



# **Strengthening our continuing competence approach: initial Regulatory and Equality and Diversity Impact Assessments**

---

April 2026

## Contents

Summary.....	3
Our consultation proposals .....	4
What is the problem and what do we want to achieve .....	5
The problem we want to solve .....	5
What we want to achieve .....	6
Evidence to support our proposal to require solicitors to participate annually in mandatory ethics discussions .....	7
Stakeholder engagement.....	8
Regulatory and Equality and Diversity Impact Assessments.....	9
Regulatory Impact Assessment .....	9
Assessment of the potential impact of our proposals on the holders of specific protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 .....	10
Requiring solicitors to record their learning and development needs and how they identified and addressed these .....	10
Requiring solicitors to participate in mandatory ethics discussions.....	10
How we have addressed potential negative impacts we have identified in developing our consultation proposals .....	11
Possible additional costs or resources needed by some solicitors and firms to comply with our proposals.....	11
Concerns that some firms will need to begin delivering ethics learning and development or adopt existing approaches to meet our requirements .....	12
Barriers to participation in a mandatory ethics discussion for those with verbal or auditory processing disabilities.....	12
Potential time impact on solicitors who act as facilitators in preparing for sessions .....	12
Requiring some or all solicitors to complete specific learning and development where we identify a competence concern or concern in how competence is maintained. ....	13
Impact of our proposals on our regulatory objectives .....	14
Impact of our proposals on innovation and economic growth.....	17
Option analysis.....	18
Impact on how we operate.....	20
Impact on other legal services regulators.....	21
Monitoring and evaluation .....	22

# Summary

---

This is our initial Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) and Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment (EIA) to support our work strengthening our continuing competence requirements. We have also considered our proposals in light of the Better Regulation Principles. You should read this document in conjunction with our [consultation](#).

Here we assess the potential impacts of our proposed regulatory changes to give us greater assurances that solicitors are maintaining their competence and keeping their understanding of their legal, ethical and regulatory obligations up to date. The proposals respond to evidence of shortcomings in how some solicitors currently maintain their competence and wider concerns about the [ethical behaviour of lawyers](#).

We have not identified any significant or disproportionate negative regulatory or equality and diversity impacts. Based on our analysis, we believe our proposals are a proportionate and legitimate regulatory response to address shortcomings we have identified.

Our proposals aim to protect consumers and maintain public confidence in the legal profession. We do this by providing stronger assurance that all solicitors are keeping their knowledge and skills up to date including their legal, ethical and regulatory obligations. At the same time, our proposals allow solicitors and their employers flexibility to decide how they meet these requirements.

We will publish an updated RIA and EIA when we publish our consultation response later this year.

# Our consultation proposals

---

Our consultation proposals include:

- Requiring solicitors, registered European lawyers, registered foreign lawyers or registered Swiss lawyers to:
  - record their learning and development needs and how they identified and addressed these having considered all aspects of their role and work
  - and if no learning and development needs were identified after appropriate consideration, the reason or reasons why the solicitor reached this conclusion.
- Requiring solicitors, registered European lawyers, registered foreign lawyers or registered Swiss lawyers to participate annually in mandatory ethics discussions. Solicitors and registered lawyers are bound by their ethical duties, wherever and however they practise. They will encounter ethical dilemmas and novel scenarios through which they must work. We believe that engaging in such discussions with other solicitors about how to approach ethical dilemmas and unfamiliar scenarios will help them decide on the right course of action when approaching such situations in practice.
- Making a rule so that we can require some or all solicitors to complete specific learning and development where we identify a competence concern or concern in how competence is maintained. We also propose to make a rule to require non-authorised persons within an SRA regulated organisation to complete specific learning and development we specify where we identify a competence concern. This builds on an existing [obligation](#) for SRA regulated organisations to make sure their managers and staff remain competent.

We describe these proposals in detail in our consultation. We also seek comments on how we can improve our [continuing competence resources](#).

# What is the problem and what do we want to achieve

---

## The problem we want to solve

Each solicitor is responsible for keeping their knowledge, skills and understanding of legal, ethical and regulatory obligations up to date. What they need to know, and the skills they require, change as their role, the law, legal practice and the legal market evolve. We do not currently prescribe specific learning activities that a solicitor must complete or require them to keep evidence of the learning and development undertaken.

We regularly review if and how solicitors are meeting their requirement to maintain their competence and whether our regulation continues to drive the learning behaviours we expect to see. Our ongoing monitoring programme includes:

- Analysing reports made to us to identify competence concerns or competence issues in specific practice areas. Since 2019, we have analysed more than 83,000 reports. We publish findings in our [annual assessment of competence](#).
- Conducting thematic reviews and inspections where we have competence concerns about an area of practice or a type of practice setting. Since 2023, we have carried out reviews and inspections in residential conveyancing, probate, immigration, family law and landlord and tenant law.
- Reviewing training records to understand if and how solicitors have completed learning and development. Since 2023, we have reviewed more than 1,000 individual records in the above practice areas.
- Delivering a rolling programme of inspections to check on the extent to which SRA-regulated firms are complying with anti-money laundering regulations. We carry out around 350 inspections every year.
- Carrying out specific checks on training and supervision arrangements in SRA-regulated firms to understand the steps they take to assure themselves that the solicitors they employ are maintaining their competence.
- Monitoring developments and emerging competence risks through market monitoring.
- Regularly engaging with solicitors to understand the challenges they face maintaining their competence.

Our work suggests that most solicitors take steps to keep their knowledge, skills and their understanding of their legal, ethical and regulatory obligations up to date.

However, we have consistently identified shortcomings in how some solicitors meet their obligations. These include:

### **A failure to demonstrate the learning and development they undertook was a result of meaningful consideration of all aspects of their work and practice**

We make clear in our continuing competence resources that we expect all solicitors to regularly consider the quality of their practice, in every aspect of their role, to identify all learning and development needs.

Some solicitors do this. They evidence and explain, often in a training record, how they identified their learning needs and record how they were addressed.

However, most training records we reviewed through our monitoring simply listed completed learning and development activities without explaining why they were needed or how they were identified. Large proportions of solicitors in the practice areas we reviewed (65 per cent in landlord and tenant; 47 per cent in probate) provided no rationale for their activities.

A small number of solicitors could not show any evidence of keeping their knowledge or skills up to date.

As a result, we have insufficient assurance that all solicitors are fully reviewing their role and their practice to identify all relevant learning and development needs and keeping their knowledge and skills up to date.

### **Focussing learning and development exclusively on maintaining their technical legal knowledge rather than other areas of their practice that may be required to maintain their competence**

Our evidence suggests that many solicitors focus their learning and development on maintaining their technical legal knowledge, with little attention to the broader skills required in a solicitor's role, including keeping their understanding of their legal, ethical and regulatory obligations up to date. For example, in our family law training record review, over 70 per cent of solicitors in the sample had not documented that they had completed any ethics focussed learning or development during the review period.

Our analysis of misconduct reports made to us between 2019 and 2025 showed 52 per cent of the 83,000 reports we received related to ethics, professionalism and judgment (section A of the Statement of Solicitor Competence). Reports relating to this section of the statement were more likely to result in an investigation.

We also know that some solicitors lack awareness of our warning notices and guidance. Understanding of warning notices and guidance helps a solicitor maintain their competence.

## **What we want to achieve**

Our proposals, if implemented, will:

- provide us with greater assurance that solicitors are maintaining their competence and keeping their legal, ethical, and regulatory obligations up to date
- support a culture in which solicitors are encouraged to think and talk about ethical issues, are confident making ethical decisions and can deal comfortably with unfamiliar or ethical scenarios
- enable us to take targeted and proportionate action to address competence concerns or concerns in how competence is maintained
- provide the public with greater confidence that solicitors are maintaining their competence and keeping understanding of their legal, ethical, and regulatory obligations up to date
- continue to give solicitors and their employers flexibility to determine how they comply with our requirements
- give solicitors greater clarity on how they can meet their obligations to maintain competence.

# Evidence to support our proposal to require solicitors to participate annually in mandatory ethics discussions

---

Facilitated group discussion is a form of learning that is used in other sectors and other countries. It builds on [Lave and Wenger's](#) concept of community of practice which emphasises that learning is fundamentally a social process.

Various academic studies also promote the benefits of this type of learning:

- One [academic study](#) suggests that 'the discussion method of teaching professional responsibility may encourage 'more reflective moral reasoning.'
- [Another study](#) suggests that the 'problem method' of sharing a hypothetical scenario for discussion is beneficial in the teaching of legal ethics.
- A [study in Finland](#) of health and social care students reported that 'Findings suggest that online dilemma discussions can advance students' moral reasoning development. This is especially when students' exposure to higher-level arguments is ensured through complementary means, such as instructions, examples and plenary discussions.'
- A [study](#) of medical students in Turkey found that team-based learning (versus lectures) resulted in improved long-term retention of ethics knowledge.
- [Research by Skills for Care](#) found that group action learning can lead to improved decision making, increased confidence and a willingness to act in challenging work situations.

Our view is that participation in facilitated group discussions on ethical scenarios is more effective at building ethical competence than simply teaching and testing knowledge of the rules. This approach should help solicitors engage more deeply with ethical principles and improve their ability to make judgments in difficult ethical situations.

Giving solicitors the chance to talk through ethical duties, dilemmas and recent cases with colleagues should also help them understand why professional conduct rules exist. Participation in such discussions should encourage them to think beyond simply applying rules and help build confidence and consistency when making ethical decisions.

Introducing a new requirement to participate in mandatory ethics discussions each year should support higher professional standards and better protect consumers and the public from unethical behaviour.

# Stakeholder engagement

---

We have engaged with stakeholders during our policy thinking. This includes meetings with individual solicitors, small, medium and large firms, in-house solicitors and their employers, the Sole Practitioners Group, the Society of British Bangladeshi Solicitors and the Law Society. We have also engaged with other regulators to understand how they satisfy themselves that the individuals they regulate are competent.

Some solicitors and firms raised concerns about proposals to record learning and development needs and to require solicitors to participate annually in a mandatory ethics discussion.

They suggested compliance could disrupt existing approaches and require new approaches to recording learning and development and delivering ethics training. This feedback has helped shaped our final consultation proposals and we explain how we have addressed these concerns in the design of our proposals.

Some solicitors and firms supported the proposals suggesting they would make our requirements clearer, help maintain competence and support them to keep their understanding of their ethical and professional obligations up to date.

We will use the consultation and ongoing engagement with stakeholders during the consultation to seek views on our initial assessments.

# Regulatory and Equality and Diversity Impact Assessments

---

In this section, we outline our regulatory impact assessment and our assessment of our proposals on people with the characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010. We explain any potential negative impacts we have identified and how we intend to mitigate them.

## Regulatory Impact Assessment

We have identified the following potential positive and negative impacts of our proposals:

Proposal	Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts
Require solicitors to record their learning and development needs and how they identified and addressed these	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater assurance that all solicitors are taking steps to maintain their competence.</li> <li>• Easier for us to assess compliance with our requirements and act if required.</li> <li>• Strengthened public trust in the profession.</li> <li>• Greater clarity for solicitors and firms on how to comply with our continuing competence requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible additional costs and resources for some solicitors and firms to comply with our requirements to record learning and development if they do not currently record this or if changes to existing systems are required.</li> </ul>
Require solicitors to participate annually in mandatory ethics discussions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater assurance that all solicitors are keeping their understanding of their ethical obligations, up to date.</li> <li>• Strengthened public trust in the profession.</li> <li>• Greater clarity for solicitors and firms on how they should keep their understanding of their ethical obligations, up to date.</li> <li>• Contribute to building solicitors' confidence in handling ethical dilemmas and applying principles.</li> <li>• Strengthen some solicitor's confidence to challenge unethical behaviour in the workplace by pointing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible additional costs and resources needed for some solicitors and firms to comply. For example, some firms may need to outsource facilitation.</li> <li>• Possible changes to how ethics learning and development is delivered by firms and employers of solicitors.</li> <li>• Potential time impact on solicitors who act as facilitators in preparing for sessions.</li> </ul>

	to learning from mandatory ethics discussions.	
Making a rule so that we can require some or all solicitors or non-authorized staff to complete specific learning and development where we identify a competence concerns or concern in how competence is maintained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater public confidence that we can take timely targeted action to address competence concerns or concerns in how competence is maintained.</li> <li>• Targeted learning and development to address issues or concerns.</li> </ul>	No impact until the rule is used.

## Assessment of the potential impact of our proposals on the holders of specific protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010

We collect diversity data every two years from the law firms we regulate in England and Wales. We have [published diversity analysis](#) for 2025, and our assessment is based on this.

We have used this data to help us understand if our proposals would put solicitors with a particular protected characteristic at a disadvantage.

While the focus has been on assessing the impact on individuals according to their protected characteristics, we have also considered the impact of our proposals on our wider regulated community, for example small firms and sole practitioners.

[Our data](#) suggests that there is a higher proportion of solicitors from the younger age groups in the larger firms, and vice versa for the older age groups in the smaller firms. Eight per cent of solicitors declared they had a disability. 55 per cent of solicitors are women compared to 43 per cent men. There was a higher proportion of lawyers from a Black, Asian and minority ethnic background working in one-partner firms (42 per cent) than any other firm size.

### **Requiring solicitors to record their learning and development needs and how they identified and addressed these**

We know that some solicitors and their employers may need to begin or make changes to how they currently record their learning and development. This could have a cost and time impact.

All solicitors, irrespective of their protected characteristics, will need to meet this requirement if implemented. Any cost or time impact because of doing so is unlikely to be associated with a particular characteristic group. We do not believe that there is an unequal impact on any characteristic from our initial assessment. We outline in the next section the steps we have taken to minimise any time or cost impact on solicitors in the design of our proposals.

### **Requiring solicitors to participate in mandatory ethics discussions**

All solicitors irrespective of how and where they practise will need to participate in at least three hours of mandatory ethics discussions if we implement this proposal. We do not believe there is an unequal impact on any particular characteristic group.

We recognise that sole practitioners or sole in-house solicitors may not have immediate access to other solicitors with whom to join in a mandatory ethics discussion.

We also recognise each solicitor has their own preferred learning style. Although no data exists on the types of disabilities within the profession, if the disability is related to verbal or auditory processing, our proposal to require solicitors to participate in a mandatory ethics discussion may be more challenging for some solicitors. Neurodivergent individuals might have specific learning needs that a standard facilitated discussion group may not accommodate.

We recognise that some solicitors may return from maternity, parental leave or long-term illness and may not have worked for a full practising year before being required to confirm that they have participated in a mandatory ethics discussion.

Acting ethically is critical to upholding public trust, the rule of law and the administration of justice. Given this, we expect all solicitors to comply with this requirement by participating in at least three hours facilitated ethics discussion.

Our view is that there is sufficient flexibility in how solicitors in different practice settings, with different learning styles and different practice patterns can meet the requirement to participate in a mandatory discussion on ethical duties even if they have not practised for a full year. We explain this in more detail in the next section.

### **Making a rule so that we can require some or all solicitors to complete specific learning and development where we identify a competence concern or concern in how competence is maintained**

We do not believe that there is an unequal or disadvantage on any characteristic group or cohort from our proposals to make a rule to require some or all solicitors to complete learning and development we specify.

### **How we have addressed potential negative impacts we have identified in developing our consultation proposals**

We explain below how we have addressed potential negative impacts we have identified from our assessments and through our engagement.

### **Possible additional costs or resources needed by some solicitors and firms to comply with our proposals**

We have incorporated flexibility into how solicitors and their employers can meet our proposed requirements.

This flexibility includes:

- Not prescribing the specific template, approach or way that a solicitor must meet our proposed requirement to record their learning and development needs and how these were identified and addressed. This will enable solicitors and their employees to build on existing recording systems and approaches they use. For those solicitors and firms that currently do not have any recording systems, there are many free recording tools available. For example, the Law Society offers a free continuing professional development diary. We will also provide a learning and development template that can be used by solicitors, but it is not a requirement to do so.

- Continuing to allow solicitors flexibility in how they maintain their competence subject to a new requirement to participate in mandatory ethics discussions. This enables solicitors and their employers to take advantage of the wide range of activities, often free, that the legal and wider learning and development market offers.
- Giving solicitors and their employers a reasonable period to make any changes to meet our proposed requirements. Subject to the outcome of consultation, we intend to confirm our position in late 2026. We intend to introduce the requirements from the start of the 2027/28 practising year. This provides solicitors and firms with a lead in time to make any changes before our proposals are implemented.
- Encouraging employers to organise mandatory ethics discussions for their own solicitors. We also propose to allow discussions to be organised by, for example, local law societies or other groups for their members. And for them to be held virtually. They could also be run by commercial providers, including Solicitors Qualifying Examination training providers. These options would enable all solicitors including sole practitioners, those working abroad and sole in-house solicitors to meet our proposed requirement.
- Not authorising organisations that produce materials to support delivery of mandatory ethics discussions. We do not want to make the requirements too restrictive or deter firms and other employers from organising their own discussions. To support implementation of this requirement, we will provide materials and case studies for facilitators to use.

### **Concerns that some firms will need to begin delivering ethics learning and development or adopt existing approaches to meet our requirements**

We recognise that some firms are concerned that they will need to introduce or amend their ethics training to meet our requirements. In addition to the flexibility we have incorporated in how facilitated discussions can be delivered, we will mitigate concerns by providing materials to support firms to design and deliver facilitated discussions. For example, we will provide a bank of case studies for discussion.

### **Barriers to participation in a mandatory ethics discussion for those with verbal or auditory processing disabilities**

We have incorporated flexibility in how these groups can be delivered. Groups can be small (a minimum of three) and we propose a maximum of 12 participants. They could be set up to make sure familiar participants are present, or to accommodate other adjustments to ensure that neurodivergent individuals get the most benefit from the sessions.

While we propose to require participation in discussions, due to its overall benefits, we do not propose to prescribe the format of the mandatory ethics discussions. They could involve short presentations or videos but must not consist solely of a lecture, for example. This flexibility can enable sessions to be better tailored to neurodivergent individuals.

### **Potential time impact on solicitors who act as facilitators in preparing for sessions**

We will mitigate this by providing resources to outline our expectations and support facilitators to deliver sessions. We will also provide scenarios for facilitators to support discussions.

**Requiring some or all solicitors to complete specific learning and development where we identify a competence concern or concern in how competence is maintained.**

We will make sure any impact on solicitors is proportionate to the concerns we have identified by:

- Publishing a regulatory and equality impact assessment before deploying requirements under this rule. This would demonstrate how we have considered impacts and identified an appropriate and proportionate approach.
- Publishing a clear, evidence-based rationale for the prescribed learning and development. This would include explaining the concerns raised and how the approach would address it.
- Considering whether the approach should be adopted on a targeted and/or time-limited basis.

# Impact of our proposals on our regulatory objectives

---

We have identified the potential impacts below of our proposals on the regulatory objectives set out in the Legal Services Act 2007.

<p>Legal Services Act s1(1) Regulatory Objective</p>	<p>Potential impact of our proposals on the Regulatory Objectives, having regard to the Better Regulation Principles (Legal Services Act ss 1 and 28)</p>
<p>Protecting and promoting the public interest</p>	<p>Requiring solicitors to maintain evidence of learning and development and a record of their participation in mandatory ethics discussions, are proportionate and transparent measures to strengthen public confidence that solicitors are taking steps to maintain their competence. It also provides assurances that they are keeping their understanding of their legal, ethical and regulatory obligations up to date.</p> <p>At this stage, we have not identified any negative impact of our proposals on this objective.</p>
<p>Supporting the constitutional principle of the rule of law</p>	<p>A requirement that solicitors must participate annually in a mandatory ethics discussion should improve understanding of professional duties and ethical decision-making. This is a proportionate measure that could help reduce misconduct that could undermine the rule of law.</p> <p>Our proposed ability to direct either all or some solicitors or non-authorised staff to complete learning and development might have an impact on the maintenance of the rule of law.</p> <p>At this stage, we have not identified any negative impact of our proposals on this objective.</p>
<p>Improving access to justice</p>	<p>Our proposals strengthen an already existing requirement on solicitors to maintain their competence including their ethical obligations.</p> <p>At this stage, we have not identified any negative impact of our proposals on this objective.</p>

Protecting and promoting the interests of consumers	<p>Consumers of legal services will benefit from greater assurance that solicitors are taking steps to maintain their competence and keeping their understanding of their legal, ethical, and regulatory obligations up to date.</p> <p>At this stage, we have not identified any negative impact of our proposals on this objective.</p>
Promoting competition in the provision of services	We do not think our proposals affect this objective.
Encouraging an independent, strong, diverse and effective legal profession	<p>Our proposals are designed to provide greater assurance that solicitors maintain their competence and keep their understanding of their legal, ethical, and regulatory obligations up to date. This should help increase the effectiveness of the profession.</p> <p>A requirement to participate annually in mandatory ethics discussions should help drive culture in which solicitors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• apply and think beyond the rules of professional conduct,</li> <li>• are confident in making ethical decisions</li> <li>• can deal comfortably with unfamiliar or ethical scenarios.</li> </ul> <p>We recognise that there may be an impact on some neurodivergent individuals who are required to participate in mandatory ethics group discussions. We have outlined in this document how the proposals have been designed to reduce or mitigate any impact.</p>
Increasing public understanding of the citizen's legal rights and duties	At this stage, we have not identified any negative impact of our proposals on this objective.
Promoting and maintaining adherence (by authorised persons) to the professional principles	<p>The proposal to participate annually in mandatory ethics discussions is a proportionate measure to help reinforce understanding and adherence to principles. Such as acting with integrity, maintaining competence and upholding the rule of law.</p> <p>At this stage, we have not identified any negative impact of our proposals on this objective.</p>
Promoting the prevention and detection of economic crime	Our proposals to require solicitors to consider all aspects of their work and practice to identify learning and development needs might drive some to carry out learning and development in this area. Similarly, this is a

	<p>topic that could be discussed as part of the mandatory discussion on ethical duties.</p> <p>If, in the future, we identified concerns around this objective, we could consider using our proposed option to introduce a targeted learning and development requirement.</p> <p>At this stage, we have not identified any negative impact of our proposals on this objective.</p>
--	--

# Impact of our proposals on innovation and economic growth

---

We have not identified any negative impact of our consultation proposals on innovation and growth. We currently allow solicitors flexibility in how they meet their regulatory obligation to maintain their competence. This flexibility would continue under our proposals, subject to a new requirement to participate in mandatory ethics discussions.

Such flexibility allows solicitors to determine how they meet their learning and development needs. And enables them to complete activities that best align with their learning style and to access learning and development offered by their employer. It also enables solicitors and firms to take advantage of the wide range of activities, often free, and innovative, that the legal and wider learning and development market offers.

# Option analysis

---

We considered several options in developing our consultation proposals. We set out our analysis on the options on which we chose not to consult.

Option	Positives	Negatives
<p>Do not strengthen our current continuing competence requirements.</p>	<p><b>Public</b> None identified.</p> <p><b>Solicitors and employers</b> No additional time or cost impacts.</p>	<p><b>Public</b> A lack of assurance that all solicitors and firms are taking steps to maintain their competence including keeping their understanding of their legal, ethical and regulatory obligations, up to date.</p> <p>Shortcomings in how solicitors currently maintain their competence are not addressed.</p> <p><b>Solicitors and employers</b> Some solicitors may not be identifying all learning and development needs.</p> <p>Reputational impact on profession that solicitors are not maintaining competence and/ or may not act ethically.</p>
<p>Require solicitors to complete learning in all areas of the Statement of Solicitor Competence annually</p>	<p><b>Public</b> Provides assurance that solicitors are undertaking some learning and development relevant to the different aspects of competence.</p> <p><b>Solicitors and employers</b> Solicitors carry out learning and development in all areas of the Statement of Solicitor Competence.</p>	<p><b>Public</b> Possible impact on legal service costs as solicitors engage in learning and development that may not be essential for or required by them.</p> <p><b>Solicitors and employers</b> Learning and development carried out by solicitors may not be meaningful nor required. Learning and development may become a 'tick box exercise.' This could unnecessarily increase costs for solicitors and</p>

		employers which could be passed on to consumers.
Require solicitors to complete more than three hours of mandatory ethics discussions	<p><b>Public</b> Solicitors have more time to develop and reflect on ethical issues, potentially making them more likely to act ethically and make ethical decisions.</p> <p><b>Solicitors and employers</b> Solicitors participate in a greater number of hours discussion on ethical issues, allowing for wider and/or deeper discussions.</p>	<p><b>Public</b> Possible impact on legal service costs as solicitors engage in additional learning and development.</p> <p><b>Solicitors and employers</b> Possible increased cost and time for solicitors and employers to comply.</p>
Require solicitors to complete a prescribed online ethics course or training module.	<p><b>Public</b> Provides assurance that all solicitors have carried out some learning and development in ethics.</p> <p><b>Solicitors and employers</b> Certainty to solicitors on what they need to do to meet their requirement.</p>	<p><b>Public</b> Solicitors might not fully engage with the material limiting its impact.</p> <p><b>Solicitors and employers</b> Solicitors might not fully engage with the material limiting its impact.</p> <p>A prescribed course would not be tailored to specific areas of practice.</p>

# Impact on how we operate

---

We have not identified at this stage any increased operational costs for us of implementing our proposals.

# Impact on other legal services regulators

---

We propose to allow other legal professionals to participate in the mandatory ethics discussions.

The session should be facilitated by a solicitor who:

- has a current practising certificate, or is on the roll and has practised for a minimum of three years since admission or registration
- has no regulatory or disciplinary record with us.

Participants could also include other legal professionals such as barristers or CILEX lawyers or non-qualified staff. This could help smaller practices or teams to manage the discussions in-house and develop the understanding of ethics and the factors that can support or hinder ethical behaviour.

We have and will continue to engage with other legal services regulators as we develop our policy proposals.

# Monitoring and evaluation

---

We will monitor and evaluate the effectiveness and impact of our proposals should we implement them. We will initially monitor implementation of our proposals to identify if there are any aspects on which we may need to provide further support. We will then evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the new requirements. We will publish details of our evaluation plans when we publish the outcomes of the consultation.