

## Minutes of the 128<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Office for Legal Complaints (OLC)

**Thursday 20 July 2023**

<p><b>Present:</b>          Elisabeth Davies, Chair          Rachel Cerfontyne          Patricia Tueje          Hari Punchihewa          Martin Spencer          Jane Martin          Dale Simon</p> <p><b>Apologies :</b>          Alison Sansome          Blessing Simango, Interim Head of Finance</p> <p><b>Minutes:</b>          Kay Kershaw, Board Governance Manager</p>	<p><b>In Attendance:</b>          Paul McFadden, Chief Ombudsman          Steve Pearson, Head of Complex Casework and Deputy Chief Ombudsman          Laura Stroppolo, Head of Head of Programme Management and Assurance          Debra Wright, Head of Head of People Strategy and Services          David Peckham, Head of Operations, Transformation and Business Intelligence          Mark Persard, EDI Manager (item 8)          Steph Godbold, Stakeholder and External Engagement Manager (item 10)          Ashley McCann Internal Communications Manager (item 10)          Sarah Gilbert Policy Officer, (item 10)</p>
---	--

### **Item 1 – Welcome, apologies and declarations of interest.**

1. Attendees were welcomed to the meeting by the Chair. The private NED session on the Board effectiveness review was noted as was the shared commitment to elevating Board meetings to occupy more strategic and less operational space.
2. Apologies were noted.
3. The meeting was quorate.
4. There were no declarations of interest reported.

### **Item 2 – Executive Report**

5. The Chief Ombudsman (CO) presented the Executive Report. The following points were drawn to the Board’s attention:
  - Internal and external engagement over the first quarter had primarily focussed on the developing 2024/27 OLC Strategy; this included discussions with the wider ombudsman community at the Ombudsman Association conference in June.
  - Responses to a staff survey on future ways of working would help to inform LeO’s approach to future office accommodation options and future hybrid working models.
  - LeO was engaging with the Government Property Agency (GPA), MoJ and property agents to clarify and understand the options and next steps regarding future

accommodation for the Birmingham office; early indications suggested that the MoJ was keen for its Arms Length Bodies to move into MoJ hubs.

6. Clarity was sought on whether a potential move to an office within the MoJ estate would be helpful in terms of mitigating the strategic risks associated with recruitment and retention. Recognising that there would always be some risk associated with an office move, the CO reported that staff feedback in response to the future ways of working survey had indicated that a safe, centrally located office close to transport links and with car parking facilities would be important to them; this it would be taken into account when considering the location of the Birmingham office. MoJ hubs were mostly based centrally and staff working from the Cardiff and Leeds hubs, which were based in MoJ estate, found the location and accommodation to be attractive and a positive environment to work from.
7. The Board would receive regular updates on developments associated with the accommodation for the Birmingham office and future ways of working.
8. The Board **noted** the Executive report.

### **Item 3 - 6 – Q1 Performance Dashboard Reports**

The Board recognised the value of receiving a single integrated performance report in the future and that further consideration would be given to this in advance of the next Board meeting.

#### Operational Performance

9. The quarter one Operational Performance Report was presented by the Head of Operations, Transformation and Business Intelligence. The following points were drawn to the Board's attention:
  - Performance at the start of quarter one was strong and in line with closure expectations but a dip in performance was seen in June resulting in the overall number of closures in quarter one falling short of the Business Plan target range.
  - Three key factors underpinned the dip in performance in June: attrition; pressures on ombudsman resource due to an increase in high complexity cases and the provision of support and training to new staff; increased volumes of work in the General Enquiries Team due to the manual checks on the discretion to apply times limits, reducing workflow into the Front-End Team (FET) .
  - A performance recovery plan had been implemented to mitigate the associated performance risks that were within LeO's control. The recovery plan included the transfer of six staff from Investigations to the General Enquiries Team; a reduction in the number of Quality and Feedback checks to free up ombudsman resource to focus on case closures and the introduction of targeted overtime.
  - The Executive was confident that operational performance would recover and be back within the ranges set out in the Business Plan in quarter two.
  - The stepped progression associated with the Scheme Rules changes was expected to have a positive impact on performance throughout quarter four and into 2024/25.
10. Board members commented that they had been re-assured by the clarity of information reported on quarter one performance, particularly the analysis of the converging challenges

that underpinned the dip in performance in June and the mitigating actions that had been taken to bring performance back within Business Plan ranges.

**11.** There was some concern about the potential risk and impact of further unexpected attrition and questions were raised about whether attrition could ever be overcome. Considering this, and the long-standing nature of this Strategic Issue, the Board sought to understand whether business planning was taking sufficient account of its impact on performance. In response, the Head of Operations, Transformation and Business Intelligence and the Chair of the Performance Sub-Group (PSG) made the following points:

- The (PSG) had met on 19 July 2023 and considered the impact of the current Strategic Issues and Strategic Risks (known and unknown) on performance and what that would mean for business planning and forecasting for 2024/25. The PSG had paid particular attention to the Strategic Issue associated with attrition, its impact on performance and what was and was not within the OLC/ LeO's control to manage it.
- Attrition was difficult to forecast as it was dependent on the external recruitment market which LeO had no control over. Attrition was currently 5% above the worst-case scenario set out in the 2023/24 Business Plan; this was due to recent recruitment campaigns across the ombudsman sector where the pay and benefits package offered was more competitive than LeO's. Considering this, and the buoyancy of the recruitment market, it had been agreed that the worst-case scenario set out in the 2023/24 Business Plan for attrition would become the likely-case scenario for 2024/25 Business Plan.
- The PSG had been keen to ensure that there was no optimism bias built into the 2024/25 business planning and forecasting and had recommended a realistic and steady approach to be taken to business planning and forecasting for 2024/25, but with the ambition to out-perform the forecasts wherever possible.
- The PSG had also recommended that customer journey time should become a primary measure of performance in 2024/25 so that it assumed greater importance over case closures and the size of the Pre-Assessment Pool; how this would be measured was yet to be determined.
- A significant amount of work had been done to mitigate early attrition. In response to staff feedback and lessons learned, improvements had been made to the induction process, including changes to workload trajectories and quality and feedback checks.
- It was important for operational staff to be fully inducted and productive as soon as possible considering that, on average, they only stayed in role for between twelve to eighteen months before moving on to other opportunities.
- Considering the high attrition rates amongst nationally recruited staff who had worked permanently from home, recent recruitment campaigns had focused on recruiting staff to work from LeO's office hubs.
- Inline with some other ombudsman schemes, LeO now has a recruitment pool; this ensures that staff can be appointed quickly to minimise the impact of attrition on performance.

**12.** Feedback was provided on the timing of Performance Sub-Group meetings and associated reporting to the Board. Noting this, the Chair nonetheless highlighted the challenges of aligning multiple meetings.

13. The Board **noted** the update on quarter one operational performance.

### People

14. The Head of People Services and Strategy presented the quarter one People Performance Report, drawing the Board's attention to some of the work being undertaken to overcome the challenges associated with attrition, recruitment and retention. The following key points were made:

- Attrition across operational and corporate roles had increased in quarter one, with most staff leaving for promotion and progression opportunities.
- The finding of the pay and benefits benchmarking exercises had confirmed that LeO's pay and benefits package was not competitive in some areas. A full report of the findings would be shared with the Executive and Board in due course.
- Feedback in response to structured, manager-led sessions on the 2022 People Survey results had provided helpful information on the benefits that staff felt would help to attract and retain staff. Feedback emphasised that: benefits including pay, annual leave, working hours, flexible working arrangements and pensions were not sufficiently competitive to attract and retain staff; further work was required to raise awareness of all the benefits that were currently available to staff; the value staff had placed on the training and development opportunities, increased levels of staff engagement and performance development process that had been introduced over the last 12 months.
- Staff feedback and the evidence from the pay and benefits benchmarking exercises would help to inform LeO's future Employee Value Proposition (EVP) along with future discussions with the LSB and MoJ on Budget, pay and benefits.

15. Discussions took place on: the reasons why some other ombudsman schemes were able to offer more competitive pay and benefits packages than LeO; the implications of the Levelling Up agenda for some ombudsman schemes and what that could mean for LeO in terms of risk; the valuable insight that could be gained by asking staff why they stayed at LeO and how it could be used to develop recruitment and retention strategies; the value staff placed on LeO's EDI Policy and how this could be promoted to aid recruitment and retention.

16. Planning for the 2024/25 Budget would soon commence in preparation for discussion at the September Board meeting where consideration would also be given to a three-year strategic approach to budgeting. The 2024/25 Budget submission would be based on evidence from the pay and benefits benchmarking exercise. It was expected that the 2024/25 pay settlement would be difficult considering cost of living pressures and competitiveness challenges.

17. The Board had been pleased to note that levels of sickness absence continued to fall.

18. The Board **noted** the quarter one update on People Performance.

### Quality and Service

19. The Deputy Chief Ombudsman (DCO) presented the quarter one Quality and Service Assurance Report.

20. Having sought to understand the implications of the dip in operational performance in June on quality and service, the Board was advised that:

- Performance against quality metrics had dipped slightly in quarter one but outcomes and resolutions remained fair, robust and reliable and there were no instances where a decision or agreed outcome had been withdrawn or reissued following an unsuccessful outcome review.
  - The number of legal challenges to decisions remained broadly consistent with previous quarters and the overall number of successful judicial review challenges are low.
  - The themes and trends identified through service complaints remained broadly consistent with previous quarters and reflected the issues that had been identified through quality assurance reviews.
  - Feedback was provided to staff on the learning from quality and service reviews. The opportunity to implement large scale interventions such as process changes or training programmes to improve quality and service was limited by available resource.
  - The quarter one customer satisfaction survey scores were not available at the time of the Board meeting, but scores were expected to be in line with previous quarters.
21. A report highlighting the findings of an external benchmarking exercise identified that there was a range of differing approaches to quality assurance taken by eleven ombudsman schemes depending on factors such as organisational remit and size, resources, complaint volumes and stakeholder expectations. Considering this, the Board was advised that it could take assurance that LeO's Quality Framework was proportionate and robust.
22. A set of 'benchmarking insights' and 'critical questions' had been identified by the author of the external benchmarking report which would be taken into consideration as LeO continued to review, improve and refine its Quality Framework.
23. The Board was advised that further consideration would be given to the implications of EDI and its impact of quality and service for LeO's different customer groups.
24. A discussion, the DCO advised of actions taken to mitigate the risks associated with service complaints and their impact on reputation.
25. The Board **noted** the quarter one update on quality and service.

### Finance

26. The finance report was presented by the CO, who drew the Board's attention to the following points:
- The year-to-date expenditure was £171k underspent mainly due to higher-than-expected attrition.
  - The current full year forecast was for a £78k underspend. The Executive considered this to be a manageable forecast at this stage in the year which would be closely monitored. Potential mitigating actions including additional investigator recruitment, overtime and increased focus on insight and learning were to be considered as the year progressed.
  - The pay remit had progressed with the 4.5% pay award now being confirmed and the one-off payment of £1500 being made to all eligible staff in July. The Executive was considering one remaining element of the pay remit guidance which permitted LeO to apply flexibility to award an additional pay award to lower paid staff where affordable and up to a maximum of 0.5% of total salary bill.

27. The ARAC Chair suggested that alternative plans were identified to utilise the budget in case LeO was unable to recruit the required number of investigators to mitigate the risk of a year-end underspend. The CO confirmed that this was already being considered and that ARAC would be kept updated accordingly.

28. The CO **agreed** to give further consideration to reporting the unit cost of customers helped instead of the unit cost of case closures.

**ACTION: The CO to give further consideration to reporting the unit cost of customers helped instead of the unit cost of case closures in future performance dashboard reports.**

29. The Board **noted** the quarter one update on finance.

### Item 7 – Scheme Rules Update

30. The Scheme Rules Update Report was presented by the DCO.

31. The data collected so far to assess the impact of the Scheme Rules changes on performance, access to justice and EDI was limited considering that the revised Scheme Rules only went live on 1 April 2023 and that there had not yet been any cases progressed through to investigation and resolution. Of all the changes, the change to time limits had been the most prevalent in quarter one. This change did have an impact on operational performance due to the time and resource required to assess eligibility to apply ombudsman discretion. The following key points were drawn to the Board's attention:

- The average number of people using LeO's online Eligibility Checker and Complaint Form had dropped slightly but despite this the conversion rates of contacts to cases had increased.
- Broadly in line with expectations, 27% of the complaints submitted had been out of time and had therefore been assessed to consider the application of ombudsman discretion. Ombudsman discretion had been applied to accept 75% of the out of time cases received. Reliance on the application of ombudsman discretion was expected to reduce during the transitional period as the public became more aware of the changes to time limits.
- The impact of the time limit changes had reduced demand by 7%; this was broadly in line with forecasts and performance trajectories.
- EDI data was requested when people accessed the online Eligibility Checker; the submission of EDI data at this stage was voluntary, anonymous and could not be linked to an individual or case in line with GDPR. Considering this, it was not possible to assess the EDI implications of the application of discretion without asking customers to submit their EDI data again once their case had been accepted for investigation. Unfortunately, only 5% of customers receiving a discretion decision in relation to time limits had been willing to provide their EDI data; this data set was too small to draw any robust conclusions on the impact of changes to time limits.
- Data on the impact of the Scheme Rules changes, including those relating time limits, would continue to be collected and monitored and further consideration was being given to what more could be done to encourage customers to submit their EDI data and to help them understand how the data was being used to ensure that the Scheme Rules changes had not disadvantaged any of LeO's customer groups.



32. Board members had been encouraged to note that EDI data was being assessed and tracked to determine the impact of the Scheme Rules changes on LeO's customers and that steps were being taken to encourage more customers to submit their EDI data.
33. The Board was advised that clear criteria were in place to ensure that the new Scheme Rules were applied fairly and proportionately as the period of transition from the old Scheme Rules progressed.
34. Having sought to understand the impact of the Scheme Rules changes on staff, the Board was advised that there had been a significant increase in workload for the General Enquiries Team (GET) resulting from the changes to time limits. The response from staff to this had been positive with volunteers moving from other areas of the operations to support their GET colleagues. A communications plan had been put in place to ensure that GET staff understood the reason for the increased workload and the associated challenges they were experiencing. Any impact on investigations would be seen later in the year when cases had progressed through the business process.
35. The Board **noted** the update on Scheme Rules.

#### **Item 8 – EDI Update**

36. This agenda item, part of the Board's commitment to having a deeper dive into EDI issues twice a year, was introduced by the EDI Board Sponsor, who reported on the work that had been undertaken to develop and re-prioritise the EDI Strategy and action plan in consultation with key internal stakeholders. The EDI Board Sponsor provided assurance to the Board that a credible three-year strategy and one year action plan that was aligned to the Business Plan, Strategic Objectives, Equality Priority Objectives, the People Strategy, legislative requirements and EDI best practices had been created and would provide a solid foundation to build on in the future.
37. The EDI Manager presented reports on the EDI Strategy, Diversity Baseline Data and Social Mobility.
38. In discussion about the EDI Strategy, the Board's attention was drawn to the following key points:
  - Staff were supportive of the new EDI Strategy; it was anticipated that this would contribute to stronger employee engagement in the future.
  - The re-prioritised EDI Strategy now had an internal and external focus.
  - The risks and dependencies associated with the EDI Strategy had been considered and mitigations and controls had been identified.
  - The three-year EDI Strategy and one year action plan were realistic and achievable whilst also being ambitious in terms of what would be achieved over the three years.
  - Confidence levels in delivering the three-year EDI Strategy were high.
39. In response to a question, the EDI Manager explained that staff engagement through networks and other forums would be key to gaining insight on what would be important to staff in terms of the EDI activities that could help to promote an inclusive culture at LeO and support retention and attraction strategies.
40. In discussion, the Board was advised that the success of the EDI Strategy would be measured in different ways including compliance with EDI frameworks; accreditations for

becoming a Disability Confident Employer; compliance with the Race at Work Charter; and the Civil Service People Survey results.

- 41.** Positive feedback had been received from the Mentors and Mentees taking part in LeO's mentoring pilot. A survey would be issued to Mentees at the end of the pilot and the responses used to measure its success; a summary of the findings would be shared with the Executive and Board.
- 42.** Plans to introduce a reverse mentoring programme were being made; details would be shared with the Board in due course.
- 43.** The Board's attention was drawn to the following key points relating the diversity baseline data of LeO's workforce and customers:
  - The provision of diversity data was voluntary and therefore not all staff and customers had provided this information.
  - In line with the workforce in other ombudsman schemes, LeO had a higher proportion of female staff. Considering that 68% of females worked in business-critical operational roles and that 29% of females were in the age range 40-60, targeted sessions to raise awareness of menopause had been planned for quarter three.
  - Broadly in line with the Civil Service workforce, LeO had a higher proportion of white staff to BAME-minority ethnic staff; a higher proportion of staff who did not have a disability compared to those that did, and a higher proportion of staff were in the 30-39 age range.
  - LeO's customer diversity data was broadly in line with the Legal Services Consumer Panel's Tracker Survey data and the census data. LeO had a similar number of male and female customers; a higher proportion of white customers compared to BAME-minority ethnic customers; a higher proportion of customers with a disability compared to the wider population; a higher proportion of customers were from older age groups.
  - Further consideration would be given to ensuring that there were no barriers preventing larger customer groups accessing LeO's service.
  - Consideration would be given to publishing the diversity baseline data of LeO's workforce in line with the requirements of the Race at Work Charter.
  - The workforce data would be examined by grade and any insights shared with HR and operational colleagues to support workforce and strategic planning.
  - Links would be made with other ombudsman schemes and regulators to compare LeO's workforce and customer data to provide a broader view of the sector.
  - Customer insights would be shared with the Service and Standards Team to support external engagement work with the profession.
- 44.** The EDI Manager was commended for the work that had been undertaken to collate the workforce and customer diversity data.
- 45.** The Board reflected on the number of staff and customers that did not provide diversity data; sought to understand the reasons for this and was supportive of action being taken to promote awareness of why the data was important to the OLC/ LeO and to provide assurance on how the data would be used.



46. The Board was supportive of work being undertaken to ensure that there were no barriers preventing LeO's older customers groups accessing its service.
47. The CO confirmed the LeO would aim to present workforce and customer diversity data to the Board on an annual basis.
48. The EDI Manager reported that the findings of a social mobility survey completed by all members of the OLC and Executive Team in May 2023 were broadly in line with the findings of a previous survey carried out in November 2022 and highlighted the non-typical profile of the OLC Board and LeO's Executive Team, as defined by the Social Mobility Commission framework.
49. To demonstrate OLC/LEO's commitment to transparency, the EDI Manager suggested that the findings of this survey could be shared with staff; published on LeO's website and included in the OLC's next Annual Report and Accounts.
50. It was also suggested that the survey was conducted on an annual basis and that, to enrich LeO's social mobility data set, the survey was expanded next year to include LeO's Management Team
51. Considering this, Board members made the following key points:
- It would be important to contextualise the data, particularly regarding eligibility for free school meals to ensure the information was accurate.
  - If the survey were to be expanded next year, the findings for parental attendance at university could be distorted by generational changes that had given people better opportunities to attend university.
  - There would be value in conducting the survey on an annual basis to ensure transparency and to ensure that any information included in the OLC's Annual Report and Accounts was accurate.
52. The EDI Manager **noted** the Board's comments.
53. The OLC Chair reported that the Big Promises made in 2022 would be re-circulated so that Board members could review, self-assess and make any changes to the Big Promises they had made and so that new Board members could make their Big Promises. Further consideration would then be given to how the Big Promises would be shared with staff.
54. The Board **noted** the EDI update.

### Item 9 – Annual Risk Workshop

55. The annual Board risk workshop took place at which consideration was given to the Board's collective understanding and ownership of risk; the proposed strategic issues and strategic risks for 2023/24 and the proposed risk appetite statement for 2023/24.
56. The Board drilled down into the proposed strategic issues and strategic risks, questioning the distinction drawn between strategic issues and strategic risks; their inter-relationships and dependencies; what would happen if a strategic issue could not be brought into tolerance; and what triggers would result in exception reporting of risks to the Board.
57. Following a detailed discussion, in which members recommended that more time was allocated to future annual risk workshops to ensure the Board was sufficiently sighted on risk, the Board:

- **Approved** the 2023/24 risk statement for an overarching open risk appetite approach for operational delivery which would be managed alongside a minimal approach to financial risk.
- **Conditionally approved** the 2023/24 strategic risks and strategic issues subject to the clarification of the questions that had been raised.

**ACTION: The Executive to give further consideration to the distinction drawn between strategic issues and strategic risks, their inter-relationships and dependencies; to what would happen if the Board believed that a strategic issue could not be brought into tolerance; and to the triggers that would result in exception reporting of risks to the Board and report back to the Board accordingly.**

**ACTION: The OLC Chair and Board Governance Manager to reflect on the time allocated to future annual risk workshops to ensure that the Board is sufficiently sighted on risk without duplicating any of the detailed work on risk undertaken by ARAC.**

58. The Board was advised that a new Risk Manager had been appointed and would commence in role in September.

#### **Item 10 - 2024/27 OLC Strategy**

59. The Board was updated on the changes that had been made to the 2024/27 OLC Strategy in line with previous Board feedback.

60. The Board's discussions focussed on:

- The changes that had been made to the 2024/27 OLC Strategy.
- The feedback received from staff in response to a range of well attended internal engagement sessions that had taken place during 'Strategy fortnight'.
- How stakeholder feedback should be managed to demonstrate that it had been considered.
- The skeleton strategy document: its format, level of detail and the publication channels to be considered.
- What success would look and feel like for the draft strategic objectives.
- External engagement and consultation.

61. The Board's specific feedback was captured by the Stakeholder and Engagement Manager and would be taken into consideration as the 2024/27 OLC Strategy and skeleton strategy document continued to be developed.

62. Further discussions of the 2024/27 OLC Strategy would take place at the Board's workshop in September, where the next iteration of the skeleton strategy document would be considered along with the feedback from external engagement that would be taking place over the Summer.

63. The Board **noted** the update on the 2024/27 OLC Strategy.

### **Item 11 Welsh Language Report**

**64.** The Board **approved** the Welsh Language Report for 2022/23.

### **Item 12 – Previous Minutes; Matters Arising and Previous Actions**

**65.** The minutes of the OLC Board meeting held on 15 June 2023 were **approved** for accuracy and **approved** for publication.

**66.** The minutes of the OLC ARAC meeting held on 15 May 2023 were **approved** for publication.

**ACTION: The Board Governance Manager to arrange for the minutes of the OLC Board meeting held on 15 June 2023 and the minutes of the OLC ARAC meeting held on 5 May 2023 to be published.**

**67.** The Board **approved the** Terms of Reference for the Performance Sub-Group which had been circulated out of committee on 7 July 2023.

**68.** Board **noted** the update on the actions from previous Board meetings.

### **Item 13 – Transparency Reporting**

**69.** The Board **noted** and **conditionally approved** the Q1 Board member Register of Interests for publication, subject to the addition of a new public appointment for Dale Simon.

**70.** The Board **noted** and **approved** the Q1 Ombudsman and senior manager Register of Interests for publication.

**ACTION: The Board Governance Manager to update the Board member Register of Interests and arrange for it to be published along with the Q1 Ombudsman and senior manager Register of Interests.**

**71.** The Board **noted** that there had been no entries on the Gifts and Hospitality Register since it was last presented to the Board at the January 2023 Board meeting.

**72.** The Board agreed that the Q1 Board Member and Senior Manager Expenses Report was to be submitted along with the Q2 report at the October Board meeting.

**ACTION: The Interim Head of Finance to submit the Q1 and Q2 Board Member and Senior Manager Expenses Reports for approval at the October Board meeting.**

### **Item 14- Board Paper Redactions and Non-Disclosure Report**

**73.** The Board **approved** the items identified for redaction and non-disclosure in the July Board pack.

**ACTION: The Board Governance Manager to publish the July Board papers taking account of the redactions and items for non-disclosure approved by the Board.**

### **Item 15 – Board Effectiveness**

**74.** Board members were asked to feedback to the Chair on the effectiveness of the performance review and scrutiny section of the Board meeting. Any feedback would be considered as part of a follow up on the External Board effectiveness review at September's Board workshop.

**ACTION: Board members to feedback to the Chair on the effectiveness of the performance review and scrutiny section of the Board meeting.**

**75.** In line with the Board's commitment to improving Board effectiveness, Hari Punchihewa and Dale Simon provided feedback on the Board meeting. The following points were made:

- There had been a good level of engagement at the meeting with a good balance between operational and strategic discussions.
- The meeting had been supported by good quality, informative papers.
- The best papers had been on Risk, Strategy and Scheme Rules. The Scheme Rules paper had provided a good balance of the facts and the impact the Scheme Rules changes had had on LeO's customers.
- The best sessions had also been on Risk, Strategy and EDI: areas for development had been identified at the Risk session that would lead to further improvements in managing risk in the future; discussions at the Strategy session had contributed to the further development of the OLC's 2024/27 Strategy; the detail provided in the accompanying papers had helped to ensure the right tone and level of discussions had taken place at the EDI session.
- There may be value in giving further thought to the order of agenda items to ensure that meetings flow well; to streamlining the performance update papers and to aligning OLC meetings to layer input from OLC committees and other meetings to ensure that Board discussions remain at a strategic level.

**76.** Wider reflections on the effectiveness of the meeting were put forward. The following key points were made:

- The pre-Board private NED session on Board effectiveness had been helpful and informative.
- Board members were supportive on a streamlined report on performance that was strategically focussed.
- To elevate Board discussions on the 2024/27 OLC Strategy, there would be value in focussing less on the draft Strategy document and more on the revisions to the thinking behind how the Strategy was being developed.

**Item16 – Any other business**

**77.** There was no other business discussed.