

TAXATION
DISCIPLINARY
BOARD

ANNUAL REPORT

and

ACCOUNTS

2007

THE TAXATION DISCIPLINARY BOARD 2007

Board Directors

Vicki Harris MA, Ph D, FCCA, C Dip A F (Chairman) (2004)

John Clark MA, CTA (Fellow) (2005)

Peter Gravestock CTA (Fellow), FCA, ATT (2006)

(Year of appointment shown in brackets)

Executive Officers

Executive Director and Company Secretary

Neville Nagler MA

Secretary to Disciplinary Committee

Peter Douglas FCA

Auditors

Alan Secker & Co,
4 Churchill Court,
58 Station road,
North Harrow,
Middlesex HA2 7SA

Registered address

12 Upper Belgrave Street,
London SW1X 8BB

Registered as a Company limited by Guarantee
No. 4210063

Address for Correspondence

PO Box 544,
Pinner,
Middlesex HA5 9EY

Telephone and fax: 020 8868 9717

Website: www.tax-board.org.uk

CONTENTS

Aims and Objectives of the TDB	Page 4
Chairman’s Report	Page 5
Executive Director’s Report	Page 8
Timescales for Handling Complaints	Page 10
Cases handled in 2007	Page 11
Committee Membership	Page 16
Training	Page 18
The Taxation Disciplinary Scheme 2008	Page 20
Looking Ahead	Page 23
Financial Information and Accounts	Page 26
Annex A: History of the TDB	Page 33
Annex B: The original Taxation Disciplinary Scheme	Page 35

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE TDB

The **aims** of the Taxation Disciplinary Board are to investigate complaints and take action against CIOT and ATT members who have breached professional standards; provided inadequate professional service; or behaved in an unbecoming manner, in order to:

- Protect the public, especially those who use the services of members of the CIOT and ATT;
- Maintain high standards of behaviour and performance among members of the CIOT and ATT;
- Ensure that confidence is maintained in the CIOT and ATT.

The **objectives** of the Taxation Disciplinary Board are to:

- Deal with complaints expeditiously, thoroughly and fairly;
- Be open, fair, transparent and cost efficient in handling complaints;
- Ensure appropriate disciplinary action is taken against those who breach the applicable professional standards, provide inadequate professional service or display unprofessional conduct;
- Provide some redress for those who receive poor service from members of the CIOT and ATT (although the Scheme is no replacement for Court action in serious cases).
- Where a complaint is found proven, recover the costs of handling that complaint from the member of the CIOT or ATT.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

This is the first time that the Taxation Disciplinary Board (TDB) has presented an Annual Report. It marks the completion of our administrative separation from our two participants, the Association of Taxation Technicians (ATT) and the Chartered Institute of Taxation (CIOT). It is therefore a natural development so that we are appropriately accountable to those who appoint the TDB Directors and fund our work. We very much intend that this should become an annual event. Council members from our two participating bodies have asked for such a report, and I hope that they will find these contents of great interest.

The different sections of the report describe the history of the TDB; details of the procedures which we administer (under both the original Scheme and the new Scheme which came into effect in January 2008); information about the kind of cases we deal with; and statistical and financial information about our activities. I shall therefore focus upon the key developments of 2007.

Review of Scheme

For the Board, the year was undoubtedly dominated by the review of the Taxation Disciplinary Scheme. We commissioned this early in the year, with the intention to introduce the new arrangements to come into effect by the end of the year. We almost met our target: the new arrangements were approved by the Council of the ATT in December and by that of the CIOT on 8 January 2008. The new Scheme came into operation the following day. It applies to all cases, except for those already in the system on that date where it was fairer to the member to continue the case under the previous arrangements.

Details of the new Scheme are in the main body of the Report. We believe it embodies the principles, jurisdiction and powers required by a disciplinary body at the outset of the twenty-first century. However, only

experience will confirm this. If relatively minor changes are needed, the TDB now has the power to amend the Regulations which govern the procedural arrangements. Major changes affecting the Scheme itself would continue to require approval by the Councils of both the ATT and CIOT.

Our aim is to ensure that there is a fair, thorough and independent investigation of every complaint referred to the TDB, and that any member against whom a complaint is made is fairly treated. The number of disciplinary cases involving members of the ATT and the CIOT is relatively small—around 30 to 40 a year. Members who conduct themselves in a professional manner are unlikely to be exposed to the disciplinary process. The disciplinary arrangements exist first and foremost to protect the public. But in doing so, they also protect members of the ATT and CIOT by upholding professional standards and ensuring the public has confidence in the tax profession.

Recruitment and training of committee members

Our Committees comprise both members of the ATT and CIOT and lay members who do not belong to either body. The Board spent time during the year in recruiting new members for our Committees. We undertook an open selection process, designed as far as possible to meet the Nolan principles which apply to appointments to public bodies. As a result we appointed six new lay members, five for the Investigation Committee and one for the Disciplinary Committee. Between them they have brought a wealth of experience from other regulatory bodies, which is being applied to great effect in considering the issues raised within the TDB. With the change from committees to panels under the new Scheme, we have been reviewing the composition of the new panels and are now seeking to ensure an adequate balance in terms of the skills required and the length of membership.

One of our innovations last year was to arrange training for all members of the Investigation Committee, including the new lay members. The two sessions, provided by an external trainer focused upon structured decision-making, with a particular emphasis upon the giving of reasons for every decision. This has clearly benefited the quality of decision-making, and has been reflected in the letters sent to inform members and complainants of the decisions reached by the Investigation Committee.

Later in the year we held a consultation meeting to brief all Committee members on the Board's proposals for the new Scheme and Regulations, and to hear their comments on the changes we were proposing. As part of the feedback process, the Board decided to drop from the new arrangements a proposal to introduce summary tribunals to deal with the more straightforward cases where the Investigation Committee had found a prima facie case. In the light of the views expressed by Committee members, we decided that all such cases would go before a Disciplinary Tribunal for a full hearing. Since the new Scheme was introduced, we have held two further training sessions on the new arrangements. As a result, every member of the Investigation and Disciplinary Panels has received training in the new procedures.

It is with great sadness that I must record the death of Marion Simmons, QC on 2 May 2008 following a long illness. She chaired the Disciplinary Committee and gave freely of her advice and considerable expertise to help the Board in devising the new Scheme. She will be remembered with affection and admiration by many.

Directors and staff

Over the year as a whole, the Board's Directors have had an extremely busy time. I am enormously grateful to my two fellow Directors, John Clark and Peter Gravestock, for their substantial and vital contribution to our decision-making. Their professionalism,

wisdom and commitment have played a major role in crafting the new Scheme and Regulations, and both have devoted many days to the work of the Board, far in excess of the call of duty.

Until the start of 2007 all the day to day administrative work and running of the disciplinary scheme was undertaken by ATT and CIOT members of staff. They combined TDB work with their other demanding roles for the ATT and CIOT and this inevitably lead to additional pressures on them. A great debt of gratitude is due to Andy Pickering (former Secretary of the TDB and responsible overall for the operation of the Scheme as well as being Secretary to the Appeal Committee); to Philip Pearson (Secretary to the Investigation Committee); to Heather Brehcist (Conciliation Officer); and to Jonathan Crump (Secretary to the Disciplinary Committee, who also handled all the TDB finances).

All these roles were brought together (save for conciliation) in the appointment of our new Executive Director, Neville Nagler. I would also wish to thank him for all his efforts on behalf of the Board. Although appointed to work three days a week, Neville Nagler has been prepared to work way beyond that in order to see through the Board's workload with his customary efficiency. He is not only skilled in drafting policy papers and correspondence, but he has also had to set up new financial and banking arrangements for the Board, which were previously handled within the CIOT. Looking at the range of work which our Executive Director has handled over the year, I cannot imagine how we would have managed without this new arrangement.

The Executive Director experienced a considerable burden of work in undertaking the initial investigation of every complaint, supporting the work of the Investigation Committee and assisting the Board with the review of the old Scheme and implementation of the new one. Because of this we needed additional resources to

prepare cases for the Disciplinary Committee (and catch up on the backlog of cases that had accumulated). So we created a separate post of Secretary to the Disciplinary Committee, and appointed Peter Douglas to manage the caseload for the Committee hearings. He works for approximately one day a week for the Board. These were necessary changes, not only to enshrine the requisite independence of the disciplinary process from the ATT and CIOT, but also to ensure that cases are dealt with in a timely fashion and to eliminate the backlog of cases awaiting resolution.

Financial matters

The financial information contained in this report shows how modest our overall costs are. We have calculated that the overall cost of the Board works out at £3,686 per case (£2,690 if last year's exceptional one-off costs are excluded) or approximately £5.40 per member (£4.03 excluding exceptional costs). These figures are significantly lower than the costs of other disciplinary bodies who have published comparable information.

My aim, and that of my fellow Directors, is to continue to run the Board efficiently and effectively. But regulation undoubtedly comes at a price. The levels of fees and salaries paid by the TDB are not over-generous. Good regulatory practice requires that there is open recruitment and appointment of panel members and their training. Without the services of an in-house lawyer, we also have to pay Counsel to present cases to the disciplinary tribunals. All this costs money.

The TDB looks carefully at all its costs and attempts as far as possible to minimize them. We have taken steps to enhance the efficiency of the disciplinary scheme for the ATT and CIOT. The new Scheme now explicitly provides for small Investigation Committees (with up to 5 members) to consider the cases in the first instance (in contrast to the original practice of all 12 members considering every case).

Furthermore, we now have an economical fast track process for handling administrative complaints such as failure to return CPD forms when required.

Whilst the costs of running the Scheme necessarily fall on all the members of the ATT and CIOT, we believe it is only fair that the specific costs of dealing with a complaint fall on those whose conduct lead to the complaint being made. This is reflected in our policy that the "polluter pays", and we have issued explicit guidance for levying costs on members against whom disciplinary findings are made.

All these measures should reduce the financial call on the ATT and CIOT. Overall we consider that the TDB is economical in its expenditure. As the new Scheme beds down, we will continue to monitor costs carefully and strive, wherever possible, to reduce them.

Looking ahead

2007 has been a challenging year for the TDB. But with the new Scheme and the other innovations which I have mentioned above, I believe that the TDB is in much better shape to perform its role. In the coming year, as the new Scheme beds down there are a number of topics on which we plan to issue guidance to the panels. Particularly important will be the provision of Indicative Sanctions Guidance as a means of securing a measure of consistency in the sanctions imposed by tribunals. So there remains a busy programme for the TDB. What remains the most important component of our work is to operate our procedures in such a way that the participant bodies, the profession and the public as a whole have confidence in the Board and know that if there is a complaint it will be dealt with fairly, efficiently and transparently.

VICKI HARRIS
Chairman

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Taking up any new post is nearly always a challenging prospect. All the more so when you are not taking over the work of any single individual. And when this is coupled with having to set up a whole fabric of new administrative arrangements in order to do the job, the prospect can be particularly daunting.

Office set-up

I took up my position with the Board in late January, in the expectation of working an average of three days a week from home. That necessitated a raft of practical arrangements in order to enable the TDB to operate from Pinner, with remote access to the main computer set-up at 12 Upper Belgrave Street. Needless to say remote working on a laptop is not without its occasional difficulties, but the arrangement ensures that I can usually access the TDB's files stored on the CIOT's server. We rapidly arranged for a PO Box for all correspondence, and for the most part communications have been excellent.

The other practical challenge was to set up new operating arrangements for the TDB's finances. As part of the move towards administrative autonomy, it was decided that, in place of the former arrangement whereby all the TDB's finances had been handled by the CIOT's finance department, the TDB would receive quarterly contributions from both of the participant bodies and assume responsibility for dealing with all the Board's expenditure. That called for the preparation of a budget for the TDB, which had to be approved by the two bodies, and new banking arrangements. Once all the practicalities were sorted, the new arrangements have worked well, and we are grateful for the help we received from officers in the CIOT in setting up the new systems.

These arrangements have provided the essential underpinning to enable the TDB to function efficiently. But the main focus for my work has involved the processing of complaints and support for the Directors on significant issues of policy.

Handling complaints

Over the year as a whole the TDB received 35 new complaints, a record number. The statistics of these complaints are described later in this report. Suffice to say that where the complainant is a member of the public, each complaint that reaches the Investigation Committee will have entailed several rounds of correspondence. It can prove quite time-consuming if complainants or members are slow to respond and require reminders. The Board has set down timescales for the processing of different stages of a complaint and examines the reasons where these targets are not met. Once the correspondence is complete, usually after two contributions from both the complainant and the member, the Board has introduced a new procedure whereby I prepare a case summary for the Investigation Committee. This has facilitated the work of the Committee, so that instead of receiving all the correspondence with supporting documents in an unprocessed condition, for each case the Investigation Committee now has a summary accompanying the key documents.

I act as Secretary to the Investigation Committee, and follow up on all its decisions. Last year the Committee held six meetings and examined 23 cases. I also processed 15 cases which were withdrawn by the complainant before reaching the Committee. (The detailed statistics are set out on Pages 15—19 below.) In each case the Committee's findings, with the reasons for its decisions, were sent to the complainant and to the member, whilst the CIOT and the ATT were also kept informed. Where a case was referred to the Disciplinary Committee, I would also prepare the papers, so that the Secretary to that Committee could refer them to Counsel in order to prepare the charges. I also liaised with the CIOT or ATT over the arrangements for bringing cases before the Disciplinary Committee, since under the former Scheme it was the responsibility of the two participants to present cases to that Committee. In the course of the year, the Board appointed Peter Douglas as the

Secretary to the Disciplinary Committee, in order to relieve the CIOT of the responsibility for undertaking the practical arrangements for hearings of the Disciplinary Committee.

Legal review

A significant part of my role during the year related to the Board's review of the Scheme and Regulations, which is described elsewhere. At each stage of the process, beginning with the appointment of the lawyers undertaking the review, there were papers to prepare setting out the Board's policy and then assessing their translation into specific drafts and redrafts of the eventual new arrangements. This proved a fascinating, albeit exhaustive, process. And with the new Scheme and Regulations brought into force in January 2008, my next challenge is to prepare first drafts of all the issues on which guidance is required in order to ensure the smooth functioning of the new arrangements.

TDB Board

As Secretary to the Board, I have worked closely with the Directors throughout the year. Part of my role is to follow up on all decisions reached by the Directors, whether at Board meetings or less formally. These include matters relating to the appointment of committee (now panel) members, the determination of procedural arrangements and timescales for the processing of cases, and the resolution of matters of policy as they arise on an ad-hoc basis. During 2007, the Board met on eleven occasions, six of which were related almost exclusively to the legal review. In the coming year, the Board intends to revert to its more normal pattern of quarterly meetings.

Overall, 2007 proved an extremely challenging year for the TDB, but the result has been the development of a structure better suited to meeting its core tasks of investigating complaints brought against members of the two participant bodies and disciplining those against whom a prima facie case has been made out. The procedural changes have sought to enhance the independence, accountability, transparency and effectiveness of the TDB. Whilst in reality the volume of work falling to the Executive Director has called for an input closer to four days a week than the expected three, viewed from my former perspective as a senior civil servant I believe that the TDB delivers excellent value for money. Given the tasks required of any professional disciplinary body in today's climate, the TDB operates efficiently and effectively. Its overall budget and unit costs are modest, particularly when compared with those of other regulatory bodies.

In setting up the new arrangements over the past year, I have been greatly assisted by those staff members previously engaged on work for the TDB. These include Andy Pickering (former Secretary to the Board), Phillip Pearson (former Secretary to the Investigation Committee) and Jonathan Crump, (former Secretary to the Disciplinary Committee). I have welcomed the support provided by the new Secretary to the Disciplinary Tribunal, Peter Douglas. And most especially, I have valued enormously the advice and unstinting effort devoted by the Board's three Directors, headed by Vicki Harris, the Chairman.

NEVILLE NAGLER
Executive Director

TIMESCALES FOR HANDLING COMPLAINTS

The Board has considered and approved timescales for handling each stage of the complaints and disciplinary process. These are designed to ensure that the administrative processes are handled efficiently and expeditiously.

As soon as a complaint is received, the complainant is sent the Board's standard complaint form. Once this is returned, there will normally be two rounds of correspondence involving both the complainant and the member. The case is then prepared for a meeting of the Investigation Committee. Overall the Board anticipates that on average it takes around 3—4 months between receipt of the complaint form and the Investigation Committee hearing. In some cases, not every stage of the process will be required, for example where the complaint is made by one of the participant bodies and the issue is clear-cut. Delays may, however, be caused by either the member or the complainant in submitting correspondence. There may also be cases involving large quantities of paper which may arrive at a time when other work has to take priority. It may also be necessary to postpone a meeting of the Investigation or Disciplinary Committee until there is

sufficient business to warrant convening a meeting.

The Disciplinary Committee stages of the process are less easy to timetable than the earlier processes. The overall timetable depends largely on the member and the presenting barrister who are responsible for producing most of the documentation. There are also timed procedures laid down in the Regulations that applied under the original Scheme, whilst the two Response Forms, which were instituted some years ago by the Board, lay down their own procedural timescales. On average, however, the TDB aims to ensure that a Disciplinary Tribunal will take place within 5 or 6 months of the Investigation Committee decision.

Because the former Appeal Committee never met, the Board has not set down any timescales for that element of the process.

Now that the new Scheme has come into effect, the Board will be promulgating new timescales to reflect the changes in procedures contained in the 2008 Regulations.

CASES HANDLED IN 2007

Complaints received by TDB

The TDB received 35 new complaints during 2007. This was the highest total for any year since the Scheme started during 2001. The table below sets out the annual total of complaints received and cases disposed of by both the Investigation and the Disciplinary Committees. It demonstrates the fluctuations in the volume of complaints received and handled by the TDB since it was set up.

<u>Year</u>	Complaints brought forward	New complaints	Complaints disposed of	Complaints carried forward
2001(May-Dec)	0	4	3	1
2002	1	35	23	13
2003	13	22	29	6
2004	6	26	15	17
2005	17	17	26	8
2006	8	22	20	10
2007	10	35	35	10

The table below sets out in more detail the handling of cases by the TDB in 2006 and 2007.

	Number of Cases	
	2006	2007
Investigation Committee		
▪ Brought forward from previous year	7	8
▪ New cases in year	<u>22</u>	<u>35</u>
	<u>29</u>	<u>43</u>
▪ Cases withdrawn by complainant	7	15
▪ No prima facie case or no action taken	8	11
▪ Rest on file without costs	2	0
▪ Rest on file with costs	0	4
▪ Admonished with costs	1	1
▪ Referred to the participating bodies for presentation to the Disciplinary Committee	3	7
▪ Carried forward to next year	<u>8</u>	<u>5</u>
	<u>29</u>	<u>43</u>
Disciplinary Committee		
▪ Brought forward from previous year	1	2
▪ New cases referred in year by the Investigation Committee	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>
	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>
▪ Case dismissed	2	1
▪ Case proved	0	3
▪ Carried forward to next year	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>

In 2007, the 35 new complaints were made against 37 professional members, of whom 16 belonged to the ATT, 16 to the CIOT, 4 had dual membership and one was not identified by the complainant. In addition, eight cases were brought forward from the previous year, giving a total of 43 cases to process, five of which were carried forward to 2008.

Source of complaint

The new complainants in 2007 fell into the following categories:

- 5 were from current clients
- 8 were from former clients
- 1 was from a relative of a client
- 4 were from advisers to a former client
- 2 were from former employers
- 1 was from a potential employer
- 1 was from a former business associate
- 5 were referred by the CIOT on the basis of reports of disciplinary action taken by the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales;
- 6 were referred by the ATT for failure to provide CPD returns
- 1 was anonymous
- 1 failed to put the complaint in writing

Grounds for complaint

The 35 new complaints received in 2007 raised in total 50 separate grounds for complaint. These fell into the following categories:

Deception or dishonesty	4
Failing to respond to correspondence in a timely manner	13
Incompetence	9
Lack of objectivity	2
Professional misconduct	7
Conflict of interest	3
Poaching clients	1
Failure to submit CPD record	6
Failure to report disciplinary action taken by another professional body	<u>5</u>
Total number of grounds for complaint	<u>50</u>

Handling of complaints by Executive Director

A number of cases were withdrawn before they reached the Investigation Committee. Six were withdrawn by the ATT: all of these related to the failure by the member to submit CPD returns when so requested by the ATT. In each case, following the intervention of the TDB, the required return was eventually

submitted. The ATT thereupon decided to withdraw its complaint, and no action was taken against the member. (Under the new Scheme such cases are likely to attract a fixed penalty, reflecting in part the amount of work required in order to secure submission of the return.) Two other cases could not be pursued by the

TDB because they involved a complaint against a firm which was registered with the CIOT as having CTA status. Under the original Scheme complaints made against a firm did not come within the jurisdiction of the TDB, but this omission has been rectified under the new Scheme.

In a further seven cases (including one received late in 2006), the complainant decided not to pursue the complaint. In most of these cases the complaint was withdrawn before the stage at which it would be sent to the member. In only one of the withdrawn cases was a reason given. In that particular case, the complaint had been put forward by a solicitor acting for two clients who were complaining about two members. The complaint was withdrawn after one of the members threatened the complainants with defamation proceedings, on the grounds that their complaints were baseless and contained libellous remarks about him; the solicitor made it clear that the complainants did not wish the TDB to continue with the case.

The processes for the handling of cases prior to their consideration by the Investigation Committee and the planned timescales are described on Pages 12-14 of this Report. At the end of the year five of the complaints received during 2007 were still at the correspondence stage, and were expected to go to the Investigation Committee early in 2008. Of the sixteen cases received in 2007 which went to the Investigation Committee during the year, the time taken between receipt of the complaint and the Committee's first consideration of the case broke down as follows:

<u>Time taken</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>
1 month	5
2 months	0
3 months	4
4 months	3
5 months	3
<u>6 months</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	<u>16</u>

In two cases the Investigation Committee requested additional information from both the complainant and the member. As a result, the time taken to reach its eventual finding in each of these cases was extended by three months—in one case to 6 months and in the other to 8 months. Part of the delay was caused by the fact that at some times of the year there can be a three month gap between meetings of the Committee.

The above figures show the total time taken between receipt of the complaint and the Investigation Committee meeting. No allowance is made for delays caused by members or complainants in responding to correspondence. In a case where two rounds of correspondence take place with both the member and the complainant, it is likely to take around four months before a case will be considered by the Investigation Committee. The cases which take less time are those which are more straightforward, particularly those where the member has failed to report disciplinary proceedings taken by another professional body, as less correspondence is required in order to establish the facts.

Investigation Committee

The Investigation Committee held 6 meetings during the year. It considered 7 cases started in 2006 and 16 cases started in 2007; this left 5 complaints awaiting the Committee at the beginning of 2008.

Of the 23 cases considered by the Investigation Committee in 2007, it found no Prima Facie case in 7 cases. The allegations made in these cases ranged from dishonesty and poaching of clients to incompetence and conflict of interests. In a further four cases, the Committee considered that there was a Prima Facie case, but that the matters in question were too minor to warrant further action. Three of those cases involved the member's failure to report to the CIOT disciplinary proceedings undertaken by the ICAEW on matters unrelated to tax. In the other case, the member had put incorrect information on a business card used for a short period and had sent in a return on behalf of a colleague without making it clear on the return that it had not been sent in by the colleague.

In five cases the Committee decided to propose a consent order, which was accepted by each of the members involved. In each case, costs were awarded against the member. The conduct which was the subject of a consent order was as follows:

- One member was admonished for discreditable conduct. He had refused to supply the address of the CIOT when requested by his client and, by way of a riposte, had requested details of the client's employer, even though he clearly knew the answer.
- Four cases were ordered to rest on file for three years. Three such cases involved a failure to report disciplinary proceedings

by another professional body; these cases were regarded by the Committee as either being more serious than those where no further action was taken or else demonstrating a failure by the member to provide any explanation or apology for his conduct. The fourth case involved a failure by the member to deal with correspondence from a client and from a successor adviser.

The remaining seven cases considered by the Investigation Committee were regarded as sufficiently serious to be referred to the Disciplinary Committee.

Disciplinary Committee

The Disciplinary Committee held one meeting in December 2007. Meeting in a panel of three, the Committee heard one case brought forward from 2006 and three cases referred in 2007. A further five cases were pending at the end of 2007.

Of the cases heard by the Disciplinary Committee, brief details are as follows:

- The member had been charged with a failure to respond to correspondence from the client and from his new adviser after the client had terminated his engagement with the member. The member had also failed to respond to any correspondence from the TDB relating to the complaint. Unexpectedly, the member turned up at the hearing and admitted the charges. He claimed to have been suffering from health problems at the time. In the light of his explanation, which was heard in closed session, the Committee decided that the member should not receive any sanction.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Investigation Committee

The Investigation Committee had eleven members during most of the year. It normally sits in panels of five, and held six meetings during the year.

The members of the Committee, their category of membership, and the dates of their original appointment, are as follows:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Date of first appointment</u>
Kenneth Crofton Martin (Chairman)	CIOT	15 March 2001
Helen Folorunso (Vice Chairman)	Lay	15 March 2001
Elizabeth Hinds	Lay	1 April 2007
Alison Middleton	CIOT	15 March 2001
Ken Monk	CIOT	15 March 2001
Brian Ogilvie	CIOT	23 January 2002
Marilyn Palmer	ATT	1 April 2007
Nicola Burnett Smith	Lay	3 October 2001
Barbara Stephens	Lay	1 April 2007
Linda Stone	Lay	1 April 2007
Rod Varley	Lay	1 April 2007

Barbara Stephens resigned from the Committee in February 2008.

Disciplinary Committee

The Disciplinary Committee had seven members for most of the year. It held only a single meeting, sitting in a panel of three members. The panel is composed of a legally-qualified chairman, a member of the ATT or CIOT and a lay member.

The members of the Committee, their category of membership, and the dates of their original appointment, are as follows:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Date of first appointment</u>
Marion Simmons (Chairman)	Lawyer	1 August 2005
Peter Newman (Vice Chairman)	Lay	15 March 2001
Ken Ball	Lay	1 August 2003
Julie Dingwall	ATT	1 October 2007
Henry Joseph	Lawyer	28 March 2001
Nick Lloyd	CIOT	30 May 2001
Michael Squires	CIOT/ATT	15 March 2001
Stephen Walzer	Lawyer	1 April 2007
Michael Warburton Wood	CIOT	15 March 2001

Henry Joseph's term of appointment expired on 31 March. Michael Warburton Wood's term expired on 31 March 2008, and Stephen Walzer resigned during March 2008. Marion Simmons passed away on 2 May 2008.

Appeal Committee

The Appeal Committee had six members throughout the year, but held no meetings as no cases were appealed from the Disciplinary Committee.

The members of the Committee, their category of membership, and the dates of their original appointment are as follows:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Date of first appointment</u>
Malcolm Palmer (Chairman)	Lawyer	16 March 2002
Paul Heim (Vice Chairman)	Lawyer	1 October 2004
Brian Cleave	Lawyer	1 January 2006
Shirley Leighfield	Lay	1 June 2004
Angus Nicol	Lawyer	1 January 2006
Tony Ring	CIOT/ATT	1 August 2003

Malcolm Palmer and Shirley Leighfield resigned on 31 December 2007. Tony Ring's term of appointment expired on 31 March 2008, and Paul Heim resigned in April 2008.

With the introduction of the new Taxation Disciplinary Scheme in January 2008, the three Committees were replaced by an Investigation Panel and a Disciplinary Panel. All members of the former Investigation Committee were invited to become members of the Investigation Panel, whilst most members of the Disciplinary and Appeal Committees were invited to join the Disciplinary Panel. The Board will be seeking to recruit additional members to the two panels during 2008.

TRAINING

One of the significant innovations of 2007 was to introduce a compulsory training requirement for members of committees. The aim of the Board is to provide at least one day's training each year for every member of the Investigation and Disciplinary Panels.

Developments in the field of professional regulation over the past few years have significantly changed the way in which disciplinary bodies are expected to perform their roles. Indeed, the extent of these changes, even during the six years since the original Taxation Disciplinary Scheme was set up, prompted the legal review last year and led to the introduction of the new Scheme earlier this year.

It is incumbent upon regulatory bodies to ensure that members of their committees and tribunals are fully aware of recent developments which affect the conduct of their proceedings, particularly where there have been relevant court judgements. Whilst many members have experience derived from their involvement in other disciplinary bodies, the Board has taken the view that it is important to ensure that all members of TDB committees and tribunals receive the same training, as a means of ensuring a measure of consistency when applied to the sort of cases with which they are dealing.

In the early part of the year, two training sessions were held, primarily for members of the Investigation Committee; the Board Directors also attended, together with a newly-appointed member of the Disciplinary Committee. Only one member of the Investigation Committee was unable to attend either session. Both training events were led by Mary Timms, a solicitor at Field Fisher Waterhouse. Mary Timms has wide-ranging experience

in professional regulation, including the preparation and presentation of cases before disciplinary bodies, and has provided training for external committee members of many such bodies.

Topics covered during the training session included:

- Acting in the public interest
- Concepts of fairness and human rights
- Standard and burden of proof
- The Disciplinary Scheme and Procedure Regulations
- The role of the Investigation Committee:
 - The nature of a preliminary committee
 - Procedure
 - Structured decision making
 - Mitigation
 - The Shipman Inquiry—lessons learned about preliminary committees
- Giving reasons

The session ended by looking at some recent cases dealt with by the Investigation Committee in order to apply the lessons learned during the session to real scenarios.

As the legal review progressed during the year, the Board decided to hold a meeting in October for members of all three of the TDB committees. The purpose of this event was to brief members on the outline of the proposed new Scheme and Regulations at a time when the structure of the new arrangements was crystallising but before final decisions were taken. About fifteen members were able to attend the meeting, whilst others sent in written comments. The session was led by Peter Cadman, the partner at Russell-Cooke, Solicitors, who had led the legal review and the drafting of the new Scheme and Regulations.

The session focussed on the main components of the proposed new arrangements. Most of the changes proposed by the Board were welcomed by participants at the meeting. But one significant element of the Board's proposals was contested by many of the committee members: the establishment of a Summary Tribunal to deal with less serious cases of misconduct. The Board had originally proposed that the Investigation Committee should no longer have a power to make consent orders (see Page 12 above). Instead, such cases would be referred to a Summary Tribunal, which could deal with the case in a less formal way than a Disciplinary Tribunal. In the light of the concerns expressed and after careful consideration of the issues, the Board decided to drop the proposal for a Summary Tribunal.

Once the new Scheme came into effect in January 2008, two further training events were held so that all members of the new Panels could be briefed on the new arrangements. The training sessions were again led by Peter Cadman, together with Heather Brehcist, Standards Officer at the CIOT.

Heather Brehcist gave a briefing on the new Anti-Money Laundering Regulations which the Government had brought into effect in December 2007. (These are discussed more fully at Page 24.) This was followed by a discussion centred around the main changes which the new arrangements had introduced. The meeting then divided into separate sessions for members of the Investigation and Disciplinary Panels. Peter Cadman led that for the Investigation Panel, focussing on the criteria needed to establish a Prima Facie case and on the role of the Investigatory Assessor, a new function introduced by the Scheme. The Board's Chairman, Vicki Harris, led the session for members of the Disciplinary Panel, dealing with the Board's plans to issue later in the year guidance to tribunals on cost awards and Indicative Sanctions Guidance.

Overall these training events have received highly positive feedback from the members who participated. Further sessions are likely to take place once the Board has drafted guidance on some of the topics on which such guidance could be helpful to panel members.

THE TAXATION DISCIPLINARY SCHEME 2008

In January 2008, a new Taxation Disciplinary Scheme came into operation, after securing the approval of the Councils of the ATT and the CIOT.

Background to review of Scheme

When the original Scheme was drafted in 2000, it reflected good practice in professional regulation. But professional regulation has moved on over the past few years, so that the Scheme no longer reflected best practice.

Among the factors which have contributed to these changes were:

- A growing emphasis on the need for disciplinary bodies to be independent, and be seen to be independent, of the professions which they discipline by a separation from the bodies and the greater involvement of lay members in the process;
- Interventions and rulings by the courts, particularly on human rights aspects, which have affected the procedures adopted by disciplinary bodies;
- A growing disposition on the part of complainants to refer cases to disciplinary bodies and to expect fair and expeditious remedies;
- A broadening of the range of legitimate grounds for complaint to include providing inadequate professional services and engaging in conduct unbecoming a professional person, in addition to more specific breaches of the professional standards and guidelines of regulatory bodies.
- A need for greater transparency and openness in handling complaints and publicising the outcomes.
- A need for improved cost effectiveness, underpinned by the concept that the “polluter pays” rather than the profession as a whole.

In addition, the TDB needed to make some specific amendments to the Scheme in order to enable the ATT and the CIOT to meet their commitments to the Government that appropriate disciplinary action would be taken to deal with breaches of the new Anti-Money Laundering regulations, which took effect on 15 December 2007. It was therefore necessary to ensure that the new Scheme would apply to firms as well as to members, students and other associates.

Against this background, the Board had decided before last year that the Scheme would benefit from a fundamental review to ensure that its procedures would reflect recent court judgements and developments in best practice. The TDB recognised that its Scheme needs to protect not only the interests of members of the ATT and CIOT, but also the public interest and the interests of the complainant. Professional bodies are expected to arrange their regulation in a fair, proper and transparent manner and demonstrate regulatory independence from the representational activities of the bodies. The Legal Services Act 2007 required similar ring-fenced regulation for solicitors and barristers. So this concept would be familiar to those ATT and CIOT members who are also solicitors and barristers

To assist with the review, early in 2007 the TDB invited tenders from a number of firms of solicitors experienced in the field of professional discipline and regulation. Russell-Cooke was selected for the project. From the outset, the TDB was advised that, rather than approach the subject by piecemeal amendments, it would be better to create an entirely new Scheme and Regulations. While retaining much of the current structures and procedures, this would provide a clearer and more comprehensive framework for the disciplinary processes.

Against this background, the Board decided that the new Scheme should set out principles, jurisdiction and powers for the TDB, whilst all the details relating to procedures would be contained in the Regulations. In contrast, the previous Scheme contained much in the way of procedural details, which are now included in Regulations.

Basic principles

The TDB is required to undertake the fair and expeditious handling, investigation and adjudication of complaints on an impartial and independent basis. The TDB is empowered to deal with complaints alleging breaches of professional standards and guidance, the provision of inadequate professional service and conduct unbecoming a professional person. Where a complaint is proven, the TDB has a responsibility to impose appropriate penalties or sanctions within the powers granted to it by the Councils of the CIOT and the ATT. To enhance the independence of the disciplinary process, the ATT and CIOT no longer have any role in the handling of cases.

In processing complaints, the TDB seeks to ensure that its procedures are fair to all the parties involved and operate efficiently, proportionately and transparently. The TDB's jurisdiction over members of the ATT and the CIOT is confined to disciplinary matters, and conciliation has therefore been removed from the Scheme. Complainants are advised by the TDB that making a complaint against a member is not a substitute for seeking damages or other redress through the courts. The TDB does not offer legal advice, intervene in fee disputes or advise on what is a reasonable sum for work done.

The new disciplinary process

1 The review stage

The procedures set out in the new 2008 Scheme and accompanying Regulations build upon the processes developed under the previous Scheme. The initial handling of complaints remains a function of a TDB staff member, known as the Reviewer, who processes correspondence from the complainant and ensures that the member has every opportunity to respond to the allegations made by the complainant. The Reviewer may reject complaints that appear to be trivial, vexatious, more than a year old or outside the jurisdiction of the Scheme. But the complainant may appeal against such a decision to an independent Investigatory Assessor, who will decide if the case should continue.

If the complaint involves a breach of the participants' administrative rules, such as failure to meet the CPD requirements, there is provision for the Reviewer to impose a Fixed Penalty. But a member may object and request a hearing by a Disciplinary Tribunal (although if the charges are proved, additional costs are also likely to be imposed). This is similar to the Fixed Penalty arrangements that apply in the Magistrates Courts.

2. The Investigation Committee

As under the previous Scheme, most cases will start with an Investigation Committee consideration as to whether there is a prima facie case to answer. The Investigation Committee comprises up to five members, with a majority of lay members and at least one professional member. These members are drawn from a larger Investigation Panel appointed by the TDB.

The Investigation Committee considers all cases referred to it on the basis of a dossier of written submissions from the complainant and the member. If it decides that a prima facie case has not been made out or that the case is not serious or that there is unlikely to be evidence to substantiate it before a Disciplinary Tribunal, it may conclude that the case should go no further. The Committee must give reasons for its decision and these are sent to both the complainant and the member. Either party may appeal against such a decision to an Investigatory Assessor appointed by the TDB, who may reject the appeal or require a new Investigation Committee to reconsider the complaint.

All other prima facie cases will be referred to a Disciplinary Tribunal. The Investigation Committee no longer has the power to award minor sanctions without a hearing, but with the member's consent. Thus all significant complaints will be heard by a Disciplinary Tribunal.

3. The Disciplinary Tribunal

The Disciplinary Tribunal comprises three members selected from a separate Disciplinary Panel appointed by the TDB. The majority of members of the Panel are not members of the ATT or the CIOT. Each Tribunal will include a legally-qualified chairman, a lay person and a member of either the ATT or the CIOT. Its function is to hear evidence submitted by the Presenter of the case (who is appointed by the TDB to prepare the charges and present the case) and from the member (or his/her representative) and to listen to any

witnesses. The member is not obliged to attend, although it is advisable for him/her to do so. But the member is required to cooperate with, and respond to correspondence from, the TDB.

At a Disciplinary Tribunal the standard of proof is the civil standard and if the allegations are found proven, the Tribunal has a wide range of sanctions, which include an order to apologise, a warning as to future conduct, a fine, suspension or expulsion from the body of which the defendant is a member. When the allegations are found proved, the Tribunal will normally award costs against a defendant and order that its finding be published in Tax Adviser and on the TDB's website. In cases of inadequate professional service there is a new power to award compensation where the complainant can demonstrate a quantifiable material loss, up to a maximum of £5,000.

4. The Appeal Tribunal

Following a finding by a Disciplinary Tribunal, both the member and the TDB may seek to appeal. Appeals are permitted only on specified grounds. An independent Disciplinary Assessor will be appointed by the TDB from the Disciplinary Panel to determine whether the grounds of appeal meet the criteria. If they do, the case will go to an Appeal Tribunal, which has a similar composition to a Disciplinary Tribunal. The Appeal Tribunal may uphold, reject or vary any order made by a Disciplinary Tribunal. Its decision is the final stage in the TDB's procedures.

LOOKING AHEAD

As the new Scheme and Regulations came into effect on 9 January, the main focus of the Board during 2008 will be to assess how the new arrangements bed down. It is now possible for the Board to amend the Regulations itself, without the need for the approval of the two participant bodies. The Board has already noted a few drafting changes that are needed on technical points. The present intention is to assess the operation of the new arrangements after a few months' experience, so that later in the year amendments can be made to the Regulations. In the context of reviewing how the new arrangements are working, the Board will draw upon the experience of the Panel members, probably on the basis of a further consultation meeting.

Preparation of guidance

One of the major areas for the Board during the coming year will be the preparation of guidance for panel members on particular aspects of the new arrangements. Guidance is intended to help panel members to do their job more effectively and to produce a measure of consistency in decision-making. Decisions must always reflect the particular circumstances of the individual case; but the process for arriving at a decision needs to be broadly consistent in order to achieve fairness for the complainant and the member alike.

(i) The role of Assessors

One of the issues on which early guidance will be issued concerns the role of Assessors. Under the new arrangements there is provision for the Board to appoint Assessors drawn from the membership of both the Investigation and the Disciplinary Panels. The role of the Investigatory Assessor is to re-examine decisions of the

Reviewer and the Investigation Committee where these are challenged by the member or the complainant. Thus the complainant may object to an initial decision by the Reviewer to reject a complaint on the grounds that it is trivial or vexatious, falls outside the jurisdiction of the Board, or has been submitted out of time. The Assessor will independently review the decision taken by the Reviewer and either uphold his decision or decide that the complaint should go forward to the Investigation Committee.

The Investigatory Assessor can also examine appeals against a finding by the Investigation Committee that the complaint did not disclose a prima facie case to answer or that, even though there was a prima facie case, the matter was too minor to warrant further action or that the evidence was unlikely to be of sufficient strength to establish a case before a Disciplinary Tribunal. In such cases the Assessor may uphold the finding of the original Investigation Committee or order that the complaint should be re-heard by a second Investigation Committee composed of members who have not had any prior involvement with the complaint.

The role of the Disciplinary Assessor is to consider the grounds on which a party is appealing against a decision or order of a Disciplinary Tribunal and decide whether the appeal falls within the grounds set out in the Regulations. Provided that the appeal falls within the specified grounds, it will be allowed to go forward to the Appeal Tribunal.

(ii) Costs

Another topic on which early guidance is needed concerns the award of costs against a member against whom an adverse finding has been made by a

Disciplinary Tribunal. As a matter of principle, the Board considers that the polluter should pay, rather than that the costs of bringing a successful case against a member should be borne by the entire membership. The guidance will set out the factors and elements to be taken into account by the Tribunal in assessing whether costs are payable, and if so how those costs should be calculated. The aim of the Board is to ensure a degree of consistency in the approach taken by Disciplinary Tribunals.

(iii) Indicative Sanctions Guidance

Another topic for early guidance will be the publication of Indicative Sanctions Guidance. Under the Regulations, Disciplinary Tribunals are required to take such guidance into account before deciding what sanction to impose upon a member against whom some or all the charges are found to be proven. The majority of professional disciplinary bodies have either produced such guidance or are in the process of preparing it. The aim of such guidance is to ensure that all the relevant factors are taken into account before a sanction is imposed and that Tribunals act in a consistent manner in imposing such sanctions. The new Scheme provides for a number of alternative sanctions, and it is important for all parties involved that the criteria relevant to each be considered by the Tribunal before reaching its decision. It is intended to consult members of the Disciplinary Panel before the guidance is finalised. Once it is issued, the guidance will be published on the Board's website.

There are other issues which may also form the subject of subsequent guidance. Meanwhile, it is the policy of the Board that as much information as will be helpful to members of the public and the profession should be published on its website at www.tax-board.org.uk. We hope before long to revamp the website and publish on it more information about the work of the Board, including this

Annual Report, so that it can be available to the widest possible audience.

Panel members

During the year we shall need to recruit additional panel members. The Board has a policy of open recruitment, conforming so far as practicable to the Nolan principles which govern appointments to public bodies. Our current panel members bring to the Board a wealth of experience, including experience derived from serving on other regulatory and disciplinary bodies, and we shall be seeking to perpetuate the very high standards set by our current panel members.

In the medium term there may well be particular challenges for our panel members in dealing with cases which break new ground. In particular, the ability to hear complaints against firms and the whole area of money laundering will pose new challenges for the Board. The scope to consider complaints of Inadequate Professional Service and conduct unbecoming a professional person may also raise issues of a kind that the Board has not previously had occasion to consider. It will be instructive to see whether the case load expands in the light of these extensions to the Board's jurisdiction.

It seems possible that, as a result of the changes introduced under the new Scheme, the workload for the Investigation Committee may diminish. The ability of the Reviewer to filter out cases, including cases subject to a fixed penalty, may contribute to this development. So too may the removal of the Committee's previous role in offering consent orders to members for minor breaches of the participants' standards. Conversely, the number of cases reaching the Disciplinary Tribunal will probably increase, as it will receive all those cases in which the Investigation Committee would previously have offered a consent order, including cases where the member

failed to notify the ATT or the CIOT that he was facing disciplinary proceedings in another professional body.

Resource issues

One of the major constraints that the Board faces results from its limited resources. Our accounts are shown on the following pages. The Board is financed almost entirely by contributions from our two participating organisations; these are payable quarterly in advance. Any costs or fines received are used to reduce those contributions, so that at the end of the year the Board's balance sheet shows a zero balance. Within the approved budget, we have provision to employ a part-time Executive Director for three days a week and a Secretary to the Disciplinary Tribunal for up to one day a week. In the view of the Directors, this is insufficient to accomplish all the objectives that the Board believes to be necessary. However, we accept that we cannot impose additional burdens on the participants.

The cost of the TDB is modest when compared with the costs of other

disciplinary bodies, and remains low when calculated on a cost per case or cost per member basis. We shall continue to cut our coat according to the cloth provided to us, on the basis that sometimes outputs may take rather longer than we would wish in an ideal world.

Overall, however, we achieved a satisfactory financial result in 2007. This was the first year in which we operated our finances independently of the Institute and ATT. Early in the year the Board prepared a budget, in the light of which the new system of quarterly payments from the two participants was agreed. We were delighted that our expenditure came in below budget and that overall we produced a small surplus. This was despite the substantial one-off costs incurred last year as a result of the legal review, the recruitment of lay members and our training innovations, plus office set-up costs. Our approved budget for 2008 involves a small increase (2.6%) in expenditure, and we are determined to live within the allocations approved by our participant bodies.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION AND ACCOUNTS

Statement of Directors' responsibilities

The Directors are responsible for preparing the Annual Report and the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and regulations.

Company law requires the Directors to prepare financial statements for each financial year. Under that law the Directors have elected to prepare the financial statements in accordance with United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice (United Kingdom Accounting Standards and applicable law). The financial statements are required by law to give a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Company and of the profit or loss of the Company for that period. In preparing those financial statements, the Directors are required to:

- a. Select suitable accounting policies and then apply them consistently;
- b. Make judgements and estimates that are reasonable and prudent; and
- c. Prepare the financial statements on the going concern basis unless it is inappropriate to presume that the Company will continue in business.

The Directors are responsible for keeping proper accounting records which disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the Company and to enable them to ensure that the financial statements comply with the requirements of the Companies Act 1985. They are also responsible for safeguarding the assets of the Company and hence for taking reasonable steps for the prevention and detection of fraud and other irregularities.

Auditors

The Directors, having been notified of the cessation of the partnership known as Baker Tilly, resolved that Baker Tilly UK Audit LLP be appointed as successor auditor with effect from 1 April 2007, in accordance with the provisions of the Companies Act 1989 s26(5). Baker Tilly UK Audit LLP indicated its willingness to continue in office and a resolution for their reappointment as auditors to the Board was adopted at the Annual General Meeting on 4 June 2007.

Early in 2008 the Directors decided that, in view of the auditors' proposal to more than double its audit fee, Baker Tilly UK Audit LLP should be replaced. This would also have the advantage of separating the TDB's audit from that of the participant bodies. An Extraordinary General Meeting of the Company was held on 26 February 2008, when a resolution was adopted to appoint Alan Secker & Co in place of Baker Tilly UK Audit LLP. Baker Tilly UK Audit LLP was informed of this resolution and raised no objections.

Statement of Disclosure of Information to Auditors

The Directors who were in office on the date of the approval of these financial statements have confirmed, as far as they are aware, that there is no relevant audit information of which the auditors are unaware. Each of the Directors has confirmed that they have taken all the steps that they ought to have taken as Directors in order to make themselves aware of any relevant audit information and to establish that it has been communicated to the auditors.

This report is prepared in accordance with the special provisions relating to small companies within Part VII of the Companies Act 1985 and with the Financial Reporting Standard for Small Entities effective January 2007 and this report was approved by the Board on 7 April 2008.

By order of the Board

N A Nagler - Company Secretary
7 April 2008

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT TO THE MEMBERS OF THE TAXATION DISCIPLINARY BOARD LIMITED

We have audited the financial statements of The Taxation Disciplinary Board Limited for the year ended 31 December 2007; which comprise the Income and Expenditure Account and the Balance Sheet and the related notes. These financial statements have been prepared under the accounting policies set out therein.

This report is made solely to the Company's members as a body, in accordance with Section 235 of the Companies Act 1985. Our audit work has been undertaken so that we might state to the Company's members those matters we are required to state to them in an auditor's report and for no other purpose. To the fullest extent permitted by law, we do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than the Company and the Company's members for our audit work, for this report, or for the opinions we have formed.

Respective responsibilities of directors and auditors

As described in the statement of Directors' Responsibilities the company's directors are responsible for the preparation of the financial statements in accordance with applicable law and United Kingdom Accounting Standards (United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice).

Our responsibility is to audit the financial statements in accordance with relevant legal and regulatory requirements and International Standards on Auditing (UK and Ireland).

We report to you our opinion as to whether the financial statements give a true and fair view and are properly prepared in accordance with the Companies Act 1985. We also report to you if, in our opinion, the Directors' Report is not consistent with the financial statements, if the company has not kept proper accounting records, if we have not received all the information and explanations we require for our audit, or if information specified by law regarding directors' remuneration and other transactions is not disclosed.

We read the Directors' Report and consider the implications for our report if we become aware of any apparent misstatements within it.

Basis of audit opinion

We conducted our audit in accordance with International Standards on auditing (UK and Ireland) issued by the Auditing Practices Board. An audit includes examination, on a test

basis, of evidence relevant to the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. It also includes an assessment of the significant estimates and judgements made by the directors in the preparation of the financial statements, and of whether the accounting policies are appropriate to the company's circumstances, consistently applied and adequately disclosed.

We planned and performed our audit so as to obtain all the information and explanations which we considered necessary in order to provide us with sufficient evidence to give reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or other irregularity or error. In forming our opinion we also evaluated the overall adequacy of the presentation of information in the financial statements.

Opinion

In our opinion the financial statements:

- give a true and fair view, in accordance with United Kingdom Generally Accepted Accounting Practice, of the state of the company's affairs as at 31 December 2007 and of its profit (loss) for the year then ended; and
- have been properly prepared in accordance with the Companies Act 1985; and
- the information given in the Directors' Report is consistent with the financial statements.

Alan Secker & Co

Registered Auditor

Chartered Accountants

4 Churchill Court, 58 Station Road, North Harrow, Middlesex. HA2 7SA

9 April 2008

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2007

	Note	2007	2006
		£	£
INCOME			
Contributions to expenditure from participating bodies	2	129,000	56,044
Costs borne by participating bodies	1.3	-	44,044
Cost awards recovered		1,350	300
Bank interest		616	-
		<u>130,966</u>	<u>100,388</u>
EXPENDITURE			
Amounts payable to Directors		21,558	22,374
Amounts payable to Panel members		7,819	14,223
Salaries (including NI)	1.3	49,099	} 41,900
Postage, stationery, communications		2,108	}
Scheme review		14,395	-
Legal costs	1.3	6,636	2,144
Training for panel members		14,762	-
Audit		1,028	1,087
Travel and meetings		4,500	4,332
Office and computer costs		3,181	4,847
Recruitment		3,501	8,305
Insurance		1,368	1,147
Bank charges		29	29
Miscellaneous		64	-
		<u>130,048</u>	<u>100,388</u>
SURPLUS (DEFICIT) FOR THE YEAR		918	-
Less transfer to participating bodies	6	(918)	-
		<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
		<u><u>-</u></u>	<u><u>-</u></u>

The result for the year arises from continuing operations.

No separate statement of total recognised gains and losses has been presented as all such gains and losses have been dealt with in the Income and Expenditure Account.

The notes on pages 31 and 32 form part of these financial statements.

BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2007

	Note	2007 £	2006 £
Current Assets			
Debtors	4	2,728	-
Cash at Bank		<u>5,637</u>	<u>4,778</u>
		8,365	4,778
Creditors			
Amounts falling due within one year	5	(8,365)	(4,778)
		_____	_____
Net Current Assets		<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Reserves			
Income and expenditure account		-	-
		_____	_____

These accounts have been prepared in accordance with the special provisions of Part V11 of the Companies Act 1985 relating to small companies.

Approved by the Board of Directors and authorised for issue on 1 April 2008 and signed on its behalf by:

V V R Harris
Director

P S Gravestock
Director

The notes on pages 31 and 32 form part of these financial statements.

NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2007

1. Accounting Policies

1.1 Accounting convention

The financial statements have been prepared under the historical cost convention in accordance with the Financial Standard for Smaller Entities (effective January 2007).

The company has taken advantage of the exemption in FRS1 from the requirement to produce a cash flow statement, as it is a small company.

1.2 Income

The Scheme is financed by the Chartered Institute of Taxation and the Association of Taxation Technicians and the Investigation and Disciplinary Committees' costs are shared between the two bodies in proportion to the numbers of cases dealt with from each body. All other costs are shared equally.

Both the Investigation and Disciplinary Committees are empowered to make orders for costs and in addition the Disciplinary Committee may make orders for the payment of fines. Credit is taken on receipt.

1.3 Expenditure

Expenditure includes fees and expenses of Board and Committee members for meetings and hearings held in the year.

Counsel's costs borne by the participating bodies in 2006 on the preparation and presentation of cases to the Disciplinary Committee totalled £2,144.

Secretarial and administrative support costs of jointly employed Institute and Association staff incurred by the participating bodies in 2006 were estimated at £41,900.

2. Net contributions to expenditure from participating bodies.

Contributions by the participating bodies are calculated to cover the Scheme's total expenditure less fines and costs recovered in the year, so that there is neither a surplus nor a deficit.

	2007	2006
	£	£
The Chartered Institute of Taxation (CIOT)	74,500	27,861
The Association of Taxation Technicians (ATT)	<u>54,500</u>	<u>28,183</u>
	129,000	56,044
Allocation of surplus	(918)	-
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	£128,082	-
	<hr/>	<hr/>

3. Movements on the accounts with the participating bodies.

	CIOT	ATT
	£	£
Balance as at 1 January 2007	(3,501)	(277)
Contributions	<u>(74,500)</u>	<u>(54,500)</u>
	(78,001)	(55,777)
Net Cost Allocations	<u>69,636</u>	<u>58,505</u>
Balance as at 31 December 2007	<u>(8,365)</u>	<u>2,728</u>

4. Current Assets

	2007	2006
	£	£
The Association of Taxation Technicians	<u>2,728</u>	<u>(1,277)</u>

5. Creditors - amounts falling due within one year

	2007	2006
	£	£
The Chartered Institute of Taxation	<u>8,365</u>	<u>3,501</u>

Amounts owing to the Institute represent fines and costs collected less expenses paid by the Company.

6. Allocation of Surplus (Deficiency) for the year

This is included in the net cost allocations on note 2 above

	2007	2006
	£	£
Surplus (Deficit) for the Year	918	-
Allocated to the supporting bodies:		
The Chartered Institute of Taxation	(459)	-
The Association of Taxation Technicians	<u>(459)</u>	—
	<u>(918)</u>	—
Transferred to Reserves	-	-
	—	—

7. Related Parties

The Chartered Institute of Taxation and the Association of Taxation Technicians are both related parties by virtue of their ability to influence the conduct of the company's affairs.

ANNEX A

HISTORY OF THE TDB

One of the important factors in preserving public confidence in a profession is the establishment and maintenance of appropriate professional standards of conduct for its members and the exercise of professional discipline over those who do not comply with those standards.

For a number of years the Chartered Institute of Taxation ('the Institute') and The Association of Taxation Technicians ('the Association') have had powers to issue professional rules and practice guidelines for their members and have done so. The two bodies have also had the power to enforce these practice standards through the exercise of disciplinary procedures.

Originally this power was exercised through an in-house disciplinary scheme. However, in 2000 the Institute and The Association resolved to establish an independent Taxation Disciplinary Scheme and a separate body in order to handle complaints made in regard to the professional conduct of members and students of the two bodies.

One of the objectives was to ensure that there was a common approach to procedures and philosophy in handling disciplinary matters, with a consequent improvement in efficiency and effectiveness. In addition, there was an awareness of the concepts of the Human Rights Act and, in particular, the need for complaints regarding alleged breaches of professional rules of conduct to be considered by a tribunal which was independent of the body establishing the rules. It was therefore decided that, although the disciplinary arrangements would be established by the Institute and

the Association, they would be administered through an independent company, the Taxation Disciplinary Board Limited, created expressly for this purpose.

The Taxation Disciplinary Board was set up early in 2001. The Board was charged with undertaking the fair and expeditious handling, investigation and adjudication of complaints on an impartial and independent basis. Where a complaint was proven, the Board would be responsible for imposing appropriate penalties or sanctions within the powers granted to it by the Councils of the Institute and the Association.

The Taxation Disciplinary Scheme and accompanying Regulations came into effect in March 2001, and applied to all complaints received from the beginning of that year. All members of the two bodies were covered by the Scheme, on the basis that they subscribed to its processes as a condition of their membership and as a reflection of the advantages which accrued to them as members of that professional body. Students of the two bodies were also included within the disciplinary process. Although the arrangement has continued to apply only to members of the Institute and the Association, it is structured so that other tax bodies may join at a later stage if they wish.

From the outset, overall responsibility for the Scheme was entrusted to a Board comprised of three Directors. The Chairman was to be a joint appointee of both bodies. The other members would be individual appointments of the two participating bodies. The first Chairman

was Paul Heim CMG, a barrister with considerable experience of disciplinary procedures and the European perspective. He served until October 2004, when he was replaced by the current Chairman, Dr Vicki Harris, a former Senior Civil Servant and professionally qualified accountant with considerable experience of professional regulation.

The other two founder directors were two distinguished members of the taxation profession, Roy Jennings and Ronald Ison. They were replaced by our current directors, both members of the CIOT, John Clark, a solicitor, and Peter Gravestock, a professionally qualified accountant, both of whom are also distinguished members of the tax profession.

It has always been the policy and practice that the Chairmen and members of the various Committees set up by the Board should consist of individuals who have no current involvement with the professional standards setting of the two bodies. Over the years there has been a growing participation by lay members, recruited by

the TDB on the basis of open competition. This has added to the breadth of experience which Committee members have brought to their work for the Board.

The servicing of the work of the Board was undertaken for a number of years by senior staff members of the Institute and Association. Different staff members administered the Board, the Investigation Committee and the Disciplinary Committee. They combined this work with their duties in the Institute and the Association. But as time went by, the volume of work grew and it became more difficult to balance the various work pressures. It was also judged important that the Board in all its operations be, and be seen to be, independent of the ATT and CIOT. It was therefore decided that the Board should appoint its own Executive Director, working from home on a part-time basis. After an open competition, with a very strong field of applicants, the Board appointed Neville Nagler, a former senior Home Office official, as its first Executive Director; he took up his duties in January 2007.

ANNEX B

THE ORIGINAL TAXATION DISCIPLINARY SCHEME

Under the Scheme and Regulations which applied before January 2008 (“the previous Scheme”), the complaints procedure focused upon allegations that a member or student of one of the participating bodies was in breach of their Professional Rules and Practice Guidelines.

The CIOT and the ATT made it clear that their members and students were expected to maintain standards of work and conduct which were compatible with the importance of the tax profession and which met the expectations of the public.

Where someone believed that these standards had been breached, the system allowed that person to make a complaint, which would then be independently examined by the TDB. A complaint about the professional conduct of a member or student of either body could be made either through the Secretary of that body or directly to the Board.

Role of the Board

The Board has always operated independently of the CIOT and the ATT. Under the previous Scheme, it established the following process for dealing with complaints about alleged breaches of professional rules and practice standards. These procedures applied to all the complaints received during 2007. Many aspects of these procedures have been retained under the new scheme and Regulations.

1. The Board’s Executive Director

Where a formal complaint was made to the Secretary of the CIOT or the ATT it was referred to the Executive Director of the

Board. Complaints might also be made directly to him, and this was the recommended route for complainants. In the first place the Executive Director would send the complainant a complaint form so that standard information was available and invite the submission of any relevant documents to support the complaint. He would then send these to the member who was the subject of the complaint and invite a response. The member’s response would be sent to the complainant for any further comments and, if received, those further comments would be shown to the member. If the complaint appeared trivial or outside the scope of the Scheme, it might be referred to the CIOT or ATT to consider whether it was capable of conciliation. The great majority of cases proceed to the Board’s Investigation Committee for examination.

2. The Investigation Committee

The role of this Committee was to investigate all matters referred for examination by the Executive Director in order to determine whether or not there was a prima facie breach of the relevant professional practice rules and standards. The Committee was composed of members of the CIOT and the ATT, the legal profession and lay members of the public. During 2007, the Committee sat in panels of five. The Committee was provided with a report prepared by the Executive Director, who also served as the Secretary of the Committee. This report contained a summary of the case, together with all the relevant correspondence received from the complainant and the member.

The Committee might request further information if it considered this necessary in order to ascertain the full facts of the alleged

breach and the evidence available to support the allegation. In this process the Secretary would, as appropriate, communicate with the individual under investigation, the complainant and possibly third parties. After full investigation and examination of the available information, the Committee might dismiss the complaint or find that there was a prima facie breach of the professional conduct rules or standards. If there was, it might decide that the conduct was of insufficient gravity to warrant further action; it might impose limited sanctions by consent; or it might refer the complaint to the next stage.

The sanctions available to the Investigation Committee under the previous Scheme took the form of “consent orders”. The Committee would propose that the member be admonished or that his case should rest on file for up to three years (in other words, the complaint would be referred to in the event of further disciplinary proceedings against the member during that period); in such cases, costs would normally be awarded against the member. If the member accepted the proposal of the Committee, the matter would not go any further. But if the member disagreed with the finding, he could request that the case be submitted to the Disciplinary Committee for a full hearing. In all cases, the complainant and the individual under investigation would be advised of the Committee’s findings and of the reasons for its decision.

3. The Disciplinary Committee

For cases that went forward from the Investigation Committee, the next stage in the process was the presentation of the case to the Disciplinary Committee. Cases were presented on behalf of the CIOT or ATT, usually by a barrister, who would prepare the charges and assemble the evidence. The Disciplinary Committee was, like the Investigation Committee, composed of members of the CIOT and the ATT, lawyers and lay members. It sat as a tribunal, normally with a panel of three, including a legally qualified Chairman, a member of the

relevant professional body and a lay person. Disciplinary Committee hearings were held in public. The role of the panel was to hear the evidence presented to it, including the questioning of any witnesses, in order to determine whether or not the alleged breach had been proven and to make a finding accordingly. If a breach was found, the panel could impose such penalty as they considered appropriate in the light of the powers available to them, the gravity of the breach and the facts and arguments presented. The panel would also consider whether to award costs against the member and whether its finding should be published.

4. The Appeal Committee

There was a final stage available to the individual who had been found guilty of a breach of the professional conduct rules or standards by the Disciplinary Committee. He or she could apply for a hearing before the Appeal Committee, on the grounds that there had been a misapplication of the relevant rules and/or the relevant law, or that the penalty imposed was too severe.

The Appeal Committee was, in fact, never convened under the previous Scheme. Had it done so, it would have sat in panels of three. It had the power to uphold, modify or upset any finding of the Disciplinary Committee. Its decision was final within the process.

Overall the previous Scheme sought to provide a fair and independent process for investigating and hearing complaints, whilst at the same time ensuring the fair treatment of any person against whom a complaint was made. The procedures in place were also designed to enhance the standing of the tax profession by maintaining high standards of conduct and by ensuring that complaints were dealt with in an independent and impartial way. But as time went by, experience with the previous Scheme, coupled with external changes affecting professional regulation, made it sensible to review the arrangements, as described at Pages 20-22 above.

**TAXATION
DISCIPLINARY
BOARD**

PO Box 544

Pinner

HA5 9EY

Tel/fax: 020 8868 9717

www.tax-board.org.uk

**The Taxation Disciplinary Board Limited is registered in England and Wales as
a Company limited by Guarantee, number 4210063
Registered Office: 12 Upper Belgrave Street, London SW1X 8BB**