



Bar Council response to the DBT consultation on the 'Invest 2035: The UK's Modern Industrial Strategy' green paper

About the Bar Council

The Bar Council is the voice of the barrister profession in England and Wales. Our nearly 18,000 members – self-employed and employed barristers – make up a united Bar that is strong, inclusive, independent and influential.

We lead, represent and support the Bar in the public interest, championing the rule of law and access to justice by:

- Providing advice, guidance, services, training and events for our members
- Inspiring and supporting the next generation of barristers
- Drawing on our members' expertise to influence policy and legislation that relates to the justice system and the rule of law
- Promoting the Bar of England and Wales to develop career and business opportunities for barristers at home and abroad

As the General Council of the Bar, we're the approved regulator for all practising barristers in England and Wales. We delegate our statutory regulatory functions to the operationally independent Bar Standards Board (BSB) as required by the Legal Services Act 2007.

Response to the Department for Business and Trade green paper consultation: [Invest 2035: the UK's modern industrial strategy](#)

Sector Methodology

Questions 1-3 are not applicable to the Bar Council.

Sectors

Q4. What are the most important subsectors and technologies that the UK government should focus on and why?

Legal services is a vital subsector which both supports and enables virtually every sector of the UK economy.



Legal services contribute significant sums to the British economy (£37bn in 2023, posting a trade surplus of £7.6bn) and allow an array of other sectors to flourish, from financial services to pharmaceuticals to retail to tech.

The UK accounts for around 10% of the global market for legal services, second only to the US. It is also the largest market in Europe, accounting for around a fifth of Europe's legal services fee revenue.

English and Welsh law and the legal sector is a key part of what makes the UK an attractive place to do business, both domestically and internationally. It enables a vast amount of economic activity to happen both in the UK and around the world.

Around 368,000 people are employed in legal services in the UK, with almost two thirds of those people based outside London. It is a sector which enables other sectors to grow nationwide and ought to be a subsector of focus for government.

Leading centres of legal services sector employment include London (133,000), Manchester (13,000), Birmingham (12,000), Bristol (10,000), Leeds (9,000), Liverpool (7,000), Cardiff (4,500), Nottingham (4,500), Sheffield (4,000), Newcastle (4,000) and Exeter (2,000).

The nearly 18,000 strong English and Welsh Bar plays a vital role within our legal services sector. Across the world, the Bar of England and Wales has a strong, respected reputation for excellence, integrity and high standards. There are roughly 2,000 King's Counsel (or KCs) among this group, a kite-mark for British legal excellence and probably the group of lawyers most respected around the world and act in some of the most important cases. For example, in the recent case of *South Africa v Israel* before the International Court of Justice, both sides were represented by barristers from England and Wales.

The English and Welsh Bar is often the first choice for citizens and businesses both domestically and across the world on a broad range of issues from international commercial contracts to environmental harm to intellectual property to arrest and detention. This is because the Bar has an outstanding international reputation in dispute resolution and specialist advice.

The quality of our legal services coupled with the pre-eminent reputation of the law of England and Wales, the independence of our judiciary and the rule of law is what makes our jurisdiction so attractive – and has done for decades.



But we cannot rest on our laurels. Recent years have seen the rise of competing international dispute resolution centres which are taking active steps to promote themselves as suitable jurisdictions for the resolution of cross-border disputes.

The government should prioritise the promotion of England and Wales as the law and jurisdiction of choice for international contracts and disputes as part of an integrated trade strategy in order to safeguard the jurisdiction's hard fought global position. It should also seek to encourage and support the legal services sector and justice system domestically, across all areas of practice, as net contributors to the UK economy.

Q5. What are the UK's strengths and capabilities in these sub sectors?

Legal services are the foundation for economic growth. The UK's legal services sector has broad and deep strength, with many of the world's leading lawyers based in this jurisdiction.

International business is attracted by predictable legal frameworks, respect for the rule of law and our excellent judges and advocates. The confidence of many sectors (not least financial services) is based on a strong and properly functioning legal system. To maintain this trust and confidence, the system requires adequate recognition by government.

The revenue generated by legal activity grew by around 60% over the last decade to £43.7bn in 2022 meaning that the legal services sector makes a significant contribution to the UK economy.

The CityUK calculates that the total tax contribution to UK public finances of legal and accounting activities in 2023 was £30.9bn, up from £20.5bn in 2020.

The tax generated by the work of those within the legal services sector more than subsidises the entire cost of provision of the justice system by the state. We are not aware of any other area of public services where the sector more than pays its own way. This should be recognised by government.

The export premium the legal market provides is founded upon the English and Welsh courts system (as well as those of Scotland and Northern Ireland but we represent only the English and Welsh Bar). To capitalise on the growth potential as the second largest legal market in the world – and to provide a domestic justice system that protects the public – adequate recognition and funding is needed to



maintain the internationally renowned reputation of English and Welsh law, judges, courts and legal professionals.

Research commissioned by LegalUK in 2021 examined English and Welsh law's role as a national asset and its wider commercial importance. It found that English law supports the creation of economic value and is also a critical platform on which other economic activity rests. As the global standard for internationally mobile transactions, English and Welsh law was estimated to have governed around £250bn of global mergers & acquisitions and 40% of global corporate arbitrations in 2019, as well as £80bn of insurance contracts annually.

The strength and capabilities of the legal sector lie in its breadth and depth of expertise. The sector uses that expertise to enable other sectors to grow, but it does also require a focus of its own from government.

Q6. What are the key enablers and barriers to growth in these sub sectors and how could the UK government address them?

The UK's legal services sector leading position globally must be protected. In order to protect and grow that position the government should:

- Restore adequate resources to the domestic justice system to promote growth and protect the public. The domestic courts are the show case to the world for our legal services. They house the judges that are world renowned for excellence and development of the law. International clients use the courts and domestic legal services for resolving their disputes, or matters ancillary to UK seated international arbitration or other dispute resolution. They also use the domestic system for their property, criminal, family and other matters associated with working in the UK.
- Increase funding for the justice system in line with the expenditure required of it and in line with overall economic growth, in order to support broader growth. In 2022/23 for justice spending to have been constant in real per person terms, an additional £2bn would have been needed to be spent – an additional 0.17% of total government spending. For justice to have kept pace with the economy, an additional £3.5bn would have needed to be spent – an additional 0.3% of total government spending. We recognise that the overall settlement for justice in October's Budget was a step in the right direction but there is still a long way to go to reverse years of underfunding.



- Provide adequate funding for the repair and improvement of the much neglected court infrastructure, as part of its mission to deliver modern public services. We endorse the need for capital spend of £1bn identified by HM Courts and Tribunal Service.
- Develop a longer-term infrastructure plan to rebuild a court estate which can function efficiently – akin to the approach taken with prison building. Committing to a long-term rebuilding of the court estate will help our justice system to function smoothly. It will also allow courts to regain their place as a respected national asset, as well as one which attracts international respect. If individuals and businesses cannot access justice quickly, efficiently and safely, they will lose confidence in the system and ultimately the rule of law. Certainly, faith in the UK as a jurisdiction of choice for those multi-nationals that have freedom to choose will be hit. Rebuilding the court estate would help to promote growth and protect the public.
- Recognise the economic and social value of providing early legal advice. There should be a focus on supporting the early legal advice sector to restore access to justice and realise savings and efficiencies across departments including health, work and pensions, and the Home Office. Providing free specialist legal advice is an area where the government should ‘spend to save’ and could save the government £4.5bn for every half a million people who receive it.
- Continue to agree trade deals as an enabler to growth in the UK legal sector – both opening up legal markets overseas and addressing the barriers we reference in our response to question 24.
- Continue to commit to the rule of law as an enabler of growth in the UK. We welcome the Attorney General’s stated commitment to the rule of law and its connection to economic growth, as set out in his Bingham Lecture on the rule of law in October 2024: *The story that we must tell is how the rule of law matters for growth, jobs and people’s livelihoods – how it impacts upon the pound in their pocket and on the type of future their children deserve to enjoy. Governments that undermine, or take a ‘pick and mix’ approach to these values, disincentivise investment. Today, we have hosted the Investment Summit with a clear message that Britain is open for business. Britain has many commercial advantages, but one of our greatest is the trust that businesses can have in our courts, and the confidence they*



can have in a stable and transparent business environment, underpinned by a strong rule of law.

Business Environment

Q7 is not applicable to the Bar Council

Business Environment – People and Skills

Q8-9 are not applicable to the Bar Council

Business Environment – Innovation

Q10-11 are not applicable to the Bar Council

Business Environment - Data

Q12-13 are not applicable to the Bar Council

Business Environment - Infrastructure

Q14 is not applicable to the Bar Council

Q15. How can investment into infrastructure support the Industrial Strategy? What can the UK government do to better support this and facilitate co- investment? How does this differ across infrastructure classes?

In our response to question 6 we outlined the need for investment in the infrastructure of the justice system – both the courts and those who work in the legal sector.

In particular, the government can better support the justice system through investment in the publicly funded Bar – through criminal, civil and family legal aid.

On co-investment, we urge the government to participate in a system of co-investment into Criminal Bar pupillages, through a matched funding scheme.

The number of barristers coming into the profession who undertake criminal legal aid work needs to stabilise and then increase accordingly, in line with demand and to bring down the Crown Court backlogs. There are currently comparatively low fees for this work meaning that criminal barristers drift away from work in crime through the early and middle stages of their career. Bar Council data shows that the total number of pupillages (barrister traineeships) completed over all areas of work has remained at around 500 for the last seven years. After the first year of practice,



less than 30% of barristers are obtaining 50% or more of their income from criminal work.

The numbers are inadequate to meet current and future anticipated needs in the Criminal Justice System.

Adding 50% more pupillages in publicly funded crime over the next five years will present a cohort of barristers able to administer the increased workload and, over time, this will reduce the rate of abortive trials. It is consistent with the government's stated mission to halve serious violent crime, tackle violence against women and girls, and raise confidence in the criminal justice system by more consistently allowing for the trial of these crimes on the first occasion.

The Bar Council, backed by the entire profession, proposes a scheme whereby the government shares the cost of funding 100 additional pupillages every year, to add to those funded by the profession through an already established independently monitored scheme paid for by the profession, administered at arms-length by the Council of the Inns of Court and headed by a serving High Court Judge.

This is thought to cost around just £1.5m a year. Subsidy of training in professions in particular need in the public sector is well established, for example science teachers and nurses.

It would help provide a long-term pipeline of criminal barristers who would help keep the system moving and assist in clearing the Crown Court backlog. The wasted costs saved from abortive trials would more than pay for the match funding sought.

Urgent effort is required to rebuild the Criminal Justice System, which is a central part of the overall ecosystem of our justice system.

Business Environment - Energy

Q16-17 are not applicable to the Bar Council

Business Environment - Competition

Q18 is not applicable to the Bar Council

Q19. How can regulatory and competition institutions best drive market dynamism to boost economic activity and growth?



It is important that regulations governing practising barristers are targeted only where necessary, clear and easy to understand. Otherwise, barristers who wish to practise in new and novel ways, for example through regulated entities, through using online clerking services or by working through agencies, can struggle to find the rules that determine the feasibility of such practice.

A practical way that the current regulatory regime could be improved would be reviewing the Bar Standards Board (BSB) Handbook, which contains the Bar's practice rules. We are of the view that the BSB Handbook is not well set out. Barristers can struggle to navigate it and to find answers to their questions. This may have a chilling effect on innovative practice. The BSB could simplify and improve the layout of the Handbook and the information on its website about different manners of practising.

The Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) undertook a market study into the legal services sector in 2016. It listened to representations from the Bar and other legal professionals and was fairly measured in its recommendations, although its recommendations around publishing fee scales and encouraging online reviews of barristers were felt to misunderstand how the Bar works. This ensured that the resultant transparency rules struck the right balance between improving the amount and quality of information available to consumers of legal services whilst also not overburdening barristers and their chambers with further regulation.

In another initiative this year, the CMA investigated the provision of unreserved legal services. To address consumer detriment, it has reminded providers of their consumer law obligations. Making use of the existing legislative framework in this way is a proportionate intervention.

Otherwise, we are of the view that the independent regulators, in our case the Bar Standards Board and the Legal Services Board, should do what is necessary to limit their activities to true conduct breaches. In particular, there should be less, not more, 'before the event' regulation. Concentrated efforts should instead be made on enforcement of existing conduct rules and exemplary action against the true bad apples. The proper role of a regulator is to make examples of bad actors.

Light regulation works. International arbitration has flourished in the UK, and it is probably the world's leading hub for international arbitration. It is subject only to ultimate supervision by the High Court, but the Arbitration Act 1996 (rightly being



modestly amended) and related rules of Court provide for only limited intervention by the Court. Strikingly, parties commonly contract out of the limited basis for appeal from arbitration awards by adopting institutional rules to govern their arbitration. They do that to avoid unwelcome Court intervention in arbitral decision-making. Overseas jurisdictions that adopt a more interventionist approach (whether to appeals or more generally) are losing business. This is proof that light regulation and minimal interference is best for encouraging growth in legal services. The same approach should be applied more broadly in the legal services sector, with the adequate, existing protection for consumers.

Business Environment - Regulation

Q20. Do you have suggestions on where regulation can be reformed or introduced to encourage growth and innovation, including addressing any barriers you identified in Question 7?

Our comments are about the approach to regulation rather than specific regulatory barriers.

Our experience is that our regulators tend towards somewhat excessive regulatory activity which hampers, rather than helps, growth, considerations of consumers and businesses within the sector.

The Approved Regulator for barristers is the General Council of the Bar. The General Council of the Bar, as required by the Legal Services Act 2007 (the Act), delegates its regulatory functions to the functionally independent BSB. The BSB is the front-line regulator for the Bar. The Act also created the Legal Services Board (LSB). The LSB's principal role is the oversight of the Approved Regulators. Thus, the legal sector has two tiers of regulation, both the frontline regulators and the oversight regulator, the LSB.

The overall purpose and objectives of both the BSB and LSB, as set out in the Act, are defined and are clear to us. However, the statutory limits as well as the defined purposes of the LSB are not always respected by the LSB itself. Over time, we consider that the LSB has moved beyond its intended function with some of its initiatives straying beyond its remit. For example, it issued a statutory policy statement on ongoing competency when (contrary to the Better Regulation Principles) there was little or no evidence of any problem.



Also, the LSB has spent funds it raises from the regulated sector on developing a strategy for the whole of the legal services sector. However, it has no role as a sector or market regulator. These matters are for Government and Parliament, not the LSB.

There are also many topical legal issues which are contentious and difficult – such as the use of Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation (SLAPPs) and the use of Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs). They are contentious topics but there is little, if any, evidence that they can be addressed by the regulation of barristers as opposed to being areas for legislative reform.

The same point may be made in respect of the BSB. It has recently consulted on a suggested amendment to the Equality Rules including a change to one of the core provisions of the Code of Conduct. However, it has not demonstrated either that the existing regulatory framework is itself the reason for deficiencies in equalities matters (which are narrowing) nor that the radical changes proposed, which will inevitably take all barristers days of time to comply with which are taken away from otherwise fee-earning time, would have a positive impact. There is indeed no evidence, or model pointed to, that the significant regulatory change proposed by the BSB will achieve the ends set out.

It is important to keep the activities of regulators within proper bounds because if regulators overreach their proper role it can lead to unnecessary burdens on regulated professionals. This can result in reduced productivity because the regulated professionals are engaged in unnecessary compliance activity. It can also result in increased costs, which are ultimately passed on to consumers.

In another example, the BSB conducted an investigation into sanctions compliance in commercial sets of chambers. Prior to the investigation there was no evidence that barristers' chambers were flouting sanctions rules. Following a heavy-handed investigation (in relation to which the Bar Council received a number of complaints from chambers) the BSB reported no examples of sanctions breaches amongst barristers. A significant amount of chambers resource was taken up responding to the regulator's requests.

Our experiences underline that regulatory action in the legal sector should abide by the statutory framework. It must be evidence based, proportionate and only targeted where needed.

Business Environment – Crowding in Investment



Q21 is not applicable to the Bar Council

Business Environment – Mobilising Capital

Q22-23 are not applicable to the Bar Council

Business Environment – Trade and International Partnerships

Q24. How can international partnerships (government-to-government or government-to-business) support the Industrial Strategy?

International partnerships are essential to underpin and support the industrial strategy. They are necessary both to help facilitate the removal of barriers that hinder economic growth and to facilitate entry into new markets.

For legal services, entry into markets can be facilitated through international partnerships that come about through Government-led overseas trade missions. For such visits to be effective, they need to be properly targeted to legal services, to ensure that those who participate are able to make meaningful contacts that can facilitate the development of business connections. Our experience is also that joint work with government and representative bodies is particularly effective in relation to legal services market entry and expansion. For example, last year there was a particularly effective mission to Delhi with the then Lord Chancellor, President of the Law Society and Vice-Chair of the Bar Council, which has reaped rewards. Close working is important and effective.

We note from the consultation paper that the intention is for the UK's overseas trade and diplomatic network to proactively support international business to invest in the UK, and UK companies to export and find new markets. We would welcome this.

Our experience is that there is currently unevenness and inconsistency in the levels of support across different markets. We recommend that DBT work with FCDO staff at Post to increase the level and depth of support staff based in embassies and High Commissions can provide to UK businesses. The Bar Council has previously provided training to FCDO personnel on the rule of law, which also fostered better understanding of the Bar of England and Wales. Whilst this received positive feedback, it was discontinued because of a lack of government funding.

We also suggest that DBT coordinate with the FCDO on its economic diplomacy review to address this in support of the industrial strategy. There is a need to remove silos and barriers which exist between government departments with an



interest in this work. Without doing so it will continue to be difficult for business to understand the government's priorities and ways of working, and to engage with those priorities and work.

International partnerships are also vital to facilitate the removal of market barriers that hinder growth. We urge DBT to address this in the strategy. For the Bar, this can include facilitating fly-in and fly-out opportunities for legal advisory work and arbitration in addition to increasing the potential presence or visibility of barristers (improving reciprocal rights of qualification).

International partnerships can also help to facilitate the recognition of professional qualification mutual recognition agreements which would help to reduce barriers to doing business overseas.

They are also vital to help ease restrictions on global mobility/visa systems. The Bar Council's [report](#) on the short-term business travel needs of the Bar of England and Wales makes a number of recommendations setting out our ideal arrangements for outbound travel (covering business visitor rules and Mode 4-style/independent professional [IP] travel routes) and inbound travel (covering business visitor/permitted paid engagement [PPE] rules and IP routes). We would like to see our recommendations on both outbound and inbound travel being implemented.

The Bar has an excellent reputation globally and has developed successful international partnerships over many years. As lawyers in independent practice, barristers can offer their services at competitive rates and be instructed on a flexible basis as and when their services are required. The Bar of England and Wales is an outward looking profession with an international reputation for excellence. Its services are increasingly in demand throughout the globalised legal market.

Q25. Which international markets do you see as the greatest opportunity for the growth-driving sectors and how does it differ by sector?

The Bar Council carries out research to explore the number of international instructions received by barristers, the proportion from clients based inside and outside the UK, and the main jurisdictions these instructions have come from. We also survey the profession about which jurisdictions barristers believe are most likely to generate future instructions. This helps provide an evidence base to assess future opportunities.



Table 1 shows both the jurisdictions from where international instructions are currently received and, looking to the future, which jurisdictions barristers think might be potential growth areas.

Table 1: Current and future jurisdictions for international instructions

	Current instructions	Future instructions
Africa (not South Africa)	5%	4%
Australia/New Zealand	5%	2%
BVI	7%	9%
Canada	1%	1%
Caribbean	10%	7%
Cayman Islands	7%	9%
Channel Islands (& IoM)	18%	15%
China	4%	6%
Commonwealth/British Overseas Territories	4%	6%
Europe EU (not Ireland)	30%	26%
Europe (non-EU)	5%	5%
Europe (non-specific)	10%	7%
Hong Kong, Korea, Far East	8%	7%
India	4%	4%
Ireland	5%	4%
Japan	1%	1%
Middle East/Gulf States/Israel	27%	30%
Other South Asia	3%	5%
Russia	2%	2%
Singapore/Malaysia	7%	7%
South America/Latin America	2%	0%
US	26%	23%
UK (GB and NI)	41%	37%
<i>Base N=number of cases</i>	642	460

Source: IES/Bar Council: Barristers' Working Lives Survey, 2023

Half of respondents who indicated that they received international instructions said that they get them from Europe but this figure reduces to 42% when respondents look to future instructions. There is also a small forecast reduction in international instructions originating from the UK from 43% today to 37% in the future.



The next most significant jurisdictions for the Bar are the Middle East (27%) and the US (26%). These are both very established markets for the Bar but they are markets which require ongoing engagement and business development efforts. Respondents expect to receive more instructions from the Middle East in future than is the case today (30%). To enable some analysis of differences in this work between key demographic and employment related variables the following analyses grouped the jurisdictions into key geographical areas.

Table 2 groups the main jurisdictions. The main change between the current position and what barristers forecast for future jurisdictions is a reduction in European instructions. There is little change in the distribution across other jurisdictions.

Table 2: Current and future jurisdictions for international instructions

Jurisdiction...	Current % cases	Responses	Future % cases	Responses
UK (GB and NI)	41%	262	38%	172
Europe (inc. Ireland, CI,EU and non-EU)	69%	440	57%	256
Caribbean/Cayman/BVI	24%	156	26%	116
Middle East	27%	173	31%	139
Asia (inc. South Asia, Far East, China, Russia)	29%	185	27%	122
America (North and South inc. Canada)	29%	184	25%	112
Africa/Other	7%	47	8%	35
<i>Total cases</i>		642		460
		1447		952

Source: IES/Bar Council: Barristers' Working Lives Survey, 2023

Although international work is at present predominantly undertaken by barristers working in commercial and international areas of practice and to a lesser extent civil, across all areas of practice there is some international work undertaken.



We are constantly looking for broader international opportunities for the Bar. In November 2024 we took a delegation of family barristers to the United Arab Emirates to explore opportunities for family barristers in that jurisdiction (we also had a delegation of commercial arbitration barristers on the visit). In December 2024 we will visit Kenya with a group of family barristers with the same aim of developing links with Kenyan lawyers who we hope will ultimately instruct members of our Bar.

Relatedly, in our international strategy, which sets the direction for our international work we have identified the following jurisdictions as priorities for further work: United Arab Emirates; Cyprus; Eastern Europe (Poland, Czechia, Ukraine); East and West Africa (Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, Uganda); India & SE Asia: (Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Philippines, Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand); Central Asia (Uzbekistan); Caribbean: Overseas Territories.

Place

Q26. Do you agree with this characterisation of clusters? Are there any additional characteristics of dimensions of cluster definition and strength we should consider, such as the difference between services clusters and manufacturing clusters?

We agree that harnessing expertise and experience through clusters may present a good opportunity to drive growth through forging links between different sectors and subsectors. As part of this ongoing work, the strategy should define what is meant by a cluster since it has various potential definitions, whether in relation to sectors, industries or geography.

The legal sector is incredibly well placed to help other sectors to grow, whether locally through clusters as suggested in the strategy paper or further afield.

One of the many advantages of our legal sector is its flexibility and ability to advise clients irrespective of their location.

However, we recognise the importance of fostering local dialogue and unleashing what the strategy paper describes as 'enormous untapped potential' outside London. The Bar is well placed to assist with enabling the awakening and growth of that potential throughout the country, and indeed is well used to working through strong local partnerships, particularly through the geographical Circuits (see question 28).



Q27 is not applicable to the Bar Council

Q28. How should the Industrial Strategy accelerate growth in city regions and clusters of growth sectors across the UK through Local Growth Plans and other policy mechanisms?

The legal sector, and the Bar itself, is established and thriving across the UK. The English and Welsh Bar has a strong presence in every region of the jurisdiction and is well placed to contribute towards local growth, whether that is focused on growing the legal sector itself or contributing to the growth of other sectors and industries.

The Industrial Strategy should seek to bring together sector and industry leaders locally, as well as offering an opportunity to build networks nationally. Sharing information and experience across sectors and partners should help to build better links between sectors and industries, and ultimately encourage growth.

The Bar is split into 6 geographical areas known as Circuits and is very well positioned to harness the expertise of the Bar locally for the benefit of other sectors. Each Circuit is headed by a Circuit Leader, a senior and experienced barrister with strong local links and relationships. The Circuits and the Bar Council work in partnership to ensure that the Bar is achieving its full potential, including seeking to grow the strength of the Bar nationally.

The largest towns and cities in England and Wales have active local Bars, comprised of dedicated and expert barristers, including senior Kings Counsel and barristers who are leaders in their fields – across all areas of practice. As mainly self-employed practitioners, opportunities for barristers to meet with leaders from other sectors and industries and to build business links would be a welcome outcome of the Industrial Strategy.

Q29 is not applicable to the Bar Council

Partnerships and Institutions

Q30 is not applicable to the Bar Council

Q31. How should the Industrial Strategy Council interact with key non-government institutions and organisations?

We would welcome the opportunity to contribute to the work of the Industrial Strategy Council (ISC) whether through regular stakeholder briefings, roundtables



The Bar Council

or other effective mechanisms. We note that that the ISC will be responsible for informing and monitoring both the development and delivery of the industrial strategy over the long term, ensuring that policy interventions are informed by a broad and high-quality evidence base. It is important for the ISC to have regular and continued dialogue with key non-governmental institutions and organisations to ensure that the recommendations it develops take into account the views and evidence put forward by relevant stakeholders.

Q32 is not applicable to the Bar Council

Theory of Change

Q33-35 are not applicable to the Bar Council

Additional Information

No further information.

November 2024

www.barcouncil.org.uk