



Baroness Andrews OBE
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State

**Department for Communities and Local
Government**

Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU

Tel: 020 7944 3083
Fax: 020 7944 4538
E-Mail: baroness.andrews@communities.gsi.gov.uk

www.communities.gov.uk

19th March 2009

Dear Interested Peer,

Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Bill: Commitments to write made at Grand Committee

I am writing to address points raised during the final three Committee sessions on the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Bill on which I made a commitment to peers to write. This letter covers commitments I made in relation to the Regional Strategy, Economic Prosperity Board and combined authorities and Construction Contracts. I hope that this letter will allay any concerns peers may still have on these particular issues before we enter debate on these provisions in Report Stage.

Regional Strategy

Progress on new regional arrangements

In Committee on 3 February I undertook to provide an update on the progress that regions were making to move to new regional arrangements.

One leaders board is already in place - in the NW –and our latest information is that leaders boards will be established in the next 2 or 3 months in at least 4 more regions which is excellent news.

The Yorkshire and Humber region is intending to move to new arrangements from April. Council leaders through Local Government Yorkshire and Humber and Yorkshire Forward Board members will take joint responsibility for the development of the Regional Strategy. LGYH will become the new Leaders Forum and the Regional Assembly will cease to exist after March 2009.

In the North East Local Government reorganisation in April will reduce the number of local authorities to 12 strategic authorities. From 31st March 2009 the Regional Assembly will be replaced by a Leaders Board comprising the 12 councils plus the National Park and Social Economic and Environmental partners.

In the South West and the South East proposals are still being finalised but with an expectation that a move will take place to a Leaders board structure by April or shortly thereafter.

Regional arrangements in the North East

At Committee on 24 February I undertook to write to Baroness Maddocks and other

interested peers with the latest position on progress in creating a leaders' board in the North East, and the arrangements taking shape there.

More detail will be available once we have received change management plans from all regions by the end of March, but in the North East Local Government reorganisation in April will reduce the number of local authorities to 12 strategic authorities. From 31st March 2009 the Regional Assembly will be replaced by transitional arrangements that have the support of ONE and GONE. The Association of North East Councils (ANEC) will provide overall accountability for the delivery of CLG funded functions during the transition. It will do this by bringing together ANEC members with partners when CLG funded regional policy is being addressed. Partners will include economic and social partners, Northumberland National Park Authority and town and parish representatives. This is an interim arrangement and following Royal Assent, the new arrangements will be subject to legislative requirements including an appropriate level of regional consultation and Secretary of State approval.

You also asked how people would be able to input to the strategies. We set out in the Regional Strategy Policy Document, published in January, how we expected the responsible regional authorities to engage with stakeholders, including communities.

The document makes clear how critical stakeholder engagement is to ensure the regional strategy integrates competing demands and commands support across a region. The Bill requires an approach to stakeholder engagement and community involvement which is transparent and accountable. It does so by requiring the responsible regional authorities to prepare, publish, keep up-to-date and comply with a statement of their policies on involving all those persons who seem to them to have an interest in the regional strategy. This should include both informal engagement and formal public consultation activity. All of this means that the responsible regional authorities' approach to engagement and involvement is open to scrutiny and challenge.

To expand on how we see this working, the expectation is that, during the drafting stage of the regional strategy in particular, the RDA and Leaders' Board would use working arrangements and a variety of means to involve different organisations and individuals. We intend to set out in regulations which specific and also which range of bodies must be consulted.

In addition, a key part of providing opportunity for local input is through the changes we are proposing for the independent testing, which will begin earlier in the process and where we will expect Examination in Public panels to hold exploratory sessions to hear different points of view.

To provide further opportunity for comment, full public consultation is assumed at two key stages:

- Once the RDA and Leaders' Board have agreed an initial draft strategy
- After the draft strategy has been modified in the light of the EIP panel's recommendations and representations received on the initial draft.

Finally, you were interested about how local involvement might work in the North East. We are conscious that within the framework for engagement and involvement set out above regions will find different ways to apply it to get the best results from their particular circumstances and as these emerge we will be looking to share some of the innovative and effective approaches that are adopted.

Difference in wording between the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

I undertook to write to Lord Greaves and other Noble Lords in relation to his amendment [166ZC] regarding the difference in wording between the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (PCPA 2004) and Clause 65(3) of the Bill. Lord Greaves said his amendment to delete this Clause probes the difference in the wording between current legislation and the Bill. He said he did not understand the reason for the change and what practical effect it might have.

He also noted [9 Feb 2009 : Column GC298] that there was a great deal of Part 1 of PCPA 2004 which was being re-enacted in Part 5 of the Bill, but that there were quite a few changes and he would find it helpful if those changes could be listed and explanations given for why they are taking place.

The direct effect of amendment 166ZC would remove the ability of Regional Strategy to deal with sub-regional issues when preparing a Regional Strategy. Although it appears that this is not Lord Greaves' intention, it would reduce the ability of Regional Strategy to have policies which deal with sub-regional issues.

I said in Committee that it was my understanding that there were no substantive differences from the 2004 Act with regard to this Clause, but I would provide written clarification on this.

Clause 65(3) says "In subsection 2(a) and (b) references to the region include any part of the region". There is no substantive difference between this clause and section 1(3) of the PCPA 2004. Both provisions clarify that policies for a "region" can apply to parts of a region and therefore enable sub-regional issues to be addressed. Section 1(3) of the PCPA 2004 includes the additional clarification that references to a region include an area within it covering the area or part of the area "more than one local planning authority". The Bill includes no such additional clarification, thereby providing for greater flexibility, although we have said in our policy document which we published alongside this Bill that whilst the regional strategy should be a strategic document, and should not attempt to set policies which are properly the responsibility of local authorities or sub-regional bodies, a Regional Strategy should have policies where there is a genuine and distinctive regional or sub-regional dimension. It is our intention that we will provide further guidance on this issue in our forthcoming guidance.

There are a number of other clauses which are repeated but where there is material change in wording:

- Clause 65(1) repeats section 1(1) of the 2004 Act but excludes London to avoid the need for a separate clause.
- Clause 65(6) repeats section 1(5) of the 2004 Act enabling Secretary of State to specify how much of the Regional Spatial Strategy will become the Regional Strategy but extends this to Regional Economic Strategies to enable the Regional Economic Strategy to form part of the Regional Strategy.
- Clause 65(7) repeats section 12(2) of the 2004 Act enabling the Secretary of State to make regulations instead of a direction. This is to simplify and reduce the scope

for the Secretary of State to make directions and because we can deal with this through regulations.

- Clause 68(2) and (4) repeat section 5(1) of the 2004 Act but says the region “may” prepare a draft revision instead of “must” when it appears necessary or expedient to do so. The word “must” is not needed as clause 68(1) requires the responsible regional authorities to keep the Regional Strategy under review. The requirement to prepare a revision “at such a time as is prescribed” or when directed by the Secretary of State is covered in clause 68(4).
- Clause 71 repeats section 5(3) of the 2004 Act regarding the matters to be taken into account in Regional Strategy revisions, but includes reference to the:
 - need to have regard to the Mayor’s Regional Economic Strategy in London
 - national planning framework for Scotland
 - EiP panel report and representations that were not considered at an EiP

This is to ensure compatibility with the other regional economic strategy provisions in the Bill; to ensure that the national planning framework for Scotland, which did not exist in 2004, is a consideration; to ensure that all representations to the draft strategy are considered; and, to clarify that the report of the Panel is also relevant.

- Clause 70(6) repeats section 7(4) of the 2004 Act but excludes reference to “the extent and nature of the consultation on the draft before it was published”. This is because reference to “the extent and nature... published” is unnecessary. Whilst the extent and nature of the consultation of the draft strategy will be taken into account during an EiP we don’t think it needs to be a factor in deciding whether to hold an EiP. Under Clause 69 responsible regional authorities are already required to set out how they will involve stakeholders and communities in the preparation of Regional Strategies. Sub-clauses 70(2)(b) and 70(6)(b) also mean that the actual and potential level of interest in the Regional Strategy process and particularly the level of controversy that may be expected relevant considerations in deciding whether or not to hold an EiP.
- Clause 70(9) repeats section 8(7) of the 2004 Act but updates the provision to refer to the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 as this is now relevant.

Economic Prosperity Boards

Secretary of State Order making powers

In the 7th session of Grand Committee on the 24th February, Noble Lords asked me to write explaining each order making power of the Secretary of State included in Part 6 of the bill. There were clear concerns that these order making powers could be exercised independently of requests from the local authorities who would be involved in economic prosperity boards or combined authorities. I will use this letter to explain how the order making powers this part of the bill grants to the Secretary of State are dependent on requests from the relevant authorities.

There will, in practice, be only four instances in which the Secretary of State will make a statutory order under part 6 of the bill – to establish an EPB, to amend an existing EPB, to establish a combined authority and to amend an existing combined authority.

The order making powers bestowed on the Secretary of State provide a legal mechanism for the creation of EPBs and combined authorities. These will be corporate bodies with independent legal status that will be able to exercise some of the functions of the constituent local authorities. Our view is that it is appropriate for the Secretary of State to be involved in establishing bodies of this type and that a statutory order is the correct mechanism for their creation, not least because it will allow for scrutiny by Parliament. It is right that there should be some degree of formality around the creation of a body with public law functions and we want them to have a degree of permanence so that they can provide long-term direction to the areas for which they are established. Given their potential powers, we also think it right that there should be a transparent process that clearly sets out their functions and constitution. If an EPB or combined authority is created by statutory order, it follows that statutory orders will also be needed to make changes to an existing EPB or combined authority. However, the Secretary of State will have no power to create or amend these bodies without this being initiated by the local authorities involved.

Establishing a new EPB

(NB – clause numbers relate to the bill as reprinted following Grand Committee)

Clauses 85 to 89 and 94 to 96 relate to the establishment of a new EPB. Clause 85 gives the Secretary of State the power to make a statutory order establishing an EPB. Clauses 86, 88 and 89 give the Secretary of State the power to make orders about the constitution (covering the membership, voting and executive arrangements), functions and funding of the EPB. It is our intention that when an EPB is created, these order making powers will be used together to lay a single statutory instrument establishing the EPB and setting out its working arrangements. This will provide a clear basis for the operation of the EPB. These powers have not been set out in a single clause as those in clauses 86, 88 and 89 may also need to be exercised separately to make changes to an existing EPB.

Clause 96 provides that an order to establish an EPB can only be made once a scheme for an EPB has been prepared and published by a group of two or more local authorities.

Clause 94 sets out that two or more local authorities may, if they wish, undertake a review of the efficiency of arrangements to promote economic development and regeneration across their area. This review must be initiated by local authorities as there is no power for the Secretary of State to direct that a review should be carried out. If two or more of the authorities conducting this review conclude that establishing an EPB would be likely to deliver improvements for the area, the authorities may (but do not have to) prepare a scheme for an EPB under clause 95. Again, there is no power that allows the Secretary of State to direct that a scheme must be prepared.

Clause 96(1) states that the Secretary of State may make an order to establish an EPB only if, having had regard to a scheme prepared and published under clause 95, she considers that to do so is likely to improve economic development in the area. It follows from this that the Secretary of State has no power to make an order creating an EPB without reference to a scheme that has been initiated, prepared and agreed by the local authorities concerned.

In practice, we expect the Secretary of State to implement the scheme as published by the local authorities. However, the statutory order used to create any particular EPB will necessarily be fairly complex and some adjustments may need to be made when translating the scheme into the order, to ensure that the new body is able to function effectively. Clause 96 requires the Secretary of State to consult all the authorities that will be involved in the scheme on the order. This provides an opportunity for any necessary departures from the scheme to be agreed.

Amending an existing EPB

The Secretary of State's power to make an order amending an existing EPB is similarly dependent on a revised scheme being published by one or more of the local authorities concerned. Clause 97 allows one or more of the EPB itself, a local authority within the EPB and a local authority who might join the EPB following a change of its boundaries, to review the operation of the EPB. This review could be focussed on a very particular aspect of the EPB, or could be quite wide ranging. Following this review, the authority or authorities may publish a scheme proposing a change to the EPB under clause 98. Clause 99 allows the Secretary of State to make an order under any of clauses 86, 88, 89, 92 and 93 to amend an existing EPB only if, having regard to the scheme prepared and published under clause 98, she considers that it is likely to improve economic development in the area.

Again, this means that the Secretary of State's order making powers in relation to an existing EPB cannot be exercised without a scheme first being prepared by one or more of the authorities concerned. This process is designed to give the local authorities the ability to initiate and design any changes that would be made to an existing EPB. These changes are those that would require amendments to be made to the statutory order that created the EPB, such as changes to the constitutional arrangements or boundaries. Any other changes could be taken forward by the EPB itself in line with its existing constitution.

Establishing or amending a combined authority

The process for creating or amending a combined authority is broadly similar to that for creating an EPB. That is, the initiative for the arrangement and its design will come from the local authorities involved. The Secretary of State's role is to give the arrangement legal status by setting it out in a statutory order. The creation of a combined authority can also be partly initiated by an existing EPB or integrated transport authority (ITA).

I hope this letter makes clear that, although Part 6 of the bill gives the Secretary of State a number of order making powers, none of these can be used without one or more local authorities first preparing and publishing a scheme. By publishing a scheme, the authorities involved will be requesting the Secretary of State to make an order either creating or amending an EPB or combined authority.

Political proportionality

I informed Noble Lords during Grand Committee that the rules on political proportionality set out in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 will apply to Councils appointing members to EPBs and combined authorities. Concerns were raised that these rules only apply to those members of the EPB or combined authority that are members of the

constituent councils, and not any non-councillors that may be appointed. While this is the case, I would like to remind Noble Lords that the bill requires that a majority of the members must be elected members of constituent local authorities. If they wish, the constituent local authorities may choose for all the members of the EPB or combined authority to be councillors. EPBs or combined authorities do not have to have any non-local authority members to be appointed. Indeed, if an order covering membership arrangements does include non-elected members of the constituent councils, the order must provide for those members to be non-voting members. Only voting members of the EPB or combined authority may resolve that non-elected members can vote.

In taking this approach we are closely following the arrangements for ITAs, and also building on precedent set with National Park Authorities and Joint Police Authorities, which both allow for persons other than elected representatives of local authorities to be appointed to their membership. There are also parallels to the approach we are taking to Leaders' Boards where, if they choose to do so, the local authorities involved may include other, non-local authority members.

Progress with ITAs

On 9 February the 6 Passenger Transport Authorities in the former metropolitan counties - West and South Yorkshire, Merseyside, West Midlands, Tyne & Wear and Greater Manchester - became Integrated Transport Authorities, under powers in the Local Transport Act 2008. That Act also enables local authorities to join together to review existing transport governance arrangements in their area, including what should be the role of an ITA. That includes those areas of the country which do not have ITAs at present, but might be interested in setting one up.

Several existing ITA areas, including Tyne & Wear and South and West Yorkshire, have already started work on such reviews, and we are also aware that several areas without ITAs are also considering undertaking reviews. How long it takes to set up a new ITA will depend upon several factors, most obviously the complexity of what is proposed and what role the local authorities in that area see the new ITA performing. Guidance published by the Department for Transport explains that where authorities submit formal proposals to the Secretary of State for Transport recommending the establishment of a new ITA, they should assume a minimum of nine months before proposals can come into force through secondary legislation, although this may vary where more wide-ranging changes are intended. (The DfT guidance can be found at <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/localtransportbill/guidancegovernance.pdf>)

Combined authorities

Part 6 of the LDEDC Bill creates additional options for local authorities to work together to promote economic development across their areas. As has been discussed in committee, economic prosperity boards will allow local authorities to formalise their joint working and establish strong governance arrangements to promote the economic development and regeneration of the sub-region. Given the extremely strong links that exist between effective transport provision in an area and wider economic development, it makes sense to think about how these issues can be considered in a joined up way at the sub-regional level. It was therefore decided that the LDEDC bill should build on the work that was being done through the LTA 2008 to strengthen sub-regional arrangements for transport, by allowing local authorities to create a single body to take on responsibility for transport and wider economic development should they wish to do so.

Essentially, a combined authority is an amalgamation of an ITA and an EPB. Their purpose is to allow transport and wider economic development to be considered in a holistic way by groups of authorities who choose to work closely together on these issues. However, an area does not have to have both of these in place before a combined authority is created. An area could decide to set up a combined authority from scratch, or build on an existing ITA or EPB to create a combined authority. The decision to proceed towards a combined authority, and the design of the new body, will be up to the local authorities involved. We are not legislating for combined authorities because either ITAs or PTEs (Passenger Transport Executives – the executive arms of ITAs) are failing to function correctly. Rather, the Government wishes to extend the principle that local authorities should be able to work together on economic and transport issues where it makes sense to do so.

Noble Lords asked about the powers and functions that would be passed to combined authorities. This will be a matter for the local authorities involved to determine and will depend on the particular circumstances in that area, for example whether there is an ITA or EPB already in place. In general, any of the functions that are available to ITAs and EPBs will be available to a combined authority.

Noble Lords also pointed out that various amendments had been made to the membership arrangements of ITAs during the passage of the then Local Transport Bill and asked whether the membership of combined authorities would operate in a similar way. The arrangements for EPBs and combined authorities were deliberately modelled on those set out in the LTA for ITAs. This means that combined authorities will be similar to ITAs in very many respects, including their membership arrangements. While it will be for the local authorities involved to set out in their scheme how members should be appointed, at least a majority of the members of a combined authority will have to be drawn from the elected members of constituent authorities; each representative council will have to have at least one elected member on the combined authority; and it will be up to the local authority members to decide whether any non-elected members should be able to vote on any matter.

Construction Contracts

The Government promised to write about two issues which arose during discussion of Part 8 of LDEDC Bill in Grand Committee on 5 March. These were:

- whether we could find a way forward on Baroness Hamwee's amendment which sought to allow the adjudicator to award his fees and expenses; and
- providing a fuller answer in response to Lord Borrie's amendment 217A which sought to provide a party to a construction contract with the right to demand surety for payment.

I would also like to provide a little more detail about what is happening with the statutory adjudication procedure.

Adjudicator's fees and expenses

The 1996 Act currently makes no provision regarding the costs of adjudication. The starting point is that costs will lie where they fall – each party being responsible for his or her own costs. A practice has arisen in the construction industry, however, whereby one

of the parties to the construction contract will require (by putting this in the construction contract) that the other will also bear all of the former's costs of the adjudication (the legal and other costs of the former and also what the former would be liable for as regards the adjudicator's fees and expenses). Often such clauses are included at the behest and to the advantage of party in the strongest bargaining position and their effect is obvious – they place a significant disincentive on one of the parties to a contract to access his or her right of adjudication.

Clause 137 of the LDEDC Bill prevents the parties from entering into any agreement regarding the costs of adjudication unless that agreement is made in writing after the notice of intention to refer a dispute to adjudication has been given. This includes all the costs of the adjudication – the adjudicator's fees and expenses and the legal and other costs of the parties.

The RICS is concerned that our blanket prohibition of pre-dispute agreements cuts across another, related, type of construction contract clause - one to the effect that the adjudicator can "award" *his own fees and expenses* i.e. can determine whether one or both parties should be responsible for his fees and expenses and in what proportion. (Typically the practical consequence of such clauses is that the loser will be asked to pay all of the adjudicator's fees and expenses.) It is correct that clause 137 will also catch this type of clause and the RICS has said that this prohibition of such clauses will act as a major disincentive to refer a dispute to adjudication. The argument here appears to be that the party referring the dispute to an adjudicator will alone be liable for the adjudicator's fees and expenses because it is with the referring party that the adjudicator has a contract for the services of the adjudication. Our position has been that while the costs of the process would always impose something of a barrier to its use the difference between knowing that you *would* be liable for the adjudicator's fees and expenses and knowing that you *might* be liable was not a significant one. Nevertheless, following Grand Committee we asked the Construction Umbrella Bodies Adjudication Task Group (RICS is a member through the Construction Industry Council) to consider whether the fact that only the party referring a dispute to adjudication would have to pay for the services of the adjudicator definitely created a significant new disincentive to adjudication.

Since the RICS produced their briefing and suggested amendment there has in fact been an important judgment in the High (Technology and Construction) Court (*Christopher Michael Linnett vs Halliwell's LLP*). We have now had the opportunity to give it fuller consideration than was the case at the time of Grand Committee. The case is important because it unequivocally spells out that it is not just the referring party to whom the adjudicator can look for payment of his fees and expenses. The judgment in *Linnett vs Halliwells* makes it clear that where the other party (with whom the adjudicator will not have an express contract) accepts the fact of and participates in an adjudication that party should also be liable for the cost of the adjudicator's services. Proceeding with an adjudication gives rise to a contract formed by conduct with an obligation on the part of that party to pay an adjudicator's reasonable fees and expenses. Given this judgment, we therefore believe that preventing the parties to a construction contract from making a valid pre-dispute agreement concerning the allocation of the fees and expenses of the adjudicator does not prevent the adjudicator from subsequently making such an allocation should he decide to do so.

We will seek the views of the Construction Umbrella Bodies Adjudication Task Group on this analysis. In short, it seems that the amendment which the RICS is seeking will not be necessary.

Security of payment in insolvency

Amendment 217A sought to introduce a new clause which gives a payee under a construction contract the statutory right to request adequate security from the payer – eg a charge or bank guarantee – in respect of the payer's payments under the contract. Where no such security is forthcoming, the payee may suspend performance until it is and, moreover, the payer will have to pay the payee an additional sum reflecting the costs which the payee incurs in stopping work.

Under amendment 217A, if a main contractor were to fail his other creditors (quite possibly not construction firms) would be in a weaker position – for instance, depending on the type of security, there could be fewer assets available to satisfy their claims. It would, of course, be open to any trading partner of the contractor to request such security but, unlike the situation which the proposed amendment would bring about, there would be no sanction (suspension of performance) if such a partner were not a construction subcontractor. The ability to in effect demand security would put the construction subcontractor in an unjustifiably stronger position.

Compelling the payer to give security will be expensive for the payer (eg the bank would charge for a guarantee) and, if the nature of any security were such that funds had to be “ring fenced” and could not be used in the working capital of the payer to further its day-to-day operations, it will be more likely that the payer would fail anyway.

We believe there were some other unfortunate consequences with this proposal. In an A to B to C contract chain, B is A's subcontractor but C is B's subcontractor. So while B will benefit from the security provision given by A, he will lose out because of the security provision he will have to give to C. That all seems a bit self-defeating. The customer will have to foot the bill for all this security and the various guarantees and insurances between supply chain members do not add direct value to the asset, the building which he or she is actually buying.

I think people would struggle to follow the logic or see the justice in introducing provisions in insolvency law which had the effect that construction firms would receive preferential treatment over and above unsecured creditors from other industries. It is very simply and very fairly the position in UK law that all unsecured creditors are treated equally. We should not therefore be seeking to introduce measures which put the construction industry on a better footing – in particular, through a piece of legislation looking specifically at a single sector of the industry.

Notwithstanding our policy objections above, people have spoken of examples from overseas – the Miller Act in the United States for instance. The Miller Act was introduced in 1935. From what has been said, we believe that it does not have general application but is limited to federal construction projects (and to some states through mini-Miller Acts). Further, we are led to believe that the Miller Act only applies to firms in the first two tiers of construction supply chains – presumably the restriction is there to keep the cost down – so it is partial in both scope and coverage. As the Specialist Engineering Contractors Group have acknowledged, despite this there is an issue for some about the costs of such a measure.

Given all of the above, we do not believe a statutory requirement for construction firms to provide a “payment guarantee” is an appropriate solution for the UK.

The Statutory adjudication procedure

Lord Brett mentioned that the Construction Umbrella Bodies Adjudication Task Group was meeting in March to identify a consensus on how to take forward the amendment of the statutory adjudication procedure which is contained in SI 1998 No 649 The Scheme for Construction Contracts (England and Wales) Regulations 1998 and SI 1998 No 687 The Scheme for Construction Contract (Scotland) Regulations 1998 ("the Scheme"). That meeting has now taken place. The Scheme is imported into construction contracts only when the parties have failed to include in their contract one or more of various key provisions regarding adjudication – the Scheme does not otherwise apply.

The Scheme will need to be amended as a result of the changes we are making to the primary legislation and the question put to the Adjudication Task Group was whether it wanted this to be an exercise limited to making consequential amendments or whether we should be more ambitious. The Task Group formed a clear view that the exercise should be a more ambitious one. It is keen that the statutory scheme is amended to ensure it incorporates the best practice common to the various industry schemes which have been created over the years that the 1996 Act has been in operation. The Task Group is starting work to identify these common threads and there will be a further meeting in April. Ensuring the Scheme reflects the common view of current best practice should remove the need for many of the industry schemes.

I believe that I have now written on all areas that I committed to in Committee. However, please feel free to contact my office if you have further issues that you would like clarified.

I am copying this letter to all interested Peers that have participated in the Bill and a copy will be placed in the Library of the House.



BARONESS ANDREW