

Minutes of the 138th Meeting of the Office for Legal Complaints (OLC)

29 April 2025

Present Elisabeth Davies, OLC Chair Elaine Banton, OLC Georgina Philippou, OLC Rachel Cerfontyne, OLC Hari Punchihewa, OLC Alison Sansome, OLC items 1 to 7 Patricia Tueje, OLC	In Attendance Paul McFadden, Chief Ombudsman Steve Pearson, Deputy Chief Ombudsman David Peckham, Head of Operations, Business Intelligence, Operational Transformation and Interim Head of IT Blessing Simango, Head of Finance, Procurement and IT Laura Stroppolo, Head of Programme Management and Assurance Mike Harris, Interim Head of Communication, Engagement and Impact Debra Wright, Head of People Strategy and Services Sarah Gilbert, Strategic Engagement Manager – items 1 to 4 Susan Bradford, Independent Service Complaint Adjudicator, item 9
Apologies Martin Spencer, OLC	
Minutes Kay Kershaw, Board Governance Manager	

Item 1 – Welcome, apologies and declarations of Interest.

1. The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and introductions took place.
2. Apologies were noted.
3. The meeting was quorate with a lay majority.
4. There were no conflicts of interest reported.
5. The minutes of this meeting reflect the true order of the discussions that took place, which deviated from the published agenda.

Item 2 – 2024/25 Annual Report and Accounts

6. The Board was updated on the progress that had been made on preparing the 2024/25 Annual Report and Accounts (ARA). The following key points were made:
 - An external organisation had been procured to draft the ARA using content provided by the Executive that reflected the Board's previous feedback on key messages and design.

- Good progress had been made on drafting the ARA; the Chief Ombudsman and Chair's forewords had been agreed, and the majority of narrative and data had been added. Any missing narrative and data would be added and validated prior to the ARA being shared with the external auditors.
 - Due to constricted timetable and the requirement to provide a clear structure and steer to the external copywriter, it had not been possible to prepare the visuals first before developing the ARA narrative as previously suggested by the Board.
 - As work to deliver the OLC's impact objective gained momentum, future ARAs would incorporate more evidence based commentary on LeO's impact.
 - The plan for the 2024/25 external audit of financial statements was on track. The financial accounts had been drafted and added the draft ARA along with the supporting notes and an interim financial statements audit had been completed. Calculations and policy notes for the complex renewal of the Birmingham office lease had been shared with the auditors to mitigate any delays like those experienced in the previous year.
 - Engagement had taken place with the MoJ and key dates and milestones for the production, approval and provisional laying date for the 2024/25 ARA had been shared.
7. Board members provided feedback on the ARA and areas for further development, including strengthening the narrative on Value for Money in recognition of how LeO is funded; the inclusion of more EDI data; the re-naming a graphic relating to learning and insight; strengthening the narrative to emphasise case complexity and its impact on the queue of cases awaiting investigation.
8. In terms of the next steps:
- The ARA would be updated to reflect the Board's feedback. Any additional feedback was to be provided to the Head of Programme Management and Assurance by 11am on 30 April 2025.
 - The updated narrative and data would be validated.
 - The Executive would conduct a final review of the ARA prior to it being shared with external auditors ahead of the external audit which is scheduled to commence on 6 May 2025.
 - A version of the ARA was to be shared with graphic designers on 16 May 2025 so that the graphics could be added.
 - The draft accounts would be presented to ARAC for review at its meeting on 19 May 2025.
 - The final accounts would be presented to ARAC for approval at its meeting on 18 June. On the same day and final version of the ARA would be presented to the Board for approval, subject to ARAC's assurance on the annual accounts.
 - Board members were asked to provide any further feedback on the draft text by the end of the week.
9. The ARAC Chair confirmed that they were content with the next steps set out for the production of the 2024/25ARA.

10. Commenting on the quality of the draft ARA and the strong forewords, the Board **noted** the progress that had been made and the next steps in the 2024/25 ARA process.

Item 3 – LeO’s strategic approach to digital technology and artificial intelligence

11. The Head of Operations, Business Intelligence, Operational Transformation and Interim Head of IT presented a paper updating the Board on the progress that had been made since the initial discussion on LeO’s strategic approach to digital technology (DT) and artificial intelligence (AI) that had taken place at the Board meeting in October 2024.

12. In discussion, the following points were made:

- With support from an external consultancy, a draft 2025/27 Digital Transformation Strategy, aligned to the 2025/27 OLC Strategy, an AI Governance Framework and an AI Policy had been developed. As part of this work, consideration had been given to the ethical and security implications associated with DT and AI and best practice and legal advice had been sought on the extent to which DT and AI could be exploited within the parameters of LeO’s Scheme Rules and the Legal Services Act 2007.
- LeO had adopted a cautious approach to DT and AI, undertaking a thorough assessment of all potential DT and AI projects to determine their impact, effectiveness and value for money before proceeding.
- The initial priority had been to identify DT and AI projects that delivered efficiencies and improvements to operational roles and to areas that would have the greatest impact, particularly on the work associated with delivering the OLC’s strategic impact objective. These include:
 - The development of a digital solution has been developed to integrate the data from on-line customer complaint forms, including EDI data, into the case management system. This is currently being tested and aims to reduce manual work, improve data quality and facilitate speedier data analysis.
 - The development of a generative AI tool has been developed to support work within the service complaints team which is currently being tested.
 - The procurement of Co-Pilot licences to be allocated to selected staff in corporate and operational roles who had undergone AI training to explore how AI could support their work.
- Following vigorous user acceptance testing, all digital solutions would be tested by a third party supplier before being accepted into the live case management system.
- AI testing was being undertaken in line with Government assurance processes which prioritised cyber security and the protection of sensitive data.
- The generative AI tool was not a decision making tool and therefore not capable of bias or inference. The Board had been pleased to note that the AI Technology Policy had considered the AI risks relating to bias and inference.
- The procurement of Co-Pilot licences mitigated the risk of any unintended data disclosures. Staff were not permitted to use open AI tools for work purposes.
- As a consequence of changes that had been made to the OLC’s 2025/26 budget and transparency agenda, the planned overall project to work towards publishing all

summarised ombudsman decisions in 2026/27 had been paused and the Executive would be exploring alternative ways to use the generative AI tool that was being developed for this work, including whether it could be used to summarise case studies and public interest decisions.

- Other future uses for DT and AI had been identified and were being considered as a proof of concept. These include:
 - The automation of processes to support operational efficiencies through the development of a generative AI tool for case decisions and other written work.
 - A digital solution for document management including evidence bundling.
- Consideration may be given to assessing the costs and benefits of using AI to support the corporate quality function in the future.
- Any digital transformation projects requiring further budgetary investment should be prioritised according to their impact and value for money and be supported by a strong evidence based business case.
- A key priority for the Executive was to embed the digital transformation strategy within LeO's culture. To support this, a communications plan had been developed.
- Recognising that staff had mixed views on DT and AI, staff who had taken part in the initial AI training and digital transformation work would play a key role in promoting the opportunities digital transformation presented and allaying any concerns staff may have about it.
- It may be necessary to consider incorporating additional controls into the AI Governance Framework to mitigate any unexpected consequences and risks that may be identified as the AI function develops, and to consider seeking additional assurance from internal audit on the robustness of the governance structure. In the meantime, it would be important for LeO to remain vigilant and mindful of any potential risks.

13. The Board thanked the Executive for the comprehensive update on LeO's strategic approach to DT and AI, welcoming the structured, strategic approach that had been adopted, which balanced aspiration with opportunities and considered the security, ethical and governance implications.

14. The Executive **agreed** to consider when the next update on LeO's strategic approach to DT and AI would be presented to the Board.

ACTION: The Executive to consider when the next update on LeO's strategic approach to DT and AI would be presented to the Board.

Item 4 – Stakeholder management

15. The Interim Head of Communications, Engagement and Impact presented a paper summarising the findings of an internal audit conducted by the Government Internal Audit Agency on stakeholder management and the actions being taken in response to the recommendations that had been made. The following key points were made:

- The audit had focussed on two key areas of risk associated with managing stakeholder relationships and had received a moderate audit rating.

- The audit had identified that areas of stakeholder management were working well and provided effective mitigation against any engagement risks materialising.
- Three medium rated recommendations had been made, and an action plan and timeline had been agreed to address them.
- There were no unexpected recommendations made.
- The outcome of the audit had provided assurance on the approach being taken to build, sustain and leverage effective stakeholder relationships, aligned to LeO's strategic and business objectives and priorities.

16. The Strategic Engagement Manager provided a detailed update on the actions being taken to address the recommendations was provided to the Board.

17. The Board requested a strategic analysis of key stakeholders was presented as part of the next Board update on stakeholder management when it was next presented to the Board.

ACTION: The Interim Head of Communication, Engagement and Impact to include a strategic analysis of the key stakeholders as part of the next Board update on stakeholder management.

18. Recognising that 2024/25 had been a development year for the Communications, Engagement and Impact Team, the Board had been pleased that the audit had confirmed that an appropriate approach was being taken towards stakeholder engagement and that the actions being taken to address the recommendations would strengthen effective stakeholder engagement and relationships.

19. The Board **noted** the update on stakeholder management.

Item 5 – 2025 Board effectiveness review

20. The OLC Board actively considers Board effectiveness on an annual basis. As part of the ongoing Board effectiveness review for 2025, the OLC Chair presented a paper updating the Board on the progress that had been made on delivering the action plan to address the recommendations of the 2023 external Board effectiveness review; the themes and learning identified from the 2024 Board member appraisals and Board effectiveness review; and, the themes and learning that had been identified from annual Board member appraisals undertaken in 2025 that would inform the 2025 Board effectiveness review.

21. In discussion the following points were made:

- Overall, the feedback from annual Board member appraisals had been consistent and reflected that the OLC Board was committed, self-aware, self-reflective and evolving to be more strategic.
- A self-evaluation of annual performance for 2024/25 had been completed by the OLC Chair and considered as part of their annual appraisal with the Chair of the LSB.
- To help inform future Board member recruitment, the OLC Chair **agreed** to share a skills audit with Board members. The Board considered the pros and cons for recruiting Broad members with broad versus specific skills sets.

ACTION: The OLC Chair to share a skills audit with Board members for completion.

- The OLC Chair **agreed** to give further consideration to incorporating more deep dives into the Board's forward plan to ensure that Board members had a better understanding of the work being undertaken in areas of key strategic priority.

ACTION: The OLC Chair to give further consideration to incorporating more deep dives into the Board's forward plan

- Future Board discussions on the review of customer satisfaction would provide opportunities for Board members to develop their understanding of customers' experience of LeO. The Deputy Chief Ombudsman **agreed** to consider when the next update on the review of customer satisfaction would be provided to the Board so that it could be factored into the Board's forward plan.

ACTION: The Deputy Chief Ombudsman to consider when the next update on the review of customer satisfaction would be provided to the Board so that it could be factored into the Board's forward plan.

- A multi-faceted approach would be taken to address the varying levels of support, understanding and acceptance of the OLC's strategy amongst some stakeholders; this would include communications across a range of channels to aid understanding and demonstrate the impact of LeO's work and its benefit to the legal profession. Further consideration would be given to this at July's Board meeting.
- Whilst Value for Money (VFM) was reported as part of the quarterly Integrated Performance Report presented to the Board, and the response to the LSB's annual Budget Acceptance Criteria further consideration would be given to incorporating more structured VFM narrative in other Board papers.

ACTION: The Chief Ombudsman and OLC Chair to consider and agree how best to incorporate narrative on VFM into Board papers.

- Recognising the need to avoid duplication across the Board, Committees, and sub-group, the OLC Chair **agreed** to follow up with the Chair of the Performance Sub-Group (PSG) and consider whether the PSG's Terms of Reference required updating.

ACTION: The OLC Chair to follow up with the Chair of the Performance Sub-Group (PSG) and consider whether the PSG Terms of Reference required updating.

22. The Board **noted** the update on Board effectiveness.

Item 6– Update from RemCo

23. The RemCo Chair presented a report highlighting key points of discussion and decisions made at the RemCo meeting held on 20 March 2025.

24. In discussion, the following points were made:

- RemCo's annual meeting with Staff Council had taken place on 20 March 2025. This had been a positive meeting, with high levels of engagement and balanced feedback on two agenda items focussed on the 2024 Civil Service People Survey results and

the refreshed Staff Council. RemCo had welcomed the opportunity to engage with Staff Council.

- RemCo had scrutinised reports on: The HR people metrics, focussing particularly on sickness absence and attrition; the progress that had been made on the People Strategy deliverables for 2024/25, noting that all actions were on track for completion within the agreed timescales; approved the updated 2024/27 People Strategy and deliverables which now incorporated areas relating to artificial intelligence and digital transformation; Health and Safety compliance; and, the 2024 Civil Service People Survey results.
- The 2024 Civil Service People Survey results had been positive with improvements in the scores for eight of the nine core themes; one score had remained the same as the previous year. There had been improvements in the scores relating to discrimination, bullying and harassment and satisfaction levels amongst disabled staff had increased.
- Safe space sessions would be held with groups with protected characteristics to gain a better understanding of some of the EDI scores and inform the EDI Strategy. Manager led team sessions, focussed on themes arising from the survey would also take place to gain further insight.
- The Cabinet Office has plans to refresh the People Survey to make it easier and quicker for staff to complete; the annual survey is to be supported by more frequent pulse surveys.
- Having considered whether the Civil Service Survey results should continue to be reported to both RemCo and Board, it was **agreed** that the detailed survey results would continue to be reported to RemCo where decisions would be made to escalate any substantive issues to the Board by exception.

ACTION: The Board Governance Manager to update the Board forward plan to reflect that the Civil Service Survey Results will no longer be reported to Board as a standing agenda item.

25. The RemCo Chair thanked the Head of People Strategy and Services for the progress they had made on delivering HR services and the People Strategy and wished them well for their future.

26. The Board **noted** the update from RemCo.

Item 7 – Chief Ombudsman’s Report

27. The Chief Ombudsman (CO) presented a report updating the Board on activity and performance in quarter four across all areas of LeO’s strategic and operational focus.

28. Operational performance had remained strong over quarter 4, with case closures delivered at the upper end of forecasts. Annual performance had increased by 4% compared to 2023/24, with case closures exceeding 8250, again at the upper end of forecasts.

29. Increased demand continued to be a significant strategic challenge. Core demand had increased by 11.6% and demand for in-depth investigations had increased by 20%.

30. The momentum and pace of delivery of the strategic impact objective was increasing and the CO report reflected this progress particularly in relation to insight and good complaints handling.
31. The LSB Board had approved the 2025/26 Business Plan and an 11.4% budgetary increase. Engagement had taken place with the LSB before and after the 2025/26 Budget and Business Plan had been approved by the LSB Board to ensure that there was clarity and agreement on how the Business Plan objectives on transparency would be met.
32. LeO had committed to publish between 30 and 50 Public Interest Decisions annually. Preparations had been progressing in 2024/25 to review LeO's processes and criteria in advance of launch in 2025/26. The first meeting of the OLC's Public Interests Decision Committee (PIDCo) would take place in quarter one. LeO was engaging with the parties involved in a number of cases where the decisions are being considered for potential publication.
33. The Government Internal Audit Agency (GIAA) had unexpectedly increased in its annual audit fee for 2025/26 by 30%.
34. Following discussion with ARAC, and to mitigate the budgetary pressure caused by this, the Board was asked to consider a proposal to reduce the internal audit plan for 2025/26 from five to four audits by removing the financial audit. It was noted that financial assurance would be provided through the end of year Financial Statements Audit conducted by external auditors.
35. GIAA had provided written confirmation that the proposed reduction in the number of internal audits for 2025/26 would not adversely impact the annual audit opinion provided at year end, as this was based on a range of factors, including audit ratings from the current and previous years, the number of audit recommendations and whether they had been completed within agreed deadlines.
36. LeO had liaised with GIAA to ensure that any future audit fee increases were communicated at an appropriate time so that they could be factored into the OLC's budget planning process.
37. It was noted that GIAA had increased the OLC's annual audit fee for 2025/26 at a higher rate compared to another similar organisation. LeO had sought to understand the rationale for this and had requested an explanation of how GIAA calculated its annual audit fee for further consideration by ARAC.
38. Following discussion, the Board **approved** the proposal to reduce the number of internal audits for 2025/26 from five to four to mitigate the budgetary pressures arising from the unexpected 30% audit fee increase.
39. The Board **noted** the Chief Ombudsman's report.

Item 8 – Quarterly Integrated Performance Report and Balanced Scorecard

40. The Board reviewed the integrated performance scorecard for Q4 2024/25.
41. In discussion the following points were made:
 - Despite a small increase in attrition in quarter four, driven by the resignation of four investigators and the retirement of two investigators, attrition remained well within target. Actions aligned to LeO's People Strategy, including the improvements that had been made to the employer value proposition and the introduction of a new

Attraction and Retention Strategy were having a positive impact on stabilising attrition. Attrition would continue to be closely monitored.

- Sickness absences had stabilised but remained out of target. Interventions were in place to manage and reduce sickness absences and support the well-being of staff. The number of staff on long-term sickness absence had reduced in quarter four.
- Consideration would be given to how a summary of the outcomes of a review of sickness absence cases could be presented to the Board or RemCo in the future.
- Attrition and sickness absences were benchmarked against data published in the Annual Report and Accounts of other similar organisations. LeO would seek to find out whether any other ALB benchmarking data was available from the MoJ.
- The budget variance at year-end was within the MoJ's 1% tolerance level.
- An increase in unit cost in quarter four had been driven by the timing of expenditure on AI training and end of year procurement.
- Due to the timing of this quarterly integrated performance report and the schedule of ARAC meetings, the 2024/25 year end position for strategic risks and issues had been shared with the full Board, prior to being considered by ARAC.
- With the Scheme Rules changes now embedded, a decision had been made at the end of quarter four to de-escalate this strategic risk to a business unit risk.
- The 2024/25 year end risk position highlighted an increase in the number of risks reported out of tolerance; this had primarily been driven by risk appetite, not a substantive issue, and none of the risks were deemed to be critical by the Executive.
- With the resignation and scheduled departures of the Chief Ombudsman and Head of People Strategy and Services over the coming months, the score for the strategic risk relating to leadership and resilience had increased and was now out of tolerance. Proactive measures were being taken to mitigate this risk; a further update on this risk would be provided to ARAC at its meeting in May.
- The Board **noted** that, in addition to the leadership and resilience risk, the risks associated with the Government Property Agency (GPA) hub in Birmingham and absorb demand volatility were also out of tolerance. Following discussion, the Board was satisfied that sufficient work was currently being undertaken to control them.
- The risk relating to the GPA hub had been updated to reflect the uncertainty around whether a new Birmingham hub, due to open in 2028, could accommodate LeO and what the associated cost implications would be. A five year lease, with an appropriately timed break clause, had been secured for the current Birmingham office and, whilst there was no immediate accommodation risk, the Executive felt that the scoring for this risk should remain unchanged until clarity was provided by the GPA to enable a full assessment of the implications for LeO.
- The Board recommended that a contingency plan was developed in case GPA could not accommodate LeO in the new GPA hub.
- The 2025/26 strategic risks and issues were being developed and would take into consideration any strategic risks relating to artificial intelligence and digital transformation.

- The Board's annual risk workshop would take place in July 2025, where a proposed suite of 2025/26 strategic risk, issues and associated risk appetites would be presented to the Board for consideration.
- Operational efficiencies and improved attrition rates have driven an increase in operational performance and productivity in quarter four.
- Despite a significant increase in demand, operational performance at the end of 2024/25 had been at the upper end of trajectories, a 4% increase compared to 2023/24; unallocated investigations had reduced by 3%; and customer journey time had reduced by approximately 7%.
- The reduction in customer journey time had been aided by changes that had been made to the mix of case complexities within investigator case holdings.
- Due to an increase in the number of in-depth investigations, the percentage of cases resolved within 90 days in 2024/25 had reduced by 1%. Despite this, 100 more cases had been resolved when compared to the previous year.
- The majority of quality and customer satisfaction metrics had remained broadly consistent in quarter 4 and ahead of expectations. However, performance volatility continued to be seen in areas relating to in-depth investigations (non-ombudsman outcome).
- Having introduced the new quality framework, more granular data was now available to analyse to identify areas requiring intervention to reduce performance volatility.
- Consideration was being given to ways of ensuring that volatility is not being driven by an inconsistent approach to quality reviews.
- The quality and customer satisfaction metrics that were out of tolerance would continue to be closely monitored and regular updates would be provided to the Board.

42. The Board **noted** the update on the integrated performance report and balanced scorecard for Q4 2024/25.

Item 9 – Service Adjudicator's annual report

43. The Independent Service Complaints Adjudicator (SCA), Susan Bradford, term of appointment ended in March 2025. Susan joined the meeting to present her final Service Complaint's Adjudicator's annual report to the Board.

44. In discussion, the following points were made:

- Over the last four years, positive changes had been made to improve the customer experience and ensure that the LeO's service was accessible, including the introduction of vulnerable customer champions, the early resolution team, and a reduction in wait times.
- Fewer service complaints about delay and lack of reasonable adjustments were now being escalated to the SCA and, of those that had been escalated, the majority had not been upheld.

- Increased resourcing in the service complaints team had enabled historic backlog of service complaints to be cleared.
 - The work undertaken by the service complaints team was of a high quality, evidenced by the reduction in the proportion of cases that had been escalated to the SCA over the last year.
 - Service complaints, and expectations for compensation, were often driven by a misunderstanding of the distinction between dissatisfaction with the lawyer complaint and the impact of the service provided by LeO.
 - Further consideration may be given to the OLC's policy on addressing poor reviews of LeO's service that had been shared on public websites.
 - The service provided to customers could be further improved by increased team leader oversight of any cases being handled by an investigator who was leaving the organisation or on sick leave to ensure that their re-allocation to another investigator was prioritised and that customers were kept updated.
45. In response to a question from the OLC Chair, the SCA **confirmed** that the Board could take assurance from the findings detailed in their annual report for 2024/25 and how the service complaint process was used as a vehicle to drive service improvement.
46. The Board **noted** the Service Complaint Adjudicator's Annual Report, thanking the SCA for their constructive feedback and support in driving service improvements for LeO's customers.
47. In April 2025, a new SCA had been appointed on a two-year contract, with the potential for two subsequent one-year extensions, with revised terms of reference.
48. The new SCA's terms of reference, will be shared with all customers who request an escalation of their service complaint to stage three of the process; this will aid customers' understanding of what is, and what is not, within the SCA's remit to investigate.
49. The views of the new SCA would be sought on the use of generative AI in the service complaint process and the changes being considered to streamline the service complaints process.
50. The new SCA would present their mid-year report at October's Board meeting.

Item 10 – Revision of the Welsh Language Scheme

51. The Interim Head of Communication, Engagement and Impact presented a report summarising the work being undertaken to update LeO's Welsh Language Scheme in collaboration with the Welsh Language Commissioner.
52. It was anticipated that a finalised version of the updated Welsh Language Scheme would be submitted to the Welsh Language Commissioner in May 2025 for their approval.
53. Once approved, the updated Welsh Language Scheme would be presented to the Board and promoted internally to ensure that staff understand their responsibilities and commitments to the Scheme.
54. The OLC is required to report against the Welsh Language Scheme annually. The 2024/25 report on the Welsh Language Scheme would be presented to the Board in July for approval.
55. The Board **noted** the update on the Welsh Language Scheme.

Item 11 – Transparency publications reports

- 56. The Board **approved** the Q4 2024/25 Board member register of interests for publication, subject to changes reported by two Board members.
- 57. The Board **approved** the Q4 2024/25 ombudsman and senior manager register of interest for publication.
- 58. The Board **approved** the Q4 2024/25 gifts and hospitality report for publication.
- 59. The Board **approved** the Q4 2024/25 Board member and senior manager's expenses report for publication.

ACTION: The Board Governance Manager to update the Board member register of interests to reflect the changes reported by two Board members.

ACTION: The Board Governance Manager to arrange for the Q4 transparency reports to be published once updated.

Item 12 - Previous Minutes; previous actions and matters arising.

- 60. The minutes of the OLC Board meeting held on 29 January 2025 were **approved** for accuracy and **approved** for publication.
- 61. The minutes of the RemCo meeting held on 27 November 2024 were **approved** for publication.

ACTION: The Board Governance Manager to arrange for the minutes of the Board meeting held on 29 January 2025 and the minutes of the RemCo meeting held on 27 November 2024 to be published.

- 62. The Board **noted** the update on the actions from previous Board meetings.
- 63. The Board **ratified** a decision made by the OLC Chair out of committee in February 2025, in line with delegated authority from the Board, to approve and sign off the 2025/26 Budget, Budget Acceptance Criteria, and Business Plan for submission to the LSB.

Item 13 - Board Paper Redactions and Non-Disclosure Report.

- 64. The Board **noted** and **approved** the items identified for redaction and non-disclosure in the April Board pack.

ACTION: The Board Governance Manager to arrange for the April Board papers to be published in line with the redactions and items for non-disclosure approved by the Board.

Item 14 – Board Effectiveness

- 65. Georgina Philippou and Debbie Wright were appointed strategy champions for this meeting and provided feedback on which session had worked well strategically and why; which paper had been the most useful strategically and why; and where there was learning and value in doing things differently in the future to occupy a more strategic space. The following points were made:

- All papers were balanced and of a good quality. The best sessions and papers strategically had been on Artificial Intelligence and Digital Transformation and the Chief Ombudsman's report. The Digital Transformation and Artificial Intelligence and paper had provided a comprehensive and informative strategic overview of the current position and the future ambitions. The Chief Ombudsman's report had provided a good overview of the current priorities which had driven good strategic discussions.
- It was evident from the Board papers that there was now more joined up strategic thinking across all areas with papers linking to wider LeO/OLC strategies and risks.
- To occupy a more strategic space there may be value and learning in further consideration being given to incorporating into Board papers information on wider external factors that might impact LeO/ OLC.

Item 15 – Any other business

55. The OLC Chair and Chief Ombudsman thanked Debbie Wright, Head of People Strategy and Services, for her service to LeO and the OLC Board, and wished her well for the future.
56. An update was provided on the landlord's planned repairs for the lift at the Birmingham office.
57. There was no other business.