



August 2018

Cabinet Office

Departmental Reviews of ALBs: Cabinet Office Assurance

Departmental reviews of ALBs: Cabinet Office Assurance document

How to use this document

This document is a gap analysis tool to compare departmental reviews of arm's-length bodies (ALBs) with the tailored review guidance. This will provide the Cabinet Office with assurance that the principles of the tailored review guidance have been covered by the departmental review, and thus no further review of the ALB will need to be scheduled in this parliament. The current guidance can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/tailored-reviews-of-public-bodies-guidance>

This document can also be used with cluster reviews of many ALBs, and where ALBs have been reviewed under multiple forms of scrutiny that collectively can meet the principles of the tailored review guidance.

For cluster reviews, you may wish to consider the ALBs separately and complete a separate assurance document for each; alternatively, if the report considers the ALBs collectively, you may wish to list the ALBs and the relevant part of the report in each section.

For ALBs under multiple forms of scrutiny, please refer to the relevant report which considers the section of the assurance to be addressed, and attach those reports to this document.

Tailored review topics and principles

The tailored review guidance set out three main areas of criteria on which ALBs should be reviewed. They are:

1. The body and its functions
2. Efficiency and effectiveness
3. Governance of the body and departmental relationships with the ALB

In addition, we expect a supplementary section to be considered **only** when ALBs in question are specifically Public Sector Research Establishments (PSREs), or classified as an Advisory Non-departmental Public Body that provides scientific advice to government.

The tailored review guidance states that when conducting the review you should have regard to the principles of proportionality, challenge, being strategic, pace, inclusivity and transparency. This template does not ask specific questions about these principles, but you should take them into account (where relevant) when setting out your responses.

Completing the template

The template is broken down into sections corresponding with one or more review criteria set out in the tailored review guidance. For each of these you should either:

- explain how the review meets the criteria
- refer to the relevant part of report that addresses the points to be considered, or
- very briefly explain why the section is not applicable

Assessing the review

You should self-assess individual sections of the assurance process in accordance with the ratings below.

- no need for further review
- further action required
- further review needed

For your self-assessment to say there is **no need for further review**, the principles of the tailored review must be fulfilled. In the relevant section, this means:

- The form the ALB should take and/or the need for its functions are justified in accordance with the tailored review guidance. The classification is appropriate for the form of the ALB. The devolved context is taken into account where relevant.
- All cross-cutting efficiency principles, additional relevant efficiency principles, and effectiveness of the ALB have been considered. Relevant CO functional teams have been engaged and efficiencies have either been identified for implementation, or have been shown as not possible or applicable.
- The ALB is compliant with the relevant principles of good corporate governance, or will be reformed to make it compliant.
- Where relevant, the principles of form and function of PSREs have been considered and/or the governance principles of SACs have been considered. If considered in the main body of the assurance, the additional section for PSREs and SACs do not need to be completed.

If the review complies substantially with the requirements of a tailored review listed under a section yet with some gaps, you should mark there is **further action required**. The further action required will be taken on a case-by-case basis. An example of this might be if a review includes a strong general analysis of efficiency that does not cover property or shared services – the action would then be to engage the relevant CO functional teams.

You should only give a rating of **further review needed** where there are substantial gaps in the review's coverage of the relevant criteria.

The role of the Cabinet Office

We will challenge self-assessments as a “critical friend” to ensure that departments explore all relevant opportunities. We will work with you on a case-by-case basis to discuss how any gaps can be addressed proportionately and in a manner that adds value. For example, if a review addresses all required points other than partnership working with the department, we would not ask you to conduct a tailored review, but it might be appropriate to dovetail the partnership work into an existing departmental programme or schedule in an internal review of partnership outside the tailored review process.

NAME OF ALB(s):**Legal Aid Agency (LAA)****SPONSORING DEPARTMENT:****Ministry of Justice (MoJ)**

The form and functions of the ALB

Refer to **Annex A** in the tailored review guidance document for relevant information.

For priority reviews and/or reviews of larger bodies, we intend for you to focus on the **Delivery Options** for the functions/role of the ALB(s) in question. The “**Three Tests**”, the **Devolved Context**, and the **UK leaving the EU**, should be focused on when your analysis found them particularly relevant to the ALB.

Form, functions, and classification

Please set out any changes to the ALB as a result of the review in the following areas:

- Functions
- Form
- Classification

Refer to the Delivery Options and the “Three Tests” where relevant in **Annex A** (max 300 words). For reference, the Classification Guidance can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/classification-of-public-bodies-information-and-guidance>

If there have not been any changes to the ALB, or the review has not examined all of the ALB’s functions, please explain why not.

This self-assessment by the LAA has found that there is no need for further review at this current point in time.

The Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders (LASPO) Act 2012 will be subject to a MoJ-led Post-Implementation Review (PIR) later in 2018. The scope of the LASPO PIR will include consideration of the effectiveness and efficiency of the LAA and its overall success in delivering its goals. We anticipate that consequently there will be a further review of the LAA’s performance later this year.

Executive Agency status remains at present the correct form for the LAA. The LASPO Act 2012 created the role of Director of Legal Aid Casework (DLAC). The Director has sole responsibility for individual cases, ensuring that decision-making in this area is independent from Government. Shaun McNally has held this role since 1 April 2016, when he took over the roles of both Director of Legal Aid Casework and Chief Executive of the Legal Aid Agency. The granting of legal aid needs to be, and be seen to be, delivered with absolute political impartiality, meeting the second of the three tests for where an ALB status is appropriate.

The devolved context

Please briefly explain how the review considers the ALB's place in the devolved context or refer to the relevant part of the report (max 200 words). For reference, the Devolution Toolkit can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/devolution-toolkit>

The LAA is responsible for commissioning and administering legal aid services in England and Wales, taking account of the relevant provisions of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (LASPO Act) and the policy and strategy set by ministers and the Ministry of Justice.

The LAA, through strategic working groups, maintains links with the Welsh Government, in recognition of the devolved administration. We work directly with stakeholder groups, for example, the Criminal and Family Justice Boards for Wales, as well as specific Welsh stakeholders including Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service Cymru.

The UK leaving the EU

Does the ALB have functions that are directly affected by the UK leaving the EU?

Yes

If "Yes", explain how the review considers this or refer to the relevant part of the report. This should be proportionate to the time the review took place, the known extent of the implications of leaving the EU at that time, and the extent of the ALB's involvement with the EU (max 200 words).

We forecast an increase in applications for legal aid (mostly relating to immigration work) as a result of exiting the EU. This results in a moderate increase in operational costs and LAA Fund costs.

Departmental self-assessment

No need for further review	X	Further action required		Further review needed	
----------------------------	---	-------------------------	--	-----------------------	--

The effectiveness and efficiency of the ALB

Effectiveness

Please comment on the effectiveness of the ALB, and how it can be improved, with reference to the following: (max 300 words)

- suitability of the priorities/goals of the ALB, with reference to the department's SDP and manifesto commitments
- overall success of the ALB at delivering its goals
- effectiveness of the ALB's current strategy, and how well they have delivered on its priorities
- ALB's performance relative to its peers

The LAA's purpose is to work with others to achieve excellence in the delivery of legal aid. The LAA has four Strategic Objectives (SOs), which were refreshed in 2017 and will be reviewed again in 2020;

1. Provide simple, timely and reliable access to legal aid
2. Build strong relationships across Government and the justice system
3. Secure value for money for the taxpayer in all that we do
4. Achieve our full potential through being fair, proud and supportive

These support delivery of two of the MoJ's objectives as outlined in the SDP:

2. Deliver a modern courts and justice system
4. Transform the department

The LAA published its Annual Report and Accounts 2017-18 on 21 June 2018. This details how the agency has performed against its Strategic Objectives and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), as well as setting out its financial performance during the year in comparison to 2016-17.

In 2017-18 the LAA administered approximately £1.6bn of public funds (2016-17: £1.5bn) through 2266 legal aid providers (covering Civil and Criminal representation) with administration costs of £81.3m (2016-17: £95.0m). Running costs as a percentage of total net legal aid expenditure are approximately 5%, significantly lower than other similar international equivalents.

Performance against KPIs is monitored monthly by the LAA Board. In 2017-18 all KPI targets bar Fund Spend (which is demand-led) were met or exceeded:

- administration spend reduced by over 5% compared to 2016-17
- net error rate remained below the National Audit Office's materiality threshold of 1%
- 4.9 average working days lost (AWDL) per member of staff compared to Civil Service benchmark of 7.3
- Over 500,000 applications for legal aid were processed and over 530,000 bills were paid in target time

The LAA published the Director of Legal Aid Casework (DLAC) annual report (2017-18) on 21 June 2018. The DLAC has responsibility for making determinations on legal aid in individual cases. The report covers the work carried out under this function.

Efficiencies

To ensure proportionality, we expect the analysis to focus on the principles of **Efficiency** in accordance with the priority and size of the ALB being reviewed, and specific other functions only where relevant.

Refer to **Annex B** in the tailored review guidance document for full information. The principles of each efficiency have been provided for your reference.

An explanation of the results or reference to the relevant part of the report should be provided for all efficiencies below. Where the efficiency is not relevant to the ALB or there have been none found, please explain why (max 200 words).

Complete for all ALBs:

Some of the following categories may not be relevant to smaller ALBs; where this is the case please briefly explain why.

Digital

Explain or refer to the part of the report that considers the ALB's potential to derive savings from shifting current services to digital channels and transforming transactional services to be digital by default, as outlined in the Digital Efficiency Report found here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/digital-efficiency-report>

This should follow the principles in the Government Digital Strategy and Department Digital Strategies. If this is not possible/relevant for the ALB, please explain why.

Department digital strategies can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/departmental-digital-strategies>

The Government Digital Strategy can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-digital-strategy/government-digital-strategy>

Under MOJ's functional leadership model LAA Digital staff transferred to the MoJ Core Department in 2017. In 2017-18 the LAA reduced digital operating expenditure whilst still making significant capital investment in IT and digital by reducing licensing costs, contractor costs and reliance on managed services (ATOS in particular).

In terms of our service provision, during the first three quarters of 2017-18, 97% of initial contact to the LAA took place online. The introduction of an upgraded IT portal has significantly improved stability and reliability of access for our external users. From 2 January 2018 it became mandatory for criminal solicitors and barristers to submit their claims for work undertaken in the Crown

Court using the online Claims for Crown Court Defence (CCCD) system, enabling quicker processing times.

New Office 365 and Windows 10 laptops were provided to 1,300 staff across 11 sites, embedding flexible working practices and allowing LAA's staff:desk ratio to be further reduced.

LAA's ongoing Agency Transformation Programme (ATP) aims to further simplify the delivery of legal aid and increase automation and efficiency. It will reduce waste and paper-based operations beyond what has already been achieved. In 2017-18 paper usage has fallen from 19 to 10 tonnes (£8k saving).

Shared Services

Explain or refer to the part of the report that considers the ALB's usage of shared services as part of the Next Generation Shared Services (NGSS) initiative. If the ALB is not using them and there is no intention to use them, please make the case why it is unsuitable for the ALB to use shared services, as opposed to its own back-office.

Efficiency has been sought through the use of shared functions, including Shared Services Connected Limited (SSCL), the Central Legal Team, and the Human Resource Business Partners, which provide support to the LAA, the MoJ, and other Government Departments. This reduces the required staff, resources, office spaces, and emissions.

During 2017-18, former LAA sites in Bristol, Cardiff and Manchester all moved to cross-government hubs, which enabled the sharing of resources with other Government departments and public bodies.

Reported savings

Explain or refer to the part of the report that details the savings to be made from this review. If no savings have been identified, explain why.

No additional savings have been identified as a result of this review.

In 2017 the LAA launched its Agency Transformation Programme (ATP). The vision of ATP is to transform the Agency to simplify the delivery of Legal Aid by 2020. We will do this by achieving the three key aims:

1. Providing a service that is easy to access and simple to administer
2. Establishing a modern digital service
3. Being a flexible, valued part of the justice system that adapts to meet future needs

ATP currently has three main workstreams; simplification, automation and organisational design. The LAA is confident that any achievable process savings will be identified and implemented through ATP by 2020.

The LAA ran a Voluntary Early Departure Scheme (VEDS) in 2016, and has already significantly reduced its use of contractors and management services.

As part of MoJ Transformation, we have significantly reduced our staff:desk ratio via the introduction of new technologies enabling smarter working, and are continuing to reduce our estate as a result of this.

Workforce

Explain or refer to the part of the report that considers the size and cost of the ALB's workforce, in reference to FTE and the following functional categories:

- HR
- Finance
- Legal
- IT
- Estates
- Procurement
- Communications
- Internal Audit

Also explain or refer to the part of the report that considers what cross-governmental services could be used to deliver the above functions and whether efficiencies could be made through this. If this is not possible/relevant for the ALB, please explain why.

The LAA achieved a £13.7m reduction in administration / running costs in 2017-18 compared to 2016-17, due to reduced workforce costs following the Voluntary Early Departure Scheme (VEDS) run in 2016-17; less use of contract and agency staff; and decrease in the estates and IT overhead recharges from the MoJ, largely due to the smaller workforce and consolidation of desk space in our London office.

The introduction of the functional leadership model has also seen 158 staff (as of 1 April 2017) transfer from the LAA to the MoJ Core Department (mostly Finance and Digital staff).

The business partnering working relationship with MOJ Finance is operating well, with joint leadership focusing on strategic outcomes.

As of April 2018 the LAA has a 1,323 headcount and 1,254 FTE.

Property

Explain or refer to the part of the report that considers the size of the estate occupied by the public body, and consider how better space use per FTE and savings may be derived from planned (e.g. lease breaks) or accelerated building exits etc. If not relevant, please explain why.

The LAA is committed to creating a sustainable, effective and efficient estate which provides value for money for the taxpayer, reduces our environmental impact and enables smarter working. We are currently undergoing further estates rationalisation to reduce the amount of space we occupy (enabled through more flexible working arrangements) and are planning to relocate offices in Leeds, Brighton and Pontypridd in 2018-19.

In 2017-18 our Cardiff, Manchester and Bristol offices entered into new accommodation arrangements and the utilities consumption and costs will now be reported through shared occupancy.

Procurement of common goods and services

Explain or refer to the part of the report that considers the procurement of goods, services and works from third parties, ensuring that common spend is channelled through the Crown Commercial Services' (CCS) centralised purchasing arrangements. If not relevant, please explain why.

Not relevant. Under the MOJ Functional Leadership model, all procurement is undertaken and managed by MOJ Commercial.

The only commercial procurement that has not transferred relates to specialist commissioning activity of legal aid services from providers. See below under Commercial Relationships. This is likely to form part of the LASPO PIR.

Context specific to all ALBs depending on their form and functions:

On the following list, check the box relating to any further efficiency relevant to the ALB, and explain or refer to the relevant part of the report below (max 200 words per efficiency).

Where the efficiency is not relevant to the ALB, leave the box blank and briefly explain why below.

- Commercial Models and/or Revenue Generation
- Commercial Relationships (focusing on contracts not covered by common procurement)
- Contribution to Economic Growth
- Fraud, Error, Debt and Grants
- Major Projects
- Technology Infrastructure
- Construction

Explain or refer to the relevant part of the report below. The principles of efficiency are provided here for your reference. Refer to Annex B for full guidance on their application.

Commercial models and/or revenue generation: Explain or refer to the part of the report that explores whether any of the functions performed by the public body could be better delivered in collaboration with other parts of the public sector and/or in collaboration with the private sector.

Commercial relationships: Explain or refer to the part of the report that considers what opportunities there are to lower the cost of the commercial contracts held by the public body and what options there might be to reduce and restructure these costs by renegotiating contracts.

Contribution to economic growth: Explain or refer to the part of the report that considers the body's contribution to economic growth. The Government's response to the Heseltine Review into economic growth can be found at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/governments-response-to-the-heseltine-review-into-economic-growth

Fraud, error, debt and grants: Explain or refer to the part of the report that considers whether the level of fraud, error and debt for the ALB is understood and, if they are, what savings can be made through the increased prevention and detection of fraud and error loss, and the efficient and effective debt management and collection of overdue debt.

Explain or refer to the part of the report that considers what the appropriate funding mechanisms are and the utilisation of cross-government best practice in grants administration and effectiveness.

Major projects: Explain or refer to the part of the report that demonstrates the proper scrutiny of the projects by the Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA).

Technology infrastructure: Explain or refer to the part of the report that considers what savings can be made on the ALBs current technology spend, following the Government Service Design Manual and the Technology Code of Practice.

The Technology Code of Practice can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/technology/code-of-practice.html>

Construction: Explain or refer to the part of the report that considers savings the ALB can make beyond the present 15-20% savings agreed under the Government Construction Strategy.

The Government Construction Strategy can be found at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-construction-strategy-2016-2020>

Commercial models and/or revenue generation:

Not applicable. The LAA is responsible for the administration of legal aid in England and Wales and is not revenue generating.

Commercial relationships:

The LAA has a commissioning and service development function which designs, develops and tenders new contracts, and a contract management function which works closely with our provider base to manage relationships and ensure the smooth running of our contracts. These contracts are not typical commercial contracts. The rates of pay and fees are set by MOJ through policy and regulation. The role of the LAA (through our contracts) is to ensure service coverage and quality of service.

In 2017 the LAA implemented new Criminal Legal Aid contracts with 1,299 providers to ensure that these services are available to everyone that qualifies. In 2018 the LAA will procure new civil legal aid contracts for both face to face advice and specialist advice delivered through the Civil Legal Advice telephone helpline. The LAA hold regular meetings with external representative bodies through the Crime and Civil Contract Consultative Groups. This team also works closely with the legal aid policy team in the Ministry of Justice and partner agencies across justice system to implement policy and legislative change.

Contribution to economic growth:

Not applicable.

Fraud, error, debt and grants:

Counter Fraud updates are a standing item on the LAA ARAC and the most significant matters receive active attention from the Board. Our fraud policy and counter fraud strategy are reviewed annually, with the fraud action plan and counter fraud activity reported monthly. We raise awareness of fraud amongst our people and stakeholders through the use of presentations, intranet articles and advice. In December 2017 the LAA became host to the MoJ Counter Fraud & Investigations Function in recognition of the expertise and successful work undertaken within the LAA. We continue to foster close working relationships with the DWP, Solicitors Regulation Authority, HMRC and wider to gather intelligence, share data and better inform our prevention and prosecution actions. We collaborate with law enforcement agencies and the CPS to ensure national file standards and practice are followed. We participate in the National Fraud Initiative and work closely with Cabinet Office on a range of fraud detection and prevention measures.

The complexity of legal aid and associated scope for discretion means there is an inherent risk of error because of incorrect eligibility assessments or inaccurate payments. This is continually scrutinised and managed as part of our stewardship arrangements. Our application and payment processes are subject to ongoing policy and administrative changes. In response we continue to focus on reducing error in a stable and sustainable way by working closely with our providers, and collaborating across our contract management, case management, finance and digital teams to identify and address root causes and strengthen both internal controls and provider compliance. In addition, where we identify a particular payment was irregular, we review and recover such payments.

The LAA has an inherent risk within trade receivables and other current assets, as it is not predisposed to straightforward cash collections. The LAA recognises this risk and mitigates it in the case of statutory charge debts, where enforcement of the debt may be deferred, by securing

land charges and using active credit management policies to recover unsecured debts. In some cases the debt collection activities are outsourced to commercial debt collectors. The LAA regularly reviews its debt collection strategy and targets.

Major projects:

Not applicable. The LAA is operates in a MOJ-led service model approach aligned to departmental programmes and feeds into the wider MoJ transformation as an executive agency of it. The agency undertakes change through a series of projects and initiatives but none exceed any thresholds or flags that mean they are classed within the boundaries of being major projects.

Technology infrastructure:

Not applicable. Ownership and responsibility for LAA Technological Infrastructure sits with MoJ Technology and Digital.

The LAA is working with MoJ on the Strategic Hosting Programme (moving applications to a cloud hosted environment). This is because:

- existing outsourced hosting and support arrangement ends in April 2019 (at the latest);
- substantial proportion of the hardware and software components currently supporting the LAA applications are out-of-date and “end-of-life”, increasing the risk of catastrophic service failure and/or cyber security incident
- existing LAA systems are tightly coupled together, dependent on expensive, proprietary equipment, and architected in a way which makes change slow and difficult;
- to align with the government ‘Cloud First’ policy

Strategic hosting will:

- safeguard and stabilise LAA's existing critical business applications;
- simplify, modernise and improve the applications to allow the agency to deliver more efficient, smarter services;
- reduce the cost of building, hosting, administering and supporting the applications;
- enable better end-user experience by providing the ability to deploy changes to small numbers of people

Some of these benefits will be realised by the MoJ, rather than the LAA.

Construction:

Not applicable. The LAA is not responsible for any construction projects.

Departmental self-assessment

No need for further review	x	Further action required		Further review needed	
----------------------------	---	-------------------------	--	-----------------------	--

Good corporate governance and assurance

Refer to **Annex C** in the tailored review guidance document for relevant information.

Board effectiveness

Describe the overall effectiveness of the ALB's board, with regard to the principles of good board governance below (max 200 words).

- The public body is led by an effective board which has collective responsibility for the overall performance and success of the body. The board provides strategic leadership, direction, support and guidance.
- The board – and its committees – have an appropriate balance of skills, experience, independence and knowledge.
- There is a clear division of roles and responsibilities between non-executive and executives. No one individual has unchallenged decision-making powers.

The LAA's Board Operating Framework was updated in April 2016. It was established with the commitment to streamline governance while enabling adequate oversight and control of the LAA's delivery priorities, and was developed in line with the principles of the HM Treasury best practice guide 'Corporate Governance In Central Government Departments: Code of Good Practice' (the Code), to the extent it applies to an Executive Agency. In the 2017-18 Annual Report and Accounts the Accounting Officer confirmed he is content that the governance structure implemented has worked effectively and as intended.

To ensure that the governance structure remains effective, the LAA undertook a further review of the Board Operating Framework in 2017. The review did not recommend any material changes to the Framework and found that the structure and framework remain fit for purpose. However, as a result of MoJ functional leadership and closer working with MoJ Tech and Digital, the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) has agreed to revised change and investment governance, to be implemented in summer 2018. Joint MoJ Digital /LAA prioritisation and oversight will improve the effective implementation of change. Membership and Terms of Reference will be agreed in July/August.

The LAA Corporate Centre will be responsible for ensuring agreed services are provided and for highlighting any performance issues. The LAA ELT and Board will use the monthly Finance and Performance Pack (which includes operational, financial and IT performance and risk updates) to monitor performance and escalate issues as necessary to MoJ. Representatives from Corporate Centre will continue to be a member of relevant MoJ governance groups, including MoJ's Functional Leadership Implementation Group and the Project Delivery Steering Group.

Relationship with sponsoring department

Describe the ALB's relationship with its department, with regard to the framework document or equivalent as well as the processes underlying them, and the principles of good corporate governance below (max 200 words).

- The departmental board ensures that there are robust governance arrangements with the board of each public body. These arrangements set out the terms of their relationship and explain how they will be put in place to promote high performance and safeguard propriety and regularity
- There is a sponsor team within the department that provides appropriate assurance and scrutiny of, and support and assistance to, the public body.
- The sponsorship guidance can be used for reference and is located at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/public-bodies-reform>

The Principal Accounting Officer of the MoJ has designated the Chief Executive as Accounting Officer (AO) of the LAA. The responsibilities of the AO, including responsibility for the propriety and regularity of the public finances, for keeping proper records and for safeguarding the LAA's assets, are set out in 'Managing Public Money' published by the HM Treasury. The AO must ensure that the LAA is run in accordance with standards in terms of governance, decision making and financial management.

The LAA currently has three Non-Executive Board Members (NEBMs). The role of the NEBMs is to provide effective objective challenge and support the rest of the Board and officials as appropriate. A NEBM chairs the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (the other two NEBMs are Committee members), and advises the AO and Board on issues of risk, control and governance. Their responsibilities include reviewing comprehensiveness of assurances and integrity of financial statements.

NEBMs are appointed on merit, through open and transparent competition run in accordance with principles of the Commissioner for Public Appointments and cover the specialist areas of audit, legal and commercial. They are accountable to the Chief Executive for their conduct as Board members. Each term lasts three years and NEBMs cannot serve for more than two consecutive terms.

As our current NEBMs have come to the end of their tenure, we are beginning an open and transparent appointment process and will be looking to increase the diversity of the Board. We are working with MoJ's Public Appointments to run the recruitment process.

It is anticipated that the LAA Framework Document (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/372206/laa-framework-document.pdf) will be reviewed after the LASPO PIR and the governance mentioned above (Board Effectiveness) has been fully implemented and adopted.

On the list below, check the box of each principle of good corporate governance that the ALB is in compliance with. No further explanation is required.

Where the ALB is not compliant, leave the box blank and provide an explanation below in those particular cases (max 200 words each).

Accountability

- Statutory Accountability
- Accountability for Public Money
- Ministerial Accountability

Roles and Responsibilities

- Role of the Chair
- Role of Non-executive Board Members
- Effective Financial Management
- Communications
- Conduct and Behaviour

Where the ALB is not compliant, explain or refer to the relevant part of the report below. The principles are provided here for your reference. Refer to Annex C for full guidance on their application.

Statutory accountability: The public body complies with all applicable statutes and regulations, and other relevant statements of best practice.

Accountability for public money: The accounting officer of the public body is personally responsible and accountable to Parliament for the use of public money by the body and for the stewardship of assets.

Ministerial accountability: The minister is ultimately accountable to Parliament and the public for the overall performance of the public body.

Role of the chair: The chair is responsible for leadership of the board and for ensuring its overall effectiveness.

Role of non-executive board members: As part of their role, non-executive board members provide independent and constructive challenge.

Effective financial management: The public body has taken appropriate steps to ensure that effective systems of financial management and internal control are in place.

Communications: The body is open, transparent, accountable and responsive.

Conduct and behaviour: The board and staff of the public body work to the highest personal and professional standards. They promote the values of the body and of good governance through their conduct and behaviour.

Not applicable.

Departmental self-assessment

No need for further review	X	Further action required		Further review needed	
----------------------------	---	-------------------------	--	-----------------------	--

Additional guidance for reviews of public sector research establishments

Refer to **Annex D** in the tailored review guidance document for relevant information.

Only to be considered for reviews of PSREs, and when the points below are not already considered in the main body of the assurance document. If already considered, check and do not complete

Explain or refer to the part of the report that reviews the form, function, and delivery model of the ALB against the supplementary principles of research establishments in **Annex D**. PSREs are a diverse group of ALBs, and this should be proportionate to the context in which the ALB in question operates (max 300 words).

Not applicable.

Departmental self-assessment

No need for further review	X	Further action required		Further review needed	
----------------------------	---	-------------------------	--	-----------------------	--

Additional guidance for reviews of advisory NDPBs that provide scientific advice to government

Refer to **Annex E** in the tailored review guidance document for relevant information.

Only to be considered for reviews of Advisory NDPBs that provide scientific advice to government and/or Scientific Advisory Committees/Councils (SACs), and when the points below are not already considered in the main body of the assurance document. If already considered, check and do not complete

Explain or refer to the part of the report that reviews the ALBs practices against the principles of scientific advice to government and the Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees as maintained by the Government Office for Science. The Code can be found here: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/scientific-advisory-committees-code-of-practice> (max 300 words).

Not applicable.

Departmental self-assessment

No need for further review	X	Further action required		Further review needed	
----------------------------	---	-------------------------	--	-----------------------	--