

Response of the Bar Standards Board

Defining competence and competence assurance

Understanding what it means to be a competent legal professional and how competence can be maintained and assured over time is a core objective of this work.

We would welcome your views on what you think is needed to demonstrate competence, whether competence needs to be tested throughout the career of a legal professional and how it could be assessed. This may cover areas such as:

- the characteristics or skills that should be part of a competency framework
- the types of competence particular to different types or work or legal disciplines (e.g. barristers, legal executives)
- different models for competence assurance that you use or are aware of

We would welcome qualitative and quantitative evidence in particular on: determining the components of professional competence; approaches to competence assurance; the effectiveness of CPD and other methods of assurance.

Please fill in the text box below using the prompts above, providing links to any evidence referenced. Alternatively, supporting documents (e.g. reports, datasets) can be provided separately.

A core responsibility of a regulator is to be able to assure itself, and the public, that members of its regulatory community are competent to practise. Our response to your call for evidence aims to set out our approach to assuring competence, identify limitations in our approach and explain how we are working to improve the way we assure the competence of barristers.

Regulatory arrangements that support professional competence

There are several regulatory controls in place which assure the competence of barristers, stemming from a requirement in the BSB Handbook that barristers should not undertake work unless competent do so (Core Duty 7 and rule C21.8). We also place great emphasis on the initial education and training of barristers as well ongoing CPD requirements. Other regulatory activities include taking targeted action focused on specific risks emerging from research or our own intelligence screenings; recent examples of targeted regulatory action are found below.

Education and training of barristers

Our recent reforms to the education and training of barristers have placed the focus of regulatory requirements on setting and maintaining appropriate standards at the point of authorisation (ie the award of a first practising certificate). To do this, we have clearly defined what competences are required and what the minimum standards are to achieve the competences; these are set out in our [Professional Statement](#).

The Professional Statement describes the knowledge, skills and attributes, and the minimum standard to which barristers should be capable of demonstrating on “day one” of practice. This now underpins our new system of training for those we authorise. It serves formally to assist us in maintaining standards both of those entering practice and of providers of education and training; and to inform the design and delivery of education and training pathways, including the development of educational materials, learning outcomes and assessments.

Moreover, a student who trains at an Authorised Education and Training Organisation (AETO) on an approved pathway will be trained to meet the requirements of the Professional Statement. The various components of Bar training are designed to ensure that anyone who starts practising has proved that they meet the standards outlined in the Professional Statement and have therefore demonstrated they have all the necessary competences to be a barrister.

The Professional Statement outlines four broad areas of competence. These include:

- **Barristers' distinctive characteristics** – this includes legal knowledge, skills and attributes; practical knowledge, skills and attributes; advocacy; and professional standards.
- **Personal values and standards** – this includes, among other things, acting with honesty, integrity and independence. It also acknowledges the need for barristers to be adaptable and flexible in their practice “by being self-aware and self-directed, recognising and acting upon the continual need to maintain and develop their knowledge and skills.”
- **Working with others** – this includes being effective in dealing with colleagues, clients – professional and lay – and relevant others from a diverse range of backgrounds by being able to adapt one’s personal approach or style to various circumstances.
- **Management of practice** – this includes being effective at managing one’s personal practice, whether acting as a self-employed or employed barrister, and keeping a client’s affairs secure and confidential.

It is too early to say how the use of the Professional Statement, alongside the other education and training reforms, will improve standards among barristers but we are monitoring progress and have commissioned an external research organisation to work with us to evaluate the effectiveness of our reforms.

Continuing Professional Development

Once authorised, barristers are subject to an ongoing requirement to complete [Continuing Professional Development \(CPD\)](#) on an annual basis.

A new scheme for established practitioners – those with more than three years’ experience – was introduced in January 2017. The new outcomes-focused CPD scheme is more flexible, allowing barristers to plan, undertake, reflect and evaluate the training they require, taking into account their own personal development needs, practice and any work which they want to undertake in future.

Following the introduction of the new scheme, our regulatory focus has been on ensuring compliance with the CPD requirements and not, in the first instance, on taking enforcement action. We monitor compliance by completing spot checks, focusing on barristers who are at higher risk of non-compliance with their CPD requirements, supplemented with a random sample of the profession. Risk scores have been established, amongst other things, with reference to a barrister’s history of compliance. Non-compliance will generally be dealt with in the first instance through supervisory action; this includes recommendations where “corrective action” must be taken. Referral for enforcement action is now reserved for persistent non-compliance or non-cooperation.

Our most recent sweep of CPD records revealed nearly 90% compliance with the new rules. Our recent [evaluation](#) of the scheme also revealed that while most practitioners

welcome the flexibility, there are still some who struggle with the reflection element of the scheme. We are therefore looking at ways to explain the benefits of reflection to effective professional development to the Bar.

We are also planning to review the New Practitioners Programme (NPP), the scheme for those with less than three years' experience, utilising lessons learned from the established practitioners scheme.

Targeted regulatory action

Where we have a concern about professional competence, we may introduce targeted regulation. For example, following a [review of proceedings in the Youth Courts](#), we developed specific [competences](#) for those undertaking this work. We also require all [barristers appearing in Youth Courts](#) to have registered this practice area and declared themselves competent to do so. Should there be reports of incompetence, these two requirements will help us to determine if steps had been taken by the barrister to ensure they had the requisite competence before appearing in Youth Courts.

Another example of targeted action can be seen in our development of specialist [guidance for immigration practitioners](#). We are currently working with the SRA to develop a similar approach to that of the Youth Courts to address issues relating to advocacy in the Coroner's Courts.

External arrangements that support professional competence

Alongside the work described above, we are building our understanding of how the market assists us to assure professional competence. This helps us to take regulatory intervention only where it is needed. It would be disproportionate for us to introduce new regulation if there is no evidence of a problem with professional competence or if it is being adequately maintained through arrangements put in place by other organisations.

Through our work in this area we know that training is provided by a wide range of organisations to support barristers in maintaining professional standards. We also know that some organisations, such as the Crown Prosecution Service and the Legal Aid Agency, place requirements on barristers before they can join advocacy panels. We are looking to work with these organisations to understand better their role in assuring professional competence and to share good practice and learning.

We also look to influence organisations to provide training where we have evidence of poor practice and to encourage barristers to take advantage of that training. This reduces the need for regulation but relies upon the profession to respond positively to this approach – we reserve the right to take more direct regulation if we have evidence that suggests our approach is not having the desired impact.

In addition, we work with large employers of barristers such as the CPS and the Government Legal Services, to understand how professional competence is maintained in an employed setting.

We also use our routine supervision of chambers to understand how feedback is provided to members of chambers and what use is made of it when it is received. Chambers play an important role in ensuring the professional competence of their members and we want to understand better how they fulfil that role and what support we can provide.

Information sharing

Key to the success of our approach is the willingness of others to share information with us about the competence of barristers. We need this to know whether our regulation is working and to identify barristers or patterns of practice that require further investigation and/or regulation. To support this, we have in place information sharing arrangements and memoranda of understanding with a range of organisations. We have also provided an online reporting tool that makes sharing information with us easy.

Limitations and improvements being made

We are aware, not least from the LSB's discussion paper that accompanied this call for evidence, that various regulators (in legal services and otherwise) may have adopted different approaches. The approach that we have set out above, is a proportionate one, based on available evidence of risks identified.

Very few reports of poor practice by barristers are made by other barristers, professional clients, lay clients (through the Legal Ombudsman) or by members of the judiciary. We have sought to understand whether there are any barriers to providing that information and have taken steps to [improve our reporting tools](#). We have also established a Contact and Assessment Team to assess all reports into the BSB, risk assess and task responses, primarily to the supervision team, to better understand particular cases and to identify themes or trends in standards of practice.

In addition to responding to individual concerns about members of the profession, we also act on evidence, from, amongst other things, our own research or from commissioned studies (eg Immigration Thematic Review, Youth Courts, and Judicial Perceptions of Criminal Advocacy). We have done so in a number of cases, including making improvements to the education and training of barristers, pro-actively monitoring CPD records and the introduction of targeted interventions in areas where evidence suggests there are higher levels of risk (as discussed above).

We continue to work with other regulators to respond to risks and hope to continue to share data and research opportunities so that the professions can better service clients and the public.

We are also in the process of building up a tool to make better use of the data being collected (and where gaps in data might be filled) and providing more nuanced reports to see trends in certain areas. This work is now in its infancy but will prove effective in the longer term in helping us target our regulation where it is most needed.

Consumer expectations of competence

Understanding consumers' perspectives on, and expectations of, competence in the legal services sector is crucial to our work in this area.

We would welcome your views on what ways consumers can have greater confidence that they have a competent advisor. This may cover areas such as:

- the ways consumers can make judgements on the quality of the advice or service that they have received
- what role consumer feedback could or should play in helping legal professionals to build their competence and helping to foster trust
- the frequency of competence checks that would reassure consumers
- different types of consumers, consumer problems or legal activities that are more likely to experience quality issues, or be vulnerable to greater harm from quality issues

We would welcome qualitative and quantitative evidence in particular on: meaningful ways to demonstrate competence to consumers; how professions can provide information to consumers on the quality they should expect; the relative risk and impact of poor quality advice on consumers.

Please fill in the text box below using the prompts above, providing links to any evidence referenced. Alternatively, supporting documents (e.g. reports, datasets) can be provided separately.

Consumer confidence is a fundamental part of the BSB's approach to assuring competence. We seek, through the regulatory arrangements that we have put in place, to give consumers the confidence that, through adherence to those arrangements, barristers remain competent to practise. In developing those regulatory arrangements, we seek a range of views and consumers are – and must be – at the heart of all our work. We are not complacent but below you will find a range of research and projects that have utilised to great effect feedback from consumers, including the following:

- [The Professional Statement](#) - the development of the Professional Statement was tested in consultation with consumer advocacy organisations. It sets out the competences and expectations that we place upon all barristers as they enter the profession and as they continue in practice throughout their careers. We provide information on our public Barristers' Register about the status of all practising barristers and whether they have been the subject of any disciplinary findings.
- [Transparency requirements](#) - we have recently introduced new requirements which mean that consumers should know upfront more information, not only on pricing models but also that the barrister they intend to instruct, whether as a professional or lay client, is a regulated professional. Our transparency requirements were informed by research with consumers testing different levels of transparency to examine their impact on consumer behaviour and views. This has been followed up by spot checking websites to assess compliance with the new rules.
- [Family Law Clients](#) - We recently commissioned this [research](#) to understand the experience of legal services among clients of family law barristers and to identify the key barriers and risks that they face. Family law was an area identified as a priority in 2016 by the Legal Services Consumer Panel due to concerns about affordability, accessibility and information asymmetry. The research findings show that the majority of people in the survey were positive about the service they have received from a barrister during family legal proceedings, and it was encouraging to see that when people use a barrister they are likely to use them for a range of legal tasks, and not just for representation in court.
- [Client Care Letters](#) Research – this research was commissioned jointly by legal regulators and the Legal Services Consumer Panel (LSCP) shows that Client Care Letters are often not as effective as they should be in making sure that clients understand the work that is being carried out on their behalf, or in outlining what is required of them. The report identified principles to help legal services providers better communicate with their clients. The research involved qualitative methods with recent and prospective users of legal services, including a series of mini-groups, face-to-face depth interviews and a workshop. We have used the feedback provided by consumers to introduce new client care letter templates.

At Board level, we have had access to a consumer champion to ensure that the consumer experience is brought to bear on decisions that are made. We are also recruiting an external expert in consumer affairs to our pool of advisors to help us continue to place consumers at the heart of our decision-making. In the meantime, we are also doing what we can to raise standards of public legal education:

- our new transparency rules require Chambers to alert clients to the fact that their barristers are regulated by us and how to seek redress if things go wrong;
- we have invested heavily in our website to improve its information for the public (eg about what to expect from your barrister and how to complain if they don't deliver) and to encourage the public to see the Bar as important for upholding the rule of law even if they are not directly consumers of barristers' services; and
- we are partnering with consumer facing websites who also seek to provide help to those in legal need.

We recognise though that there is more work to be done to better understand the consumer perspective. We utilise the complaints information received from the Legal Ombudsman; this helps us to gain a better understanding of service complaints made about barristers dealt with by the Ombudsman. Moreover, we welcome the recent consumer impact study published by the Legal Services Consumer Panel and are keen to explore their recommendations around quality indicators.

One challenge that we have found difficult to overcome is effective engagement with consumers themselves (rather than through consumer organisations or representative groups) about their perspectives on barristers and on the quality of their services. There are a number of issues here:

- the percentage of consumers who use a barrister is very low and consumers who have used barristers often do so in deeply distressing and/or personal situations (eg in criminal, family and immigration matters) so that they are reluctant to come forward to describe their experiences;
- because relatively few people use the Bar, consumer bodies such as Citizens Advice and Which have told us that the Bar is not a priority area for them; and
- clients can identify what they might see as poor customer service (delays in answering letters etc) but are usually much less well equipped to identify poor legal knowledge or advocacy, and the satisfaction of clients therefore may depend on whether their case was successful.

Another challenge for the BSB in gaining consumer views is that that the majority of barristers' work is received via referrals, where clients rely upon their solicitor to instruct a barrister on their behalf. In this environment, there can be a high degree of competitive pressure, which helps to maintain and drive up standards in many practice areas. It is those areas of practice where, because of the nature of the work, there is less competition that there may be the greatest risk of a reduction of standards – see for example, concerns around standards of practice in the Youth Court where there is little competition for available work. Irrespective of practice area, we believe that barristers should encourage clients (be they lay or professional clients) to provide feedback on the service that they receive and for barristers to use that feedback to expand on areas of strength and to address areas of concern. We have provided [guidance to barristers about gathering feedback](#) and to [consumers about leaving feedback](#).

Related to this is our planned work on helping barristers to get the most value from the reflection phase of CPD. Our approach to the regulation of CPD is set out [here](#). We published an [evaluation report](#) in December 2019 which evaluated the impact of our approach to the regulation of CPD and this highlighted 'reflection' as an area requiring greater focus by barristers. A key element of reflection is gathering feedback from a range of sources about your performance so that you can take an informed view about professional development requirements. We will look at the way in which other sectors encourage or require their members to use reflection to help us with our work in this area.

Related to gathering feedback is understanding better how complaints are addressed by barristers and their chambers when they are received. We propose through our regulatory return exercise in the Autumn (which will seek to capture information about regulatory risks and compliance) to gather information about first tier complaints handling, including aggregate number of informal and formal concerns and what use is made of them to improve service. This data will be useful to the BSB in establishing whether its regulatory expectations around first tier complaints handling are being met satisfactorily (and will enable us to target our regulation where they are not).

Competence assurance in the legal services sector

Understanding the current competence assurance frameworks adopted by regulators and the profession is important, as is confirming, qualifying and quantifying any examples of poor-quality services or suggested risk areas.

We would welcome your views on this, and it may cover areas such as:

- practice areas which do or could impose greater competency risks
- legal professionals that may be more at risk of competency challenges
- existing competency assurance methods used in the sector and their effectiveness
- the respective roles of regulators, providers and individuals to assure ongoing competence
- any potential barriers to assuring the competence of legal professionals

We would welcome qualitative and quantitative evidence in particular on: competence or quality issues for particular types of work; service and non-service-related issues experienced by consumers; the effectiveness of current competence assurance practices.

We would also welcome identification of potential evidence sources that are not readily available but that we could seek access to.

We would also welcome any evidence of competence assurance practices used in legal services sectors in other jurisdictions.

Please fill in the text box below using the prompts above, providing links to any evidence referenced. Alternatively, supporting documents (e.g. reports, datasets) can be provided separate

We have set out in our answer to the first question the BSB's approach to assuring standards. We believe that this is a proportionate approach to the evidence that is available about patterns of practice.

Where there has been evidence of a particular risk – such as with Youth Court advocacy – we have taken targeted regulatory action and the results of our approach is beginning to show. Using a five per cent sample from barristers who indicated that they currently undertake work in the Youth Courts (or intend to do so), we evaluated the impact of the new requirements to:

- assess the extent to which the profession used the Youth Proceedings competences and guidance to reflect on their practice in the Youth Court in 2018/19 and, therefore, to assess the impact of introducing the competences;
- establish whether there is a need to focus our attention on a group of practitioners, or an area within the competency framework; and

- continue to raise the profile of our focus on Youth Court work and, in particular, the Youth Proceedings Competences, and to remind all barristers who undertake work in the Youth Court of their obligations.

Whilst this exercise does not assess directly a barrister's competence in Youth Court proceedings, it does improve our understanding of what barristers working in this area are doing to maintain standards. It has revealed a high degree of compliance, especially in reflecting on one's capabilities and training as it relates to the Youth Court Competences. Eighty-five per cent of those checked were judged to have been fully compliant. 14% of barristers were subsequently given advice on ways to achieve best practice or advised to add to their CPD for the following year. One per cent of barristers checked were referred to Enforcement for further action.

This evaluation has also given us vital information about how various demographics engage with training material, whether mostly digital for those younger barristers, or in person training for older practitioners. Lastly, where work-place trends emerge, we can take action to prevent non-compliance and raise standards. In the review, we found a number of responses from barristers employed by the CPS to be lacking sufficient detail. We've since raised with the CPS who will work with practitioners to improve standards.

But that does not mean that there is room for complacency, and we will continue to refine our approach in the light of new evidence that comes to light or that we capture. For example, we are engaged in work in relation to advocacy in the Coroner's Court following recent reports that called into question the approach to advocacy in this area. The reports suggested that advocates (be they barristers or solicitors) tended to be more adversarial in their approach which was out of touch with the more inquisitorial focus of a Coroner's inquiry. The adversarial style of cross examination had a negative impact on the experience of witnesses, many of whom were vulnerable given the nature of these Inquiries. We are working with the SRA, Ministry of Justice and the Chief Coroner to put in place proportionate regulation which seeks to raise standards of advocacy in this area.

Despite efforts to understand trends, utilising complaints information and academic research (eg [Judicial Perceptions of the Quality of Criminal Advocacy](#), jointly commissioned with the SRA), a challenge for the BSB, and for other regulators, comes in the difficulty in gathering evidence that our regulatory approach to assuring competence is having the desired impact. The most effective way to do this would be for poor practice to be identified so that regulators can work with the lawyer concerned to help them improve to meet the required standards of practice. To do this, there need to be mechanisms to gather that feedback. We have in place MoUs and information sharing arrangements with a range of organisations and this provides some information on standards, but we continue to receive few direct referrals of poor practice. We are keen, therefore, to explore how to encourage people to raise concerns with us and what the barriers are to them doing so. This is a key component of our approach and one we'll be working on over the next year.

The judiciary, for example, are a valuable source of feedback and are well placed to provide views at an individual or thematic level about standards of practice. And the Judicial perception research mentioned above indicates some concern about standards of practice. But we receive very few concerns from them and it would be useful to understand more why that is the case and to address any barriers that may exist. Historically, judges may have raised concerns about a barrister with their Head of Chambers but, we believe that this happens infrequently now and there is no way of knowing what, if anything, the Head of Chambers does with that information. We plan, therefore, to discuss providing feedback with the senior judiciary and to then engage with the circuit judiciary with a view to finding an appropriate mechanism for information to be shared. One option, which would not require direct referral of information to the BSB, could be to require barristers to seek feedback from

one or more judge (as well as from other people such as instructing solicitors and lay clients) as part of their CPD reflective practice. Barristers could, through the write up of their reflection, then be asked to record how they have responded to any feedback they have received.

Competence assurance in other sectors

Understanding what other sectors do to assure ongoing competence is useful because it helps us to learn what has worked well in other professional services sectors and identify any opportunities to adapt the approach in legal services.

We would welcome your views on what ways the legal services sector can learn from the competence assurance approaches adopted in other professional sectors. This may cover areas such as:

- methods to gain competence assurance that have been tailored to different professional environments
- the benefits to consumers and the profession of different competence assurance schemes e.g. revalidation, observation or simulation
- how assurance data is collected, recorded and made accessible to consumers

We would welcome qualitative and quantitative evidence in particular on: consumer views on the benefits of competence assurance schemes; the robustness of different methods for competence assurance; the competence assurance systems which produce the most reliable assessments.

We welcome evidence from the sectors provided as examples above as well as other sectors not specified in this paper.

Please fill in the text box below using the prompts above, providing links to any evidence referenced. Alternatively, supporting documents (e.g. reports, datasets) can be provided separately.

As part of developing our approach to assuring competence we have considered, and will continue to consider, the approaches of other sectors. We set out below the most common of those but at this stage make no judgment on their value or applicability to the regulation of barristers.

What we would say though is that it is important that any regulatory intervention responds proportionately to the evidence of risk to the public interest. Because one approach has been deemed necessary in one sector does not automatically mean that it is appropriate for other sectors. We believe, for example, that the particular risk profile for doctors is substantially different to that of barristers, both in terms of consumer choice – the power to choose one’s barrister – and in outcome. A poor outcome for consumers of medical advice or surgery, resulting from a lack of professional competence, is far greater than the outcome of many (criminal, immigration and family matters the exceptions) legal problems. Ultimately, we believe that the right approach taken by any regulator should be guided by as assessment (and balancing) of risk, viability and proportionality.

Revalidation

One of the more significant differences between the legal services environment and the

environments we considered as part of our research is the issue of revalidation. Revalidation is the process whereby the relevant authorising body for a profession requires the members of the profession to undergo a revalidation in one form or another on a periodic basis. The legal services sector does not currently employ any form of revalidation process, however, a number of other professional environments do.

The Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) utilises a revalidation process once every three years. This includes:

- A requirement on the number of hours practised at a given level
- A minimum number (35) of hours of CPD to be completed over a three year period, of which 20 hours must involve participatory learning. A record of this CPD and evidence of it must be kept as well as details of how it relates back to the professional's practice and the code
- Five pieces of practice related feedback over a three year period
- Five written reflective accounts from the last three years which refer to CPD, feedback or relevant professional practice and how it relates to the code
- A health and character declaration including details of criminal offences, formal cautions or fitness practice proceedings from any professional body
- A declaration that they have, or will have when practising, appropriate insurance
- A declaration that they have complied with the revalidation requirements

The NMC selects a sample of nurses and midwives to provide further information or evidence to verify their application. The NMC reports on the revalidation process annually: <https://www.nmc.org.uk/about-us/reports-and-accounts/revalidation-reports/>

The Royal College of Anaesthetists & the General Medical Council also have a revalidation based approach which requires submitting a portfolio of supporting information which shows that they are meeting the professional values set out in Good Medical Practice. Once received the appraiser make judgements as to clinical skills and competency knowing the scope and context of the practice and having reviewed the quality of the supporting information (including evidence of CPD) in the appraisal and revalidation portfolio. Within the supporting information that doctors are expected to provide and discuss at their appraisal are:

- Keeping up-to-date - Continuing Professional Development (CPD)
- Review of practice- Quality improvement activity - clinical audit, review of clinical outcomes or case review / discussion and Significant events or incidents
- Feedback on practice- Feedback from colleagues, patients and/or carers and a review of complaints and compliments

Doctors are also required to submit general information each year about their professional work including the scope of their practice, a record of their annual appraisals, their current personal development plan, and completed health and probity declaration.

A [quality assurance report](#) for the CPD approval scheme at the Royal College of Anaesthetists is produced every year for the CPD Board to cover a number of its Terms of Reference, including reviewing the applications received for CPD approval and the subsequent decisions made by the CPD Assessors.

The GMC published a review of the operation and impact of revalidation in 2017, that can be found [here](#).

CPD based approaches

As noted in the discussion paper accompanying this call for evidence, the UK legal services sector primarily make use of a CPD based approach with breaches being addressed when they arise. However, this is also true for other professional services sectors such as accountants and opticians.

The Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA) requires its members to retain evidence of their CPD for three years. This involves planning CPD, completing the activities, evaluating the learning and reflecting. ACCA conducts reviews into some member's CPD annually.

The General Optical Council (GOC) requires the regulated community to re-register annually and requires 36 points of continuing education and training (CET) annually across competency units (these vary for different types of optometrists). These units are:

- Communication
- Professional conduct (until 31 December 2015)
- Standards of Practice (from 1 January 2016)
- Ocular examination
- Optical appliances
- Contact lens
- Ocular disease
- Assessment of visual function
- Assessment and management of binocular vision

Active inspections

A third approach to quality assurance is that used by Ofsted for the inspection of schools. Ofsted carries out routine inspections of schools and uses a risk-based assessment to evaluate the school's quality, that assessment results in a judgement of outstanding, good, requires improvement or inadequate. The assessment considers the following factors:

- Progress and attainment data from the DfE
- School workforce census data
- The views of parents and carers, including those shown by an online questionnaire for parents
- Qualifying complaints about the school
- Pupil mobility
- Time since last inspection, and inspection framework inspected under, for schools exempt from routine inspection
- The outcomes of any inspections, such as survey inspections, that have been carried out since the last routine inspection
- Statutory warning notices
- Any other significant concerns that are brought to their attention.

We are keen to learn about approaches taken elsewhere and in other professions to inform our own approach in due course.