making powers, such as approving the Approved Regulators' annual Practising Certificate Fee applications.

Office for Legal Complaints (OLC) oversight and Solicitors' Disciplinary Tribunal (SDT) oversight

8. We agree with the workstream regarding oversight of the OLC as it falls within the remit of the LSB. As stated in the draft business plan, it is important to hold the OLC to account to ensure that it delivers at an appropriate cost level and that its performance improvement is sustained. In a similar vein, we also agree with the oversight of the SDT as it falls within the remit of the LSB.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

9. The Bar Council shares and supports the LSB's objective of advancing equality, diversity and inclusion in the legal sector.

10. We do not agree that it is within the remit of the LSB to 'maximise the role of regulation in removing barriers to a diverse and inclusive profession'. We believe it is the role of the front-line regulators to ensure workable, minimum standards are in place, and that these standards are properly enforced. That is the work to which the LSB should address its attention. It is never the role of the LSB to "maximise the role of regulation" in any respect. That is to ignore the requirements of Section 3 of the Legal Services Act 2007 (LSA 2007) to act only in a way as "reasonably practicable" and so that regulatory activities should be "proportionate, consistent and targeted only at cases in which action is needed." As such we do not agree with the proposed workstream to develop a policy statement to this effect.

11. We believe it is most appropriate and more effective for the representative bodies to promote good equality and diversity practice, such as through research,

guidance, education, training, and mentoring programmes to achieve better equality and diversity outcomes in the legal professions. A list of the Bar Council's work in this area, as an example, is given in response to question 8.

12. We are unclear as to what “developing new policy on equality, diversity and inclusion”¹ from a regulatory perspective would involve. Existing E&D and other Code of Conduct rules already reflect equality standards required in other organisations and professions with respect to recruitment, monitoring the workforce and retention. [Recent BSB data](#) on the profession demonstrates good progress and that the many activities carried out by the Bar Council, Inns of Court, Chambers, Specialist Bar Associations, Circuits, and associated groups are having a beneficial effect. There is no demonstration by the LSB that regulation, let alone “maximising the role of regulation” would have good effect. On the contrary, our experience is that if practitioners are directed by regulators, it tends to extinguish goodwill, and enthusiasm is lost. On this basis, we are not convinced we need a new approach by the LSB; rather, we need to continue, and build upon, the current approach.

13. Accordingly, we question the use of LSB funding for research to support this workstream. We believe it will simply remodel existing, extensive research already undertaken by others on this issue. If, contrary to our view, the LSB looks to now get engaged in this matter (something we have worked on over many years, and with progress made), we would encourage the LSB to look at existing research, alongside work programmes currently in place or planned, before embarking on plans to create a new policy approach or directing a generalised statutory policy statement, which may be a ‘one size fits all’ approach that does not recognise the considerable differences between parts of the profession.

14. Well-considered regulation can be helpful in ensuring equality and diversity. As and when we identify that additional regulation, beyond the present position could have a role, we will raise this with the BSB (our regulator). We are confident that we are making progress and we consider that there is a particular risk of a duplication of work/wasted effort, as well as practitioner exhaustion and disillusionment, if the LSB take its proposed approach.

Rule of law and professional ethics

15. The Bar Council has previously stated its concerns with the LSB's focus on this area of work. We reiterate these concerns here. We do not consider that regulation is the most suitable tool for addressing concerns the LSB has previously expressed regarding both SLAPPs and Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs). Both need to be addressed through legislation. The LSB must take care not to confuse the regulation

¹ [LSB Draft Business Plan 2024/25 Consultation](#), page 8

of lawyers' conduct with the regulation of lawyers' client's conduct. The LSB has no role in the regulation of the conduct of lawyers' clients – that is for Parliament or the courts. Lawyers' duties to their clients are to advise them on the law and assist them in behaving lawfully in their own best interest, whilst the lawyers themselves must of course behave with integrity, honesty and independence. The LSB's recent consultation on NDAs² suggests an inappropriately wide role for legal regulators in using regulatory levers to restrict or restrain lawful conduct.³ This can only result in tensions between regulatory principles, create regulatory 'grey areas' and confusion, will not address the truly bad actors (who should be caught by existing conduct rules), and will create collateral disputes.

16. The Bar's Code of Conduct, contained in the BSB Handbook, underpins barristers' regulation by the BSB.⁴ Barristers must comply with this ethical code or risk facing disciplinary action. As we explained in our response to the LSB's 2023/24 draft business plan:

“Barristers' adherence to the code of conduct promotes the rule of law because of a primary duty to the court in the administration of justice which prevents, for example, them misleading the court. To take another example, the cab rank rule and requirement not to withhold services on the grounds that the nature of the case is objectionable or the conduct or beliefs of the prospective client are unacceptable to the barrister or any section of the public is conducive to ensuring access to legal advice and representation. We are not aware of any significant risks to the rule of law that are caused by deficiencies in barristers' code of conduct.”⁵

17. We remain committed to the importance of this theme, as demonstrated by our participation in the LSB's Professional Ethics and Rule of Law roundtables. But we do not believe that the LSB has any remit to address these issues. In addition, we are concerned that the LSB does not fully comprehend the intricacies of the Bar's Code of Conduct, as shown by its paper on the cab rank rule, published in its October 2023 board paper.⁶ This failed to account for all arguments in favour of the rule and conflates a lack of regulatory action having been taken with ineffectiveness of the rule. In reality, the rule is entirely pervasive of barristers' approach to the acceptance of instructions. Nor did the paper deal adequately with the “declaration of conscience” issue or the fact that it gives protection to barristers that take on cases from unpopular clients or issues. An important consequence of the cab rank rule is that it discourages

² [LSB Call for Evidence: Misuse of Non-disclosure Agreements](#)

³ [Bar Council response to LSB Call for Evidence: Misuse of Non-disclosure Agreements](#)

⁴ [BSB Handbook](#)

⁵ [Bar Council response to LSB Draft Business Plan 2023/24](#), p.8

⁶ LSB board paper '[Reflections on the cab rank rule: supporting the rule of law, improving access to justice and maintaining independence](#)' 17 October 2023

any public perception that barristers are to be identified with their clients, or their clients' causes. That provides a protection that is needed as much today as at any time.

Disciplinary and enforcement processes

18. Fair and effective disciplinary and enforcement processes are essential for both the public and the regulated legal professionals and are critical to the functioning of regulators. However, as in our response to the LSB's 2022/23 Business Plan:

*"Where issues with (the public confidence in) enforcement and discipline are demonstrated to exist, the LSB may assist those regulators with developing and improving enforcement principles. However, it must be careful not to constrain frontline regulators with unduly prescriptive principles, recognising that there is great variety amongst legal service providers and the types of disciplinary issues that may arise. Barristers, for example, do not handle client money, which means disciplinary issues seldom relate to client account issues/misappropriation of client funds."*⁷

19. We are concerned that this workstream has been introduced by the LSB following a stated desire by a small number of regulators to introduce unlimited fining powers.

20. Such powers are contentious and are not required universally; and we urge the LSB to carefully consider the implications of their introduction.

Technology and innovation

21. As stated in the Bar Council response to the LSB draft business plan 2023/24, we consider that the role of regulation in ensuring the safe uses of artificial intelligence (AI) is a workstream that falls outside of the remit of the LSB. Researching the role of regulation on the safe use of AI is a social and political aim relevant to politicians, Parliament and representative bodies, and not one for an oversight regulator.

22. This is a large workstream, particularly when seen under the extensive commitments detailed under paragraph 27 of the LSB draft business plan.

23. We also re-emphasise part of our response to the LSB's consultation on promoting technology and innovation:

"As the LSB will be aware, the most advanced attempt to regulate AI is the draft EU AI Act. It is anticipated that the AI Act will categorise AI systems that assist in law enforcement or in interpretation or application of the law as 'High Risk', a designation

⁷ [Bar Council response to LSB Draft Business Plan 2022/23](#), p.4

that will require such systems to be assessed before being put on the market and throughout their life-cycle.

The proposed statutory guidance fails to appreciate that the role of a legal services regulator is to create an appropriate regulatory regime to ensure that the public are protected from potentially risky technologies (while ensuring that appropriate technologies are able to exist). It is not the role of regulation to promote their use.”⁸

24. Under this same workstream, we continue to have reservations about the cost-benefit ratio of a single register of all regulated legal professionals, given that this information is already readily available from individual registers.⁹

Review of LSB education and training guidance

25. It is reasonable to have a workstream that reviews LSB education and training guidance. We believe it is the role of the front-line regulators to ensure workable, minimum standards are in place, and that these standards are properly enforced. This should be taken into account when reviewing the guidance.

Consumer vulnerability

26. We continue to support the LSB’s work on improving access to justice for consumers in vulnerable circumstances.

Evaluation of Internal Governance Rules (IGRs)

27. The Bar Council welcomes the LSB’s fulfilment of its commitment to evaluate the operation and effectiveness of the IGRs three years after they were implemented. We are concerned that the LSB’s IGRs are driving too great a separation between the Approved Regulators (ARs) and those through whom they discharge their regulatory functions. In the case of the Bar, this is the BSB. It is the Approved Regulators who are ultimately responsible for delivering high quality regulation and standards. Too remote a relationship between the ARs and those to whom day-to-day regulation is entrusted compromises the ability of the professions to maintain standards in the public interest. For instance, at the moment the Bar Council is unhappy about steps being taken by the BSB to make it easier to pass the Bar exams, and there are currently acute tensions between CILEX and CILEX Regulation. The Approved Regulators must be permitted to maintain an appropriate degree of influence over budget and policy decisions in relation to regulation (though not, of course, individual disciplinary decision-making and authorisation). As matters stand under the existing IGRs, the Bar

⁸ [Bar Council response to LSB consultation on Draft guidance on promoting technology and innovation to improve access to legal services](#), paras 12-13

⁹ [Bar Council response to LSB Draft Business Plan 2023/24](#)

Council has no practical or effective role as AR, nor as the sole legal entity and employer of all staff (including the BSB). The way the General Council of the Bar has chosen to delegate its regulatory functions, in accordance with the LSA 2007, is being significantly undermined by the operation of the 2019 IGRs. There requires to be some re-balancing, reflecting the semi-independent nature of the implementation of the regulatory functions as set out in the LSA 2007.

Market Surveillance

28. The Bar Council understands that the LSB must be able to anticipate and respond to risks facing the regulated legal sector, and that information and intelligence should be gathered in order to do so. However, we encourage the LSB to be mindful to avoid duplicating work that has already been carried out by representative bodies, regulators and other organisations. We would welcome further detail on what this work comprises.

29. As in previous years, we would be happy to provide Bar Council led research to the LSB, for example, our biennial Barristers Working Lives survey. Details are lacking for this workstream which makes it hard to comment further. We suggest that the LSB engages with stakeholders before initiating work, to determine what research has already been carried out and thus avoid duplication.

Review of LSB enforcement policy

30. We see merit in reviewing the scope and use of the LSB's current enforcement policy since it was last reviewed in 2017. We note that this review and the drafting of any amendments to the policy were due to take place in Q3 and Q4 of 2023/24.¹⁰ We are concerned that the LSB has been unable to fulfil some of its core activities this past business year yet continues to initiate new workstreams. We hope that 2024/25 sees the LSB reconsider its priorities and rationalise its work to a manageable level.

Access to Justice

31. As previously stated in our response to the 2023/24 draft business plan, "while "improving access to justice" is one of the regulatory objectives, it is critical to understand that the *achievement* of the regulatory objectives is not the function of the LSB."¹¹ This remains the position: the regulatory objectives are not, themselves, activities for the LSB to carry out. It must look to its prescribed functions. Further, it is not consistent with the Better Regulation Principles nor practicable for this to be part of a general workstream of an oversight regulator's business plan.

¹⁰ [LSB 2023/24 Quarterly Activity Schedule](#)

¹¹ [Bar Council response to LSB Draft Business Plan 2023/24](#), para 13

32. In the response to the 2022/23 LSB business plan consultation, for example, we detailed our views on third party litigation funding.¹² It is therefore unfortunate that the LSB is still pursuing its consideration of how tools such as civil litigation funding might help to address current access to justice issues, when the LSB is plainly not the appropriate body to consider this. This is a matter for government, parliament and representative bodies. It is only if front-line regulators objectively and systemically fail to regulate their regulated individuals and entities adequately, in relation to third party litigation funding, that the LSB may have a role.

Curating the Strategy

33. We appreciate that the LSB has already hosted one annual conference and as part of this workstream, the LSB aims to host another annual conference. We maintain such events are not necessary, nor do they fall within the LSB's statutory remit.¹³ When the LSB is seeking extra staff to deliver on its objectives, in our view it is not appropriate to have these additional workstreams that cost money and take away staff resources from other core workstreams.

34. In a similar vein, we previously expressed concerns about a microsite being developed, in part due to it being unclear who the intended audience would be. Additionally, maintaining the website could detract from other important work. We would welcome information on the use of the website, in particular any data that shows who might benefit from the website. In addition, the costs of developing and maintaining the website have not been specified and when requesting a budget increase, the LSB should be transparent about the cost of this work.

Q2 – Are there any areas missing from our proposed business plan 2024/25 that you consider should be included?

35. No.

Q3 – Do you have any comments on our proposed research programme?

36. Under the budget headings of 'Research' and 'Consumer Panel Research' we would welcome further details as to the exact allocation of budget in these areas, including how research is apportioned to new staff and external researchers. We would again emphasise, as noted during the LSB consultation event, that the LSB should engage with all existing research reports in the sector before commissioning external reports covering the same areas. The LSB should ensure it engages with

¹² [Bar Council response to LSB Draft Business Plan 2022/23](#), paras 30-34

¹³ [Bar Council response to LSB Draft Business Plan 2023/24](#)

representative bodies and front-line regulators in particular, to see if research has been completed in a certain area first.

Datasets

37. The Bar Council supports evidence-based policymaking and the use of data to help inform the LSB's workstreams. Dashboards can be helpful to make data more accessible and we can see their utility for the profession and regulators in a number of circumstances.

38. However, it would be helpful to understand the criteria for establishing a specific dashboard, such as the diversity dashboard, for example whether it is for comparisons in performance over time. We also encourage the LSB to ascertain the usage of dashboards.

Public Panel

39. The Bar Council continues to oppose the financing or use of the Public Panel. We repeat from our response to the LSB's 2023/24 Business Plan:

*"[The Public Panel] plainly duplicates the work of the [Legal Services] Consumer Panel, and it is highly susceptible to delivering the outcomes that the LSB hypothesise for it ... Its operation is without the checks and balances provided by the 2007 Act [LSA 2007]. As a matter of law, certainly so far as the LSB is concerned, the consumer interest is represented by the Consumer Panel. Any necessary consumer research should be carried out through the Consumer Panel. There is, in any event, nothing in the LSB's functions stated in the 2007 Act [LSA 2007] that warrants or permits research by reference to non-consumer members of the public."*¹⁴

40. We continue to have concerns about the methodology used by the LSB when conducting market research with the Public Panel, such as the guided question and answer sessions which are open to prompting a pre-determined response.

Research

Publishing a series of insights from analysis of our Individual Legal Needs Survey findings (in collaboration with the Law Society)

41. We support and have no objection in principle to the LSB undertaking a Legal Needs Survey in collaboration with the Law Society. We would again emphasise that existing research conducted by Approved Regulators and frontline regulators should

¹⁴ [Bar Council response to LSB Draft Business Plan 2023/24](#), para 15.4

be taken into account to ensure that existing research is not duplicated which would be a waste of resources.

Conduct research on EDI and barriers to progression and retention

42. We do not support the LSB conducting new research on Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) and barriers to progression and retention. As we have made clear in our response to the EDI workstream under question 1, we support workable, minimum standards that are properly enforced. We would want to better understand any research the LSB proposes to ensure it does not duplicate existing work undertaken by the professions and frontline regulators.

43. It is unclear whether ‘conducting research’ would involving the LSB commissioning external bodies to conduct research, what form this research would take, and what the research base would be.

44. We emphasise, as is noted from discussions at the consultation event, “the LSB should engage with all existing research reports in the sector before commissioning additional reports that cover the same ground – both for fiscal reasons and to limit the requests on a small pool of people who are often interviewed (for example, EDI research on senior members of the Bar).”¹⁵ This latter point is particularly important with regards to ensuring that people are not asked to recount lived experiences repeatedly which can be traumatic and draining.

45. As is illustrated in our response to question 8, the Bar Council has already undertaken a significant amount of work and research into removing barriers to progression and retention and we monitor closely qualitative and quantitative data on application (for pupillage, Silk, the Judiciary and Panels), earnings and retention, as well as on experience of the profession e.g. career satisfaction, wellbeing, working hours, bullying and harassment by protected characteristics and social background. We would discourage the LSB from undertaking any research without confirming whether there is already a data set on this issue. For example, research reports have recently included: [the Barristers’ Working Lives report](#), the [Race Working Group’s 2021 report](#), [Race at the Bar progress report 2022](#), [Bullying, Harassment and Discrimination at the Bar 2023](#) and [Gross Earnings by Sex and Practice Area at the Self-Employed Bar 2023](#).

46. In our response to the LSB Business Plan 2023/24 we detailed research undertaken by the Bar Council, third party research analysed by the Bar Council and BSB research.¹⁶ We also hold a great deal of intelligence on the profession through

¹⁵ [LSB 2024/25 Draft Business Plan Consultation event notes](#)

¹⁶ [Bar Council response to LSB Draft Business Plan 2023/24](#)

extensive online and in-person EDI training in chambers and our helpline services. This identifies persistent and emerging issues which can be explored further to ensure we take an evidence-based approach to our EDI work as required.

47. We therefore emphasise the need to avoid duplication by the LSB in this area.

Commission our next wave of Prices Research, in support of our consumer empowerment work

48. We remain of the view that the LSB is not the appropriate organisation to undertake prices research. Other organisations, such as the Legal Services Consumer Panel (being the representative body for consumers) are better placed to undertake this research.

Commissioning research on how the rule of law and professional ethics should be upheld across the legal services sector

49. We are of the view that the LSB is also not the appropriate organisation to undertake research into how the rule of law and professional ethics should be upheld across the sector as it falls outside the LSB's statutory remit.

Q4 – Is there anything missing from our proposed research programme that you think we should focus on?

50. No.

Q5 – Do you agree with our proposed budget for 2024/25?

51. We are disappointed to see that the LSB is increasing its budget for 2024/25 by 13.9%, an increase of 7.2% after inflation, in particular given the current cost of living crisis. The addition of £3.40 to the practising certificate fee represents a significant increase to those barristers whose annual earnings place them in the lower income bands and has to be viewed in the context of the other compliance costs that regulated legal professionals are subject to, for example, registration with the Information Commissioner's Office and their annual professional indemnity insurance. This follows an increase of £2.11 to the practising certificate fee paid by authorised persons in 2023/24.¹⁷ Such increases are unsustainable for those barristers in the lower income bands.

52. As we have repeated in previous Business Plan responses, and in response to Question 1, the LSB must focus on its essential regulatory functions within the remit of the LSA 2007 and must be cost-effective. Some of the LSB's continuing workstreams,

¹⁷ [LSB Draft Business Plan 2023/24](#), pp. 12-13 and [LSB Final Business Plan 2023/24](#), p. 12

such as its annual conference, are not strictly necessary and could be delivered in a more cost-effective way, for example, by hosting it online.

53. As set out in paragraph 6 above, we are concerned that the LSB is seeking extra staff to deliver on its core objectives. Given the LSB currently has a staff of around 30, an additional 6 FTE represents a significant increase. We strongly urge the LSB to focus on its specified regulatory functions and reconsider some of its workstreams. Doing so would both alleviate pressure on existing staff and remove, or at least considerably diminish, the need for new hires.

54. We request that the LSB reconsiders its expenditure on research in the 2024/25 budget. Much of the data used by the LSB is provided by the Approved Regulators who also carry out research into their respected regulated populations. We are concerned that the LSB is commissioning and carrying out research in areas that already covered by an Approved Regulator's research. For example, the LSB's EDI research into lived experience did not make reference to or any use of existing research such as the Bar Council's Race at the Bar Reports, which focus on the Bar as a whole and not just senior members, as suggested in the LSB's note on its Business Plan roundtable.¹⁸

55. Making use of existing research would save the LSB both time and money.

56. We also ask that the LSB reconsiders its expenditure when commissioning external research. As set out more fully in our response to Questions 1 and 3, we do not consider research into how the rule of law and professional ethics should be upheld across the legal sector to be within the remit of the LSB. The phrasing of this question is overly vague. The LSB should consider carefully what it is seeking to achieve with this research before making this expenditure.

57. The continued growth of the LSB's budget puts further pressure on practitioners, in particular those who are junior or publicly funded. As financial pressures force some criminal practitioners to leave the Bar,¹⁹ there is a direct impact on access to justice. Dwindling numbers of criminal barristers leads to consumers struggling to find representation and to increased waiting times for trial.

Q6 – Are there any other factors regarding the proposed budget for 2024/25 that you believe we should consider?

¹⁸ [LSB 2024/25 Draft Business Plan Consultation event notes](#)

¹⁹ There has been "a 9.8% decline in the number of full-time criminal barristers between 2017/18 and 2021/22." Institute for Governance [Performance tracker](#), 30 October 2023

58. The LSB should update its budget to reflect any changes in forecasting and inflation.

Q7 – Do you have any comments regarding equality issues which, in your view, may arise from our proposed business plan for 2024/25?

59. Nothing beyond those issues already identified.

Q8 – Are there any wider equality issues and interventions that you wish to make us aware of?

60. There is a significant body of work being carried out on equality and diversity by the Bar Council and across the Bar all levels – in Chambers and organisations employing barristers, at the Inns of Court, involving all Specialist Bar Associations and the Circuits, as well as networks of barristers such as [FreeBar](#), [Black Barristers Network \(BBN\)](#), [BDABar](#), [Inns of Court Alliance for Women \(ICAW\)](#) and organisations such as [Bridging the Bar](#) - to name a few.

61. The Bar Council itself has an extensive programme of work underway on equality, diversity and inclusion. We work to create a profession ‘representative of all and for all’. Our activities involve identifying and seeking to address barriers and assumptions that inhibit the progression of those with a protected characteristic or those from an under-represented background into and within the profession.

62. The Bar Council delivers the following services and initiatives:

- a) An email and telephone helpline (for barristers and pupils facing unequal treatment and chambers/others looking to manage issues/develop good E&D practices) and AI/online reporting for incidents of discrimination, harassment, and bullying;
- b) E&D Training, as well as wider education on these issues across the Bar;
- c) Guidance/Policy Support (on compliance with the BSB’s E&D Rules and good practice) - including via an active network of Chambers equality and diversity officers and Chambers managers, and a bespoke offer for chambers in policy and practice development;
- d) Research (data on the profile of the students, pupils, and the profession – intersectional, and including by different ethnic minority groups – and trends);

- e) Assistance to/collaboration with Bar stakeholders e.g., FreeBar, BBN, BDABar, Bridging the Bar etc.; and
 - f) Discrete Bar Council-led programmes to promote and support equality, diversity, and inclusion. For example, on earnings differentials/distribution of work; bullying and harassment; promotion of contextual recruitment and outreach to diverse students with work experience (Bar Placement Week and participation in the wider Ten Thousand Black Interns programme); supporting women returners; judicial appointment (PAJE) and wellbeing.
63. The Bar Council's programme for 2024 includes:
- a) Key 2024 Campaigns:
 - i. **Income monitoring.** Addressing earning differentials by under-represented groups with a particular focus on sex and on those of 0-3 years' call.
 - ii. **Tackling Bullying & Harassment.** Delivering and supporting the Bullying and Harassment 12-month Review alongside identifying means of tailored support for the young Bar.
 - iii. **Promoting Race Equality.** Delivering a follow up Race report (three years on from the 2021 publication) identifying and assessing progress; delivering the 10KBI programme.
 - b) **Wellbeing.** Scoping an offer of clinical supervision for barristers (to address PTSD associated with aspects of Bar work)
 - c) **Returners.** Exploring options to scale up a *Returners* offer aligned with Middle Temple's current programme of work.

Bar Council
12th February 2024

For further information please contact:
Caitlin Lamboo, Policy Analyst, Regulatory Issues and Ethics
The General Council of the Bar of England and Wales
289-293 High Holborn, London WC1V 7HZ
0207 6111 458
CLamboo@BarCouncil.org.uk

And

*Eleanore Lamarque, Policy Manager Regulatory Affairs, Law Reform and Ethics
The General Council of the Bar of England and Wales
289-293 High Holborn, London WC1V 7HZ
0207 6111 443
ELamarque@BarCouncil.org.uk*