**Review of Tribunal Non-Legal Member Fees**

**Consultation Response Form**

Please use this form to submit responses to the Review Body on Senior Salaries’ (SSRB) consultation on the Review of Tribunal Non-Legal Member Fees.

This response form should be considered in conjunction with the consultation document.

Response to the questions below should be input into this document electronically and completed document then emailed to: NLMreview@beis.gov.uk. All responses should be received by **14 April 2022**.

**Part 1: About You**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name:** | Click here to enter text. |
|  |  |
| **Email address:** | Click here to enter text. |

Respondents are not required to provide an email address. If you do wish to provide this information, it will allow the SSRB or its secretariat to contact you if they wish to obtain further information about any points raised in your response.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Are you responding:** | Choose an item. |
|  |  |
| **If you are responding as an individual, are you:** |
| Choose an item. |
|  |
| **If you are current or former NLM whose role falls under the scope of the review, please provide your job title:** | Click here to enter text. |
|  |  |
| **If not, please provide any information you wish to about your occupation or reason for your interest in this consultation:** | Click here to enter text. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please provide its title:** | Click here to enter text. |
|  |
| **Please provide a brief description of your organisation. This should include, if applicable, information about whom the organisation represents, the size of its membership and how the views of members were obtained.** |
| Click here to enter text. |

**Confidentiality**

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, could be subject to a request under access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004). The Office of Manpower Economics, which provides secretariat support to the SSRB, must deal with any such request in accordance with relevant statutory framework. If you consider that any of the information that you have provided is confidential, it would be helpful if you could explain why. This will mean that, if the Office of Manpower Economics receives a request for disclosure of the information, it can take full account of your explanation. However, we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances.

Please check this following box if any information provided in your response should be treated as confidential: [ ]

If so, please provide further details of what information is confidential and why below.

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text.  |

**Part 2: Consultation Questions**

***Underpinning principles***

**Question 1**: Do you agree with principle 1 that NLM daily sitting fees should not exceed those of the tribunal judge?

Agree[ ]  Disagree[ ]  Unsure[ ]

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. Please limit your answer to 500 words or fewer.  |

**Question 2**: Do you agree with principle 2 that NLMs acting as a tribunal chair should be paid the same daily sitting fee as the tribunal judge?

Agree[ ]  Disagree[ ]  Unsure[ ]

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. Please limit your answer to 500 words or fewer. |

**Question 3**: Do you agree with principle 3 that fee rates should not be differentiated by the number of sitting days undertaken over the course of a year?

Agree[ ]  Disagree[ ]  Unsure[ ]

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. Please limit your answer to 500 words or fewer. |

**Question 4**: Do you agree with principle 4 that the geographic location of the tribunal should not affect NLM fee rates?

Agree[ ]  Disagree[ ]  Unsure[ ]

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. Please limit your answer to 500 words or fewer. |

***Daily sitting fee rates (and salaries)***

**Question 5:** Do you agree or disagree that all NLMs should receive the same base rate but with provision for a small number of levels of supplementary sitting fee rates for roles requiring professional qualifications or expertise where recruitment and labour market evidence suggests they are needed?

Agree[ ]  Disagree[ ]  Unsure[ ]

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. Please limit your answer to 500 words or fewer. |

**Question 6:** In your view, are there compelling reasons forNLMs sitting on Upper Tribunals to receive a higher daily sitting fee?

Agree[ ]  Disagree[ ]  Unsure[ ]

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. Please limit your answer to 500 words or fewer. |

***Additional fees***

**Question 7:** One possibility is that the daily sitting fee could include some recognition of basic ‘preparation time’, leaving additional fees for a smaller number of circumstances when they are warranted. This was an issue also raised by the SSRB 2008 Review. What is your view on this?

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. Please limit your answer to 500 words or fewer. |

**Question 8:** In your view, what would be an adequate compensatory mechanism to reflect the impact of short-notice cancellations (of 48 hours or less)?

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. Please limit your answer to 500 words or fewer. |

***Recruitment and retention***

**Question 9:** What changes other than changes to fees could be made to make the role of an NLM more attractive?

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. Please limit your answer to 500 words or fewer. |

**Question 10:** How could the role of an NLM be made more attractive to younger or more diverse applicants?

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to enter text. Please limit your answer to 500 words or fewer. |

**Thank you for taking the time to submit your views to the SSRB.**