

**BAR  
STANDARDS  
BOARD**

REGULATING BARRISTERS

**Amendments to the BSB Handbook – QASA**

**For approval by the Legal Services Board**

This application is made in accordance with the requirements set out in the Legal Services Board's Rules for Rule Change applications. The Bar Standards Board ("BSB") wishes to provide the information below to support its application.

Any queries about this application should be made to:

**Oliver Hanmer**  
**Director of Regulatory Assurance**

Bar Standards Board  
289-293 High Holborn  
London  
WC1V 7HZ

[ohanmer@barstandardsboard.org.uk](mailto:ohanmer@barstandardsboard.org.uk)

## The proposed alterations

1. The LSB approved new rules in July 2013 bringing into effect the Quality Assurance Scheme for Advocates (QASA). Following a BSB decision in November 2017<sup>i</sup> not to proceed with the implementation of QASA this application seeks to remove the QASA rules from the BSB Handbook.
2. Rules C31-C63 in Part 2, section 3 of the Handbook will be removed. Rather than renumbering following sections, the rules will be replaced with text that states 'rules rC31-rC64 have been removed with effect from x date'. Consequential changes are also required in other parts of the Handbook (mainly the definitions section). A track changed version of these changes is attached at **annex 1**.

## Details of the existing arrangements

3. QASA was developed in response to recommendations arising from a review into the procurement of legal aid by Lord Carter in 2006. That report highlighted concerns about standards of criminal advocacy and suggested that arrangements for assuring quality of criminal advocates should be introduced. The development of these arrangements was first taken forward by the Ministry of Justice and the then Legal Services Commission but with limited success; the proposed scheme, which included a written test and simulated advocacy assessment, was not supported by the parties that would need to be engaged in its implementation and operation. In 2009, the three primary regulators of criminal advocacy – the BSB, SRA and CILEX regulation – established the Joint Advocacy Group and took on responsibility for developing a quality assurance scheme for criminal advocates. QASA was the output of that Group.
4. QASA was designed to ensure that, through comprehensive assurance of criminal advocacy standards, the public would have access to competent representation in the criminal courts. The detail of the Scheme is not rehearsed in this application but, as a reminder, the headline elements of the Scheme were:
  - i. Applicable to all criminal advocates;
  - ii. Four levels of assurance reflecting the levels of seniority of practice and complexity of criminal cases;
  - iii. Common advocacy standards that would be used in assessments of criminal advocates;
  - iv. Judicial evaluation in live criminal trials would be the primary means of advocacy assessment, supported by simulated assessment where necessary and only at the lower levels (levels 1 and 2). Only trained judges could assess advocates;
  - v. All criminal advocates would need to be accredited at one of the four levels. Accreditation would last for a maximum of five years after which the advocate would need to be re-accredited;
  - vi. Advocates could apply to move up a level during the currency of their accreditation;
  - vii. Judges were able, and encouraged, to raise concerns about advocates with regulators outside of the formal accreditation process.
5. The Scheme was approved by the Legal Services Board in July 2013. Although, the rules were brought into force in the Handbook, they were not implemented. In

November 2017, the BSB decided that it would not proceed with the introduction of QASA. It would instead look to put in place a strategy that is more consistent with its risk and evidenced based approach to regulation and which would provide the public with assurance that it had access to competent representation not only in criminal cases but across all areas of practice.

### **Evidential basis for change**

6. QASA was developed in the light of an identified need to assure the competence of criminal barristers following a review into the procurement of legal aid by Lord Carter in 2006.
7. The MoJ commissioned Cardiff University to pilot an approach to quality assurance of criminal advocacy. The subsequent pilot scheme indicated that judges and advocates were clear that market forces alone could no longer deal with the problem of poor performing advocates.
8. Several separate independent surveys commissioned by the BSB, the LSC and the CPS confirmed that a significant minority of criminal advocates fell below the generally expected standards of competency (by Ipsos MORI (2007) and ORC international research (2011/12) <sup>ii</sup> commissioned by the BSB, the CPS thematic reviews in 2009 and 2012<sup>iii</sup> and the results of the Cardiff Pilot in 2009<sup>iv</sup>.) For example, the CPS thematic review of 2009<sup>v</sup> found that 7.9% of prosecution advocates were “less than competent.”
9. There is little to suggest that the picture of criminal advocacy standards has changed –findings from research<sup>vi</sup> commissioned by the SRA and BSB into judicial perceptions of criminal advocacy indicated that standards were generally adequate but there were pockets of poor quality practice. Regulatory intervention remains therefore necessary. What has changed is the approach to that intervention so that it fits more with the BSB’s regulatory methodology and regulatory good practice generally.
10. The BSB has undertaken research in other areas of law to establish whether there is a need for greater regulatory intervention. For example, it published research in July 2017<sup>vii</sup> which suggested that barristers practising in family law were serving their clients and their interests well. Such research is supportive of the approach that we propose now to take to assure standards with an emphasis on regulation being used only where there is evidence of a need to do so.
11. There has been no discernible increase in complaints relating to barrister competence received by the BSB (or the Legal Ombudsman) during the hiatus in the development of QASA and the introduction of other regulatory tools. Complaints are very rarely received about professional competence and the disciplinary process is a blunt instrument to deal with them when they arise. The new approach outlined in this application will see the BSB placing greater emphasis not on disciplining poor practice, but on helping the barrister to improve.

### **Regulatory Context**

12. The BSB has, over the last few years, put in place a range of regulatory arrangements designed to assure competence. These have been supported by the development of information gathering arrangements on professional competence of barristers and an improving understanding of externally controlled means of

assuring competence. The aim of this regulatory approach has been to develop a regulatory framework that supports the whole profession taking greater responsibility for its own professional competence and limiting regulatory intervention to where it is most needed.

13. Targeted regulation has been introduced where concerns about professional competence have been identified – for example specific competence and registration requirements in relation to Youth Court advocacy.
14. In addition, the BSB receives a range of information about competence that influences its regulatory approach at both an individual and thematic level. The Legal Ombudsman for example shares data about complaints it receives and, through our supervisory approach, we understand how chambers gather and act upon feedback on standards of practice (this will be further enhanced through our CMA work). The CPS publishes annual information on the performance of its prosecutors and we receive information from other regulators about thematic competence issues.
15. There are also external means by which the profession's competence can be both assessed and enhanced. Specialist Bar Associations, the Inns, the Circuits and other professional bodies provide training to their members in support of maintaining standards and in upholding the professionalism that barristers view as integral to their position within the legal system. In addition, there are processes for reviewing the quality of barristers to join specialist panels such as the Treasury Panel or for appointment as a QC.
16. The above, when taken together, provides the framework to assure the competence of barristers. It is our view that this framework is a proportionate and flexible regulatory approach. We nevertheless highlight where more work is necessary and where the risks and challenges to that approach are.

### **Nature and effect of the proposed alteration**

17. The proposed alteration removes QASA from the BSB Handbook. The BSB has decided not to implement QASA and it therefore does not need to be referenced or included in the Handbook.

### **Our rationale for rule changes**

18. The decision not to implement QASA was taken by the BSB in November 2017. The removal of the QASA rules from the Handbook will give effect to this decision. Although QASA is no longer going ahead the BSB will still be assuring the competence of barristers in a way which is consistent with our risk based and outcomes focussed approach to regulation. To assist the LSB in considering the application to withdraw QASA the following sections set out the proposed approach to assuring competence of barristers. This approach reflects principles agreed by the Board in 2017 and seeks to build on the regulatory arrangements that have been put in place over the last three years. There are three elements to the approach:

- i. The use of existing and planned regulatory controls
- ii. External and market controls in assuring competence and the BSB's role in understanding and influencing those controls
- iii. Information gathering and sharing about professional competence

19. Dealing with each briefly in turn:

### **Regulatory Controls**

20. This section sets out the regulatory controls that the BSB has put in place that individually and cumulatively seek to assure competent practise of all practising barristers. These are a combination of regulatory activity that apply to all barristers to ensure that minimum standards of practice are maintained and targeted regulation where there is evidence of particular risks.

### *Professional competence*

21. There are regulatory controls in place which assure the competence of barristers by the BSB, stemming from a requirement in the BSB Handbook that barristers should not undertake work unless competent do so. In line with the BSB's commitment to risk and outcomes focused regulation, the BSB has moved to an approach which is focused on encouraging barristers, either individually or collectively, to take greater responsibility for their own competence, particularly in terms of their own learning and development. The BSB has done so by removing prescriptive regulation and creating flexibility for how competence should be maintained.

### *Professional Statement and Threshold Standards*

22. The Professional Statement and Threshold Standards were introduced in 2016<sup>viii</sup> and set out the knowledge, skills and attributes that barristers are expected to have on day one of practice. They apply as a minimum to all practising barristers at all times, acting as a baseline for competence. The planned evaluation of the Future Bar Training (FBT) programme will help us understand the extent to which they have become embedded in training and what impact they are having to assure competence at the Bar. Early indications from discussions with training providers and their students are that they see the professional statement as a crucial tool to measure their progress towards professional competence at the point of entry to the profession, Similarly we are piloting the alignment of the professional statement with pupillage outcomes with a number of chambers and employers of barristers – again the clarity that this approach provides for both pupils and pupil supervisors in how pupillage supports the profession towards professional competence (and in ensuring consistency of pupillage provision) is highlighted as a positive by those involved in the pilot.

### *Continuing Professional Development (CPD)*

23. The requirement that all barristers complete CPD is a cornerstone of assuring competence. CPD applies across the profession; to all levels of seniority and all practice areas equally. The BSB's new approach to CPD (which applies to barristers after three years) which has been operational since 2017, requires barristers to reflect upon their learning and development, set learning objectives

and review them annually, identifying areas for growth. The BSB recognised that a more modern approach to CPD was necessary than the previous inputs/hours based scheme. The new approach encourages greater ownership of CPD and professional development and flexibility in learning opportunities and moves away from an emphasis on merely completing a required number of CPD hours each year. Significant engagement with the profession took place in the run up to the new scheme and there has been positive responses from the representative groups within the Bar, with a number of specialist Bar associations developing their own guidance and supporting materials for their members. We have also seen training providers move away in their marketing material from stating the number of CPD hours that training provides and instead highlighting the learning objectives. This has been done to align more with the language used by the BSB when referring to CPD and indicates a shift in the market to respond to the requirements of both the regulator and the profession.

24. We will evaluate the impact of CPD during 2018/19. This evaluation will focus on how the profession has responded to a less prescriptive approach and a desire for them to take greater responsibility for their learning and development. This evaluation will comprise:

- i. Sampling of a percentage of barristers to review their CPD returns
- ii. A survey of the profession to gather views on the new approach to CPD and their response to it
- iii. Face to face interviews with a sample of barristers to have more in depth discussions (in the light of the themes arising from the survey)
- iv. Engagement with CPD and assessment experts to review our approach to CPD, the evidence gathered through the first steps above, and to make recommendations for change or refinement.

#### *The impact of our regulatory controls*

25. At this stage, given its recent implementation, we are not able to assess fully the impact of the new CPD regime; the evaluation highlighted above will provide evidence for that assessment. However, the profession engaged positively on the commencement of the new approach, with many specialist Bar associations and large employers of barristers (CPS and Government Legal Service) introducing bespoke guidance and recording tools to assist their members and employees.

26. In respect of the professional statement; this is embedded within the new CPD regime and is adopted by training providers in their curriculum and course design. Similarly, the checklist for effective pupillage is being replaced by the professional statement and is being used by a range of chambers to sign off pupils at the end of 12 months. Our supervision of pupillages indicates that this change has been positively received by those Chambers who have revised their approach to pupillage to make more explicit the expectations of the professional statement.

27. The benefit of the approach that we will now adopt to assuring standards is that, through its effective operation, we will gather information that indicates what impact our regulation is having on standards and where there are gaps and real or emerging risks.

28. Further, our published research strategy<sup>ix</sup> reflects the BSB commitment to gathering evidence to support its regulatory approach and to evaluate its impact. The strategy provides a high-level description of how impact will be assessed and what evidence will be gathered to support that assessment.

#### *Targeted regulation*

29. The controls described above apply across the profession equally. In addition to this, the BSB has introduced specific and targeted regulation where there is evidence of a particular risk for example in relation to immigration practice and youth court advocacy. In respect of both, the BSB has put in place guidance to support barristers practising in these areas to maintain expected standards of practice<sup>x</sup>. The BSB has also introduced a requirement for barrister who undertake work within the Youth Court to register with the BSB and in doing so, declare that they meet the published expected competences for youth court advocates<sup>xi</sup>. A sample of those barristers who register will be asked to provide evidence to justify their competence declaration. In addition, as part of our monitoring of CPD, barristers who have registered as Youth Court advocates will be asked to advise what training they have done to ensure that they continue to meet the competences. We will continue to work closely with the youth justice sector to raise awareness of our regulatory approach and to encourage referrals of poor practice.
30. The BSB will introduce further targeted regulation where there is evidence of a need to do so. In doing so, we limit regulatory intervention to areas of greatest risk.

#### **External/market Controls**

31. In addition to regulatory controls, there are also many means by which the profession's competence can be both assessed and enhanced by third party organisations and schemes within the market. These initiatives can develop in response to a particular risk, or are focused around a particular area of practice. Whilst the BSB does not have oversight of these controls they are a means by which we can evaluate how the profession maintains professional competence. This, combined with evaluating the impact and effectiveness of our regulatory controls, help us to determine whether there is a need for greater regulatory intervention.

#### *Training and development*

32. A wide range of training and development is available to barristers, both in response to CPD requirements and the profession's desire to maintain high standards of practice.
33. The Inns of Court and the Inns of Court College of Advocacy (ICCA) play a critical role in ensuring the competence of barristers. They create a community of practice which encourages high standards of practice at the Bar and a source of information and guidance for barristers on good practice. The Advocates Gateway, for example, provides information to barristers about law and best practice through their freely available on-line toolkits.

34. There is evidence that the development of training is responsive to identified risks - for example, in conjunction with the Bar Council, ICCA have introduced training to improve the treatment of vulnerable witnesses.
35. We propose, through the development of more effective relationships with training providers, to gain greater understanding of the training market and how barristers engage with it to assure competence. Through this programme of work, we will have dedicated points of contact with the primary training providers for barristers to understand how training programmes are identified and developed. Through this greater association, we will develop a stronger sense of how the profession is responding to new training opportunities and how training providers react to the training demands of the profession (and the expectations of the regulator). In doing so, we will be able to apply appropriate influence on the training market to ensure that training/competence needs are adequately covered.

#### *External assurance initiatives*

36. There are numerous external measures that assure competence of barristers, such as CPS prosecutor panels and Treasury Counsel appointments. Similarly, the Circuits and Specialist Bar Association, of which most barristers are members, provide training and guidance to help assure competence and standards of practice. Whilst we have some understanding of how these externally managed initiatives operate we will strengthen that position through more formal arrangements so that we have a more systematic understanding on how effective they are in assuring competence and in managing the requirement for further regulatory controls.

#### **Information gathering**

37. The BSB receives a large amount of incoming evidence and information about professional competence. This incoming information has driven the shape of the regulatory controls outlined above and allowed us to take targeted action in respect of individuals or identify thematic issues that require consideration. There is, however, a large amount of additional information in the market which could contribute to our view of competence and which we are not accessing or using as fully as we could be. There is also scope for us to be more effective in how we share, where appropriate, information that we have gathered so that the market can respond accordingly.

#### *Information sharing*

38. We have in place memoranda of understanding with a range of organisations, both within and outside of the legal services sector, that facilitate the provision of information. The further development of these and the extension to other organisations will enable the BSB to build a better picture of any competence concerns. We have found MoUs with organisations such as the Office of Immigration Services Commissioner and the Legal Ombudsman provide information about barristers that enrich our picture of standards at the Bar. Similar associations with other organisations, such as the CPS, the Court Service and financial regulators will only serve to broaden the range of information that we receive. Similarly, we will shortly be piloting the use of two information sharing networks - FIN-NET (Financial Crime Information Network) and SIS (Shared Intelligence Service) – which will provide us with access to a wide range of

previously untapped information about barristers gathered from both national and international sources.

### *Third party referrals*

39. Outside of formal information sharing arrangements, referrals from third parties are a key source of information about individual competence and competence across the market. Increasing the amount of third party information we receive is crucial to understand how well our regulatory controls (and the controls others have in place) are assuring competence and where we should focus our attention. The judiciary is a valuable source of information about standards of practice and we will continue to build a strong relationship with them to encourage referrals of concerns to the BSB.

### *Competition and Markets Authority (CMA)*

40. As part of the BSB action plan in response to the CMA market study there is a commitment to encourage barristers to gather feedback from clients and to make better use of it to improve the services that they provide. We will be issuing guidance in June 2018 setting out the advantages of proactively seeking client feedback and will review the response of the profession to this initiative during 2019 and 2020.

### *Risk reporting*

41. We have in place sophisticated means of reporting regulatory risks. Through the gathering of data at both a micro and market level we can identify real and emerging risks, what level of regulation we are engaged in to address those risks and where more might be necessary. This approach brings together a wider range of information that can be accessed in a systematic and structured way to evaluate our regulatory response. **Annex 2** provides more detail about our risk approach.

### **Use of information**

42. Information gathered and received by the BSB will be used for a range of purposes:

- i. To establish whether there is a need for specific regulatory action either in relation to an individual or area of practice or competence;
- ii. to assess the effectiveness of our regulatory controls;
- iii. to assess whether external controls are effective or whether regulatory intervention is necessary;
- iv. to share good practice or concerns with the market

43. It is the use of information in this way that enables the regulatory approach to operate effectively and for the strands of that approach to work together coherently.

## **The regulatory objectives**

44. In this section, the impact on the regulatory objectives of withdrawing QASA from the BSB Handbook is addressed.

### *Protecting and promoting the public interest*

45. Removal of the QASA rules will have no detrimental impact on this regulatory objective. The BSB can assure competence (and therefore protect and promote the public interest) through other mechanisms. For example, compulsory registration for barristers undertaking youth court work will protect and promote the public interest and interests of consumers as young people will have access to quality advocates for the proceedings they are involved in.
46. Access to competent legal representation is a fundamental right of the public. Through structured and targeted regulation, the BSB has put in place arrangements that take a proportionate approach that will give the public confidence that their barrister meets the minimum standards to practise. Further that the regulator has in place arrangements that provide information about competence that means that they can respond quickly and constructively where there is evidence of poor quality or areas of thematic concern.

### *Supporting the constitutional principle of the rule of law*

47. The rule of law is maintained by its administration by competent lawyers; lawyers who are trained and assessed throughout their career to ensure that their professional standards remain appropriate to their practice. The regulatory approach outlined in this application ensures that the BSB supports the profession to maintain its professional competence. Removal of QASA will therefore have no detrimental impact on this regulatory objective.

### *Improving access to justice*

48. This objective will not be prejudiced by the removal of QASA rules. Access to justice will be improved by the public having access to barristers whose competence is assured through a supportive and targeted regulatory framework. The combination of the three strands of the approach outlined in this application provides assurance that barristers maintain proper standards of practice and that the BSB has access to information that gives them confidence that this is the case.

### *Protecting and promoting the interests of consumers*

49. The regulatory approach set out in this application protects and promotes the consumer interest by ensuring that they have access to competent representation in all areas of practice. Removal of QASA rules will therefore not negatively impact upon this regulatory objective. The introduction of the new approach ensures through, for example, the consistent application of the professional statement at all stages of professional development of barristers that minimum standards of practice are maintained. Further, in improving our information gathering arrangements we will be better able to identify poor practice (rather than as with now relying upon 'complaints' to be raised) and, in those circumstances, seek to help barristers to improve, rather than to discipline them (which does not address the underlying competence issue). In doing so, we give greater confidence to consumers that their representation meets the expected level of competence.

### *Promoting competition*

50. Setting clear expectations on standards of practice encourages competition and drives up those standards. The BSB's promotion of this objective will not be prejudiced by the removal of QASA rules given their ongoing commitment to assuring standards and professional competence.

### *Encouraging an independent, strong, diverse and effective legal profession*

51. The withdrawal of QASA rules will not impact adversely on this objective. The current BSB regulations to assure standards and professional competence apply equally to all barristers across all practice areas. Further, information channels that provide information about quality concerns both at individual and thematic level helps poor practice to be identified and addressed.

### *Increasing public understanding of the citizen's legal rights and duties*

52. This objective is not directly relevant to this application and will therefore not be prejudiced by the removal of QASA rules.

### *Promoting and maintaining adherence to the professional principles.*

53. The general approach to regulation adopted by the BSB and the prominence that it places upon this objective means that it will not be negatively impacted by the withdrawal of QASA rules.

## **Principles of better regulation**

54. The BSB has had regard to the principles of better regulation when deciding to withdraw the QASA rules from the BSB Handbook. Looking at each principle in turn

### *Transparent*

55. We have been transparent in our consideration of withdrawing from the implementation of QASA. We issued a press release and news stories announcing our decision and the reasons for it.

### *Accountable*

56. The BSB considered at length whether to proceed with QASA. In doing so, it looked at whether it fitted with its regulatory approach and how competence would be assured if QASA was not introduced. It was confident that the regulatory objectives would not be undermined by not proceeding with QASA given the other regulatory arrangements that it has introduced to assure standards.

### *Proportionate*

57. The approach we have taken seeks to reflect the evidence and risk based approach to regulation that the BSB has adopted and enables the BSB to be proportionate in its regulation to assure standards and competence.

### *Consistent*

58. The decision not to implement and remove rules is consistent with our risk based and outcomes focussed approach to regulation

### *Targeted*

59. The decision to remove QASA from the BSB Handbook reflects a desire to take a more targeted approach to assuring standards. QASA was not risk based or outcomes focussed and did not therefore fit with the BSB's targeted regulatory approach.

### **Desired Outcome**

60. The removal of the rules is to maintain the status quo in the BSB Handbook given the decision not to proceed with QASA. In doing so, it ensures our approach to ensuring competency is in line with our risk and evidenced based approach to regulation.
61. The BSB will through the operation of the regulatory approach outlined in this application gather evidence to establish whether the desired outcome has been achieved. For example, the evaluation of the new approach to CPD will indicate whether the profession has responded positively in taking responsibility for its own professional competence

### **Other regulators**

62. We have informed the other regulators engaged in the development of QASA that we will not be proceeding with the Scheme and will therefore be seeking withdrawal of the related rules. We have received no indication that this decision will adversely affect them or their regulatory approach. As QASA was not implemented there are no operational regulatory arrangements that will be directly affected by the BSB's decision to remove QASA from its Handbook.
63. There remains a desire to take a consistent approach to assuring standards and there is broad alignment in how the primary advocacy regulators set competency expectations and monitor the profession against them. The BSB and the SRA have worked closely together on education and training reform to ensure consistency where possible. The BSB emphasis on targeted regulation to deal with incidence of poor quality practice supported by a proportionate regulatory framework is one that is shared by the SRA. There is therefore, in the removal of QASA rules from the BSB Handbook no risk of regulatory conflict or arbitrage.

### **Date of implementation**

64. Subject to approval of this application the QASA rules will be removed in October 2018, when the next edition of the Handbook is due to be published.

### **Consultation processes undertaken**

65. We have not consulted on the removal of QASA rules from the BSB Handbook. We have though consulted upon the various regulatory initiatives that support the regulatory approach to assure competence of barristers outlined in this application. Similarly, the BSB has consulted upon its risk and outcomes based approach to

regulation (which was developed both to reflect good regulatory practice but also in response to the expectations of the LSB's Regulatory Standards Framework.

66. Links are provided to the consultation reports relating to CPD<sup>xii</sup>, the Professional Statement and the introduction of targeted regulation for youth court advocacy. The recurring themes in these are:

- the desire to move towards a focus on outcomes of regulation, rather than prescriptive rules and requirements,
- an expectation that the profession will take greater responsibility therefore for how those outcomes will be satisfied, and
- a streamlining of our regulatory approach so that it is targeted to where there is evidence of greatest need (as against the risks to the proper functioning of the regulatory objectives within the Legal Services Act).

### **Other explanatory material**

67. An Equality Impact Assessment screening has been completed and no adverse impacts have been identified from removing the QASA rules.

### **Bar Standards Board July 2018**

---

<sup>i</sup> <https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/media-centre/press-releases-and-news/bsb-to-take-a-new-approach-towards-assuring-quality-at-the-bar/>

<sup>ii</sup> <https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/media-centre/press-releases-and-news/perceptions-of-criminal-advocacy-report/>

<sup>iii</sup> <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmcpai/inspections/cps-advocacy-thematic-follow-up/>

<sup>iv</sup> [http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/10490/1/QAA\\_Final\\_Report\\_November\\_2009.pdf](http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/10490/1/QAA_Final_Report_November_2009.pdf)

<sup>v</sup> <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmcpai/inspections/cps-advocacy-thematic/>

<sup>vi</sup> <https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/media-centre/press-releases-and-news/regulators-publish-reports-into-criminal-advocacy-standards/>

<sup>vii</sup> <https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/media-centre/press-releases-and-news/barristers-are-serving-family-law-clients-well,-says-new-bsb-research/>

<sup>viii</sup> <https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/media-centre/press-releases-and-news/bsb-publishes-professional-statement-for-barristers/>

<sup>ix</sup> [https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/media/1852486/bsb\\_research\\_strategy\\_2017.pdf](https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/media/1852486/bsb_research_strategy_2017.pdf)

<sup>x</sup> <https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/media-centre/press-releases-and-news/bsb-publishes-a-new-guide-for-barristers-working-with-vulnerable-immigration-clients/>

<sup>xi</sup> <https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/regulatory-requirements/regulatory-update-2018/bsb-regulatory-update-february-2018/registering-youth-court-work/>

<sup>xii</sup> [https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/media/1793143/bsb\\_2016\\_cpd\\_consultation\\_response.pdf](https://www.barstandardsboard.org.uk/media/1793143/bsb_2016_cpd_consultation_response.pdf)