

## CONSUMER IMPACT FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENT

<b>PART ONE: SUMMARY</b>	
<b>What is being reviewed?</b>	CILEx Regulation Education Standards and Authorisation Rules for CILEx Lawyers
<b>Who is completing the review?</b>	Vicky Purtill. Director of Authorisation and Supervision
<b>Date of review</b>	5 August 2019
<b>Purpose of function/policy being reviewed</b>	To create a statement of education standards that apply to CILEx Lawyers (Chartered Legal Executives/Fellows and CILEx Practitioners)
<b>Main activities of function/policy being reviewed</b>	This policy sets the minimum standards for admission as an authorised person at CILEx Regulation.
<b>Which consumers are directly affected by this policy?</b>	All consumers using CILEx Lawyers will be indirectly affected, as these standards ensure the minimum competence of those admitted at the point of first authorisation.
<b>Which consumer groups may be impacted by this policy?</b>	See above
<b>Further action required</b>	N/A
<b>Implementation of policy recommended?</b>	Yes

<b>PART TWO: FULL ASSESSMENT</b>	
<b>1. General</b>	
Which legal services are impacted by the policy?	All reserved activities are directly affected and unregulated legal service delivery (which can be undertaken by both authorised and non-authorised persons) will also be impacted, although less directly.
Does the policy impact all consumers? If not, which segments of the consumer market will be impacted by implementation of the policy?	Yes
<b>2. Cost</b>	
Does the policy impact significantly on the cost of legal services?	Unlikely – if at all this is likely to reduce the costs of legal services delivery as it may mean more CILEx Lawyers are qualified to offer reserved activities in competition with other qualified lawyers.

<b>3. Quality</b>	
Does the policy impact significantly on the quality of provision of legal services?	The standards are broadly the same as under the current arrangements – however reserved legal activities have been integrated into the first assessment of competence as a lawyer to make authorisation more streamlined.
<b>4. Availability</b>	
Is the policy likely to reduce/increase the availability of a legal services/a particular legal service? Or in specific geographical areas?	This may increase the provision of legal services as it will ensure more CILEx Lawyers are authorised to provide reserved legal activities in their specialist area.
<b>5. Choice</b>	
Does the policy impact significantly on the choice to consumers in the of provision of legal services?	See above
<b>6. Innovation</b>	
Will the policy promote innovation of the provision of legal services?	Yes – it includes explicit competencies in the area of legal technology and emotional competence
<b>7. Competition</b>	
Will the policy impact significantly on competition in the provision of legal services?	It should improve competition by increasing the number of authorised individuals able to provide reserved legal activities to the public.
<b>8. Relationship between consumer and legal services provider</b>	
<p>Will the policy change the relationship between consumers and the legal services provider?</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Will the policy provide more/better information to consumers?</li> <li>➤ Will the policy provide undue advantage to the legal services provider?</li> <li>➤ Will the policy mean consumers may utilise heuristic (e.g. information overload and resorting to rule of thumb) decision making?</li> </ul>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>Unlikely</p>

<b>9. Consumer protection and consumer redress</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Will the policy enhance/diminish consumer protections such as insurance or access to CR compensation fund?</li> <li>➤ Will the policy enhance/diminish consumer ability to seek redress (right to complain, seek compensation etc.)</li> </ul>	<p>If CILEx Lawyers, who will be qualified to set up their own legal firm once authorised, this will ensure access to client protection arrangements.</p> <p>No change (but see above)</p>
<b>10. Vulnerable consumers</b>	
<p>Does the policy raise concerns about disproportionate impacts on vulnerable or disadvantaged consumers of legal services?</p> <p>Consider effects such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Physical harm</li> <li>➤ Monetary loss</li> <li>➤ Dissatisfaction</li> <li>➤ Denial/limitation/barriers to access</li> </ul> <p>If so, which groups are disproportionately affected?</p> <p>Consider vulnerability such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Poverty</li> <li>➤ Mental/physical health</li> <li>➤ Legal service affected (e.g. Family, immigration)</li> <li>➤ Geographical location</li> </ul> <p>Reason for impact? Is there any possible mitigation?</p>	<p>No</p>
<b>11. Consumer Groups</b>	
<p>Have consumer groups been contacted about this policy?</p> <p>If yes, what feedback has been provided?</p>	<p>Yes – the Legal Services Consumer Panel provided positive support for the changes to include both legal technology and emotional competence into the standards explicitly for the first time in the legal sector.</p>

<p>If no, should there be consumer group involvement?</p> <p>Has the feedback been followed? If not, why not?</p>	
---	--