



Civil Justice Council  
Annual Report  
2014 - 2015

# Contents

Foreword by Lord Dyson, Chairman of the CJC	3
Overview of the year	4
Responses to consultations	5
Civil Justice Council Committees & Working Parties	7
Annex A: CJC Members 2014/15	14
Annex B: CJC Business Plan 2014/15	15
Annex C: Budget for 2014/15	21

---

# Foreword by The Rt Hon Lord Dyson, Master of the Rolls Chairman of The Civil Justice Council (CJC)

Changes to the civil justice system continued unabated this year, providing a varied diet of work for the CJC, described in more detail in the body of this report.

The CJC prides itself on being a respected source of advice for the Lord Chancellor and for the judiciary. Its work takes a number of different forms, including practical recommendations to Government, often based on a specific request for advice from the Ministry of Justice, and responses to wider consultation papers from a number of different Government departments and to enquiries by bodies such as the Justice Committee.

The role of the CJC under the Civil Procedure Act 1997 is to keep the civil justice system under review. It continues to do this in particular, through the detailed work of its working groups, in areas such as the impact of the Jackson reforms, litigants in person and more effective dispute resolution.

None of this would be possible without the dedication and hard work of its members – both members of the CJC itself and those who take part in its working groups. I would like to pay tribute to the contribution of those individuals to the work of the CJC and the tangible contributions they make to the continuing improvement of our civil justice system.



The image shows a handwritten signature in dark ink, which appears to be 'Rt Hon Lord Dyson'. The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

# Overview of the Year

## 1 April 2014 - 31 March 2015

### General Comments

The Council continued to consider a variety of different issues relating to the civil justice system, particularly as the impact of the implementation of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (LASPO), implemented in April 2013, continued to be felt.

Central to the work of the Council during the course of this year was the work of its Costs Committee, detailed further below. The CJC also started to tackle two other major pieces of work in the areas of online dispute resolution (ODR) and damages-based agreements (DBAs), through the establishment of two new sub-groups under the chairmanship of Professors Richard Susskind and Rachael Mulheron respectively. The work of both of those groups is described in more detail below, and owes much to the energy and enthusiasm of those chairmen. Meanwhile, the CJC's work in the area of access to justice for LIPs continued unabated, and is also described in more detail below.

In addition to these substantial pieces of work, there were a number of other smaller scale activities. The CJC was able, again thanks to the detailed work and briefing of Professor Mulheron, to keep an eye on the progress of the Consumer Rights Bill through Parliament and in particular on the scheme for class actions envisaged by Schedule 8 to that Bill. It also continued to press for the implementation of the Third Parties (Rights Against Insurers) Act 2010 – and in particular the provisions of Part 6 that, were they to be implemented, would speed up the resolution of cases involving insurers, while reducing the administrative burden on Companies House.

The Council had planned to do some work in the area of exceptional funding, and was grateful to Martha Spurrier and the Public Law Project (PLP) for a detailed briefing on the area. In the event, the work was overtaken by litigation in the courts on the subject, though the Council continues its interest in the efficacy of that scheme in providing a safety net for those no longer qualifying for legal aid.

After a review and consultation by the CPRC, the revised guidance on experts was signed off by the Master of the Rolls and published on the judicial website in August 2014.

The CJC maintains an interest in the work of a number of bodies, in particular the Justice Committee, and its work in the area of mesothelioma claims during the period under report.

As described in the last report, non-departmental public bodies, such as the CJC, are subject to periodic reviews to establish whether there is a continuing need for its functions and if so whether

it is structured in the right way to carry them out. Stage 1 of the CJC's triennial review – agreeing that the functions still needed to be carried out – was agreed during the course of this year, and work moved onto Stage 2 and an examination of the Council's governance structure, including aspects such as the diversity and appraisal of its members, and the publication of minutes and of Annual Reports.

The Council continues with regional outreach activities – a litigant in person workshop was held in Cardiff and members regularly take part in legal conferences and events throughout England and Wales. One example being Rachael Mulheron speaking at a Practical Law Company conference in Birmingham on the CJC's work on damages-based agreements.

## Responses to consultation papers

The full CJC consultation responses summarised briefly below can be found on the Council's website (<https://www.judiciary.gov.uk/related-offices-and-bodies/advisory-bodies/cjc/>). The CJC always seeks to offer constructive responses that assist the policy making process, and provide insights from practitioners and other stakeholders into the likely effects and impact of proposals on civil justice. The CJC published a number of responses to consultations during the period.

- In its response to the BIS consultation on the implementation of the EU Directive on alternative dispute resolution (ADR) and on ADR for consumers more generally, in June 2014, the CJC noted that different jurisdictions within the court system, tribunals, Ombudsman schemes and other methods of ADR all attempt to meet the different needs of those who find themselves wishing to pursue a civil claim in different ways. The CJC agreed that consumers should be encouraged to exhaust any internal processes to resolve complaints before moving their dispute to a third party (whether that is a mediator, adjudicator or court or tribunal judge). It noted however that even with a comprehensive system of ADR, there was still a place for the courts in resolving disputes – for example, for more complex cases, those requiring a degree of case management (for example, collective actions) – as well as for those for whom ADR has failed to provide a satisfactory outcome.
- In April 2014, the CJC responded to the Justice Committee inquiry: 'Impact of changes to civil legal aid under the Legal Aid, Sentencing & Punishment of Offenders (LASPO) Act 2012'. This considered the impact of the original proposals a year after they came into effect. In its response, the CJC focussed on the paucity of official data and the difficulty in assessing the impact on access to justice in its absence. The CJC was also concerned to point out the cumulative impact of the reductions in individual eligibility alongside the fall in funding for legal providers - and at a time of increasing pressure on the advice sector and pro bono services. As a result of the work of its Litigants in Person (LIP) working group, the CJC was well-placed to provide a detailed response on the effect of the Act on the number of litigants in person and the steps that were being taken by the judiciary and other professionals to mitigate adverse effects.
- In replying to the National Audit Office (NAO)'s consultation on whether the Ministry of Justice was on track to meet its main objective of significantly reducing in a short timeframe spending

on civil legal aid in July 2014, the CJC referred back to the Justice Committee inquiry on the cost of the legal aid reforms, and took the opportunity to give a flavour of the Council's work in the area, expressing willingness to help further should the NAO require it.

- The CJC noted the contents of the Civil Procedure Rule Committee (CPRC) consultation on the Pre-Action Protocol (PAP) for judicial review cases in October 2014, and wrote saying that it had no comments on the substance of the consultation.
- In May and October 2014, the CJC responded to two MoJ consultations on independence in medical reporting and expert accreditation. While welcoming the Government's efforts to develop a more streamlined procedure for soft tissue injury claims – and one that was both transparent and proportionate – the CJC was particularly concerned that the new system of accreditation for medical experts should not be unduly expensive or cumbersome, in order to ensure that a sufficient number of individuals was ready and willing to undertake the work. The CJC was also concerned that the new scheme should allow a small selection of experts and not a single one and that the claimant should have a choice between instructing an individual expert and a medical reporting organisation. Following this consultation, a series of amendments were made to the Civil Procedure Rules with effect from April 2015, to reflect the introduction of a new system for sourcing medical reports in soft tissue injury claims brought under the Pre-Action Protocol for Low Value Personal Injury claims in Road Traffic Accidents Protocol (RTA PAP).
- In January 2015, the CJC responded to the Government's consultation on Court Fees and Proposals for Reform – Part 2, reiterating its opposition to the principle of full cost recovery for civil litigation, and by corollary to the notion of above-cost recovery advocated in the consultation. The CJC was particularly concerned about the proposal that fees for cases above £10,000 in value should be based on 5% of the claim's value, and highlighted the scale of fee increases. The CJC commended the Government's decision not to introduce daily hearing fees in commercial cases.
- In February 2015, the CJC responded to an additional Government consultation 'Further reforms to court fees'. The CJC questioned the impact assessment underlying the proposal and the assumptions made on the effect on workload of steep increases, the CJC opposed the proposed fee rises in possession claims, and in general applications – which it regarded excessive. The CJC suggested small claims be exempted from the latter proposal.

# Civil Justice Council Committees & Working Parties

## Executive Committee

The Executive Committee's role is to help provide strategic direction and focus the CJC's work programme and priorities. The Committee met on four occasions during the course of the year – each time two weeks before and in preparation for the full CJC meeting. During the year under report, the periods of office of Robin Knowles QC and John Usher came to an end, and expressions of interest in joining the Executive Committee were invited from the remaining members. As a result, John Spencer and Andrew Parker were appointed as their replacements.

The Executive Committee is also chaired by the Master of the Rolls and its deputy chairman is Lord Justice Richards. At 31 March 2015 its members were:

- Alistair Kinley
- Rachael Mulheron
- Andrew Parker
- Peter Smith
- John Spencer

## Online dispute resolution (ODR) advisory group

In April 2014, the CJC set up a new advisory group chaired by Professor Richard Susskind OBE, to explore the role that Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) might play in resolving civil disputes. In February 2015, the group published its report, in which it described its vision of a three tier system to resolve the problems of individuals and small and medium sized businesses efficiently and fairly with an emphasis on helping users to understand the options and remedies available to them in resolving their grievance, thus taking weight off the court system. The report recommended that a new internet based court system HM Online Court (HMOC) be established with the purpose of resolving disputes online – rather than simply further suggestions for ways in which technology might be used within the existing court system. As well as low value civil claims, the group believed that the system proposed might also be extended to family disputes and other appropriate cases coming currently before tribunals.

The report, along with a website including interviews with leading lights in the area of ODR and supporting materials and papers, is available on the CJC's website - [www.judiciary.gov.uk/reviews/online-dispute-resolution/](http://www.judiciary.gov.uk/reviews/online-dispute-resolution/) - along with the terms of reference for the group. It was the subject of a press launch and extensive press coverage during February 2015.

The CJC continues to recommend the inclusion of the HMOC proposed and outlined in that report into the re-structured court and tribunal system. Having finished this first part of its work, the group will continue to support HMCTS in the consideration and establishment of HMOC in resolving lower value civil disputes during 2015 and stands ready to support the Government in further exploring, testing and piloting ODR.

The membership of the group was:

- Professor Richard Susskind
- Michael Collins, Ministry of Justice
- Dr Pablo Cortés, University of Leicester
- Adrian Dally, Financial Ombudsman Service.
- Paul Harris, HM Courts and Tribunals Service
- Dr Julia Hörnle, Queen Mary University of London
- Matthew Lavy, Barrister
- Nick Mawhinney, Department for Business, Innovation & Skills
- Dr Sue Prince, University of Exeter
- Graham Ross, lawyer and mediator
- Beth Silver, Barclays Bank (and CJC member)
- Roger Smith, researcher, journalist and consultant
- Tim Wallis, independent mediator

## Costs Committee

The final and most intensive stages of the work of the CJC's Costs Committee – a group set up in April 2013 – fell within the period of this report. The Annual Report for the previous year gives a detailed account of the early work of this Committee, which had been set up early in 2013, principally to produce a set of recommendations for the Master of the Rolls (MR) on the guideline hourly rate for solicitors. In carrying out its work, the Committee adopted the 'expense of time' approach, focussing on 'what it costs lawyers to run their practices'. During the final meetings of the Committee, which took place during this period, and having carried out a deal of preparatory work and investigations, members focussed on key topics such as:

- The lower grades of fee earner, and the position of paralegals, including those with years of experience.
- The definition of post qualification experience.



- The national rates for work carried out in city centres and in more rural areas.
- The position in relation to Inner and Outer London.
- The appropriate profit margin to be applied to the hourly rates for expense of time.
- The appropriate mark up to be applied for work in progress.

There was also some discussion about the structure and implementation of the new Guideline Hourly Rates (GHR), though it was acknowledged that that was a matter for the Master of the Rolls.

In submitting the final report of the Committee to the MR in May 2014, Mr Justice Foskett touched in his covering letter on the difficulties inherent in the task:

‘In short, obtaining a sufficiently reliable and robust evidence-base to enable a “comprehensive, evidence-based review” of the GHR has proved difficult. We have had no resources with which to launch a comprehensive and statistically reliable evidence-gathering exercise and, even if we had, there would have been the issue of obtaining sufficient responses to any survey to yield a satisfactory evidence-base.’

As well as including a table of figures updated to reflect the results of the Committee’s own survey and the other data available to it, the report also made a number of recommendations in relation to the geographical boundaries for the GHR – in essence, simplifying the bands so that there was one relating to London and another to the rest of the country – as well as suggesting some modifications to the descriptions of the grades of fee-earners to which the different levels of fee related.

The report was published in July 2014, alongside the Master of the Rolls’ final decisions. Both documents are available on the judicial website ([www.judiciary.gov.uk](http://www.judiciary.gov.uk)), along with the terms of reference of the Committee. In the event, the MR felt that ‘the value of such a report ultimately depends on the quality of the data on which it is based’ and was not able to accept that the new rates recommended by the Committee should be accepted. He did however accept that with effect from 1st October 2014:

- Fellows of CILEX with 8 years’ post-qualification experience should be included in the most experienced and highest earning group of fee earners; and
- that, depending on the complexity of the work, suitably qualified and regulated costs lawyers should be eligible for payment at higher grades.

Subject to those amendments, the Guideline Hourly Rates 2010 therefore continued to be applied ‘for the foreseeable future’.

The Master of the Rolls subsequently held discussions with the Law Society and the Government on the further steps need to be taken to obtain the necessary evidence on which to base any revision of the GHR. Those discussions did not produce any conclusive results – there being no funding available for the sort of in-depth survey which the Committee had considered necessary.

Though the Committee will continue to keep a watching brief on the GHR, it is acknowledged that the likelihood is that developments in business models for law firms, increasing specialisation in areas such as commercial law, the development of the principle of proportionality, increasing familiarity with costs budgeting and the possible greater use of fixed costs in litigation mean that they are likely to become less and less relevant.

The membership of the Committee at 31 March 2015 was:

- Mr Justice Foskett, Chairman
- Peter Hurst, Senior Costs Judge, Deputy Chairman
- Simon Browne QC (Bar Council)
- Helen Buczynsky (Trade Union Council)
- Peter Causton (Law Society, defendant solicitor representative)
- David Greene (Law Society, commercial solicitor representative)
- Murray Heining (Association of Costs Lawyers)
- HH Judge David Hodge QC (Council of HM Circuit Judges)
- Adrian Jaggard (Association of British Insurers)
- David Marshall (Law Society, claimant solicitor representative)
- DJ Marshall Phillips (Association of HM District Judges)
- Philip Sherwood (Chartered Institute of Legal Executives)
- Chris Warner (Which?)
- John Windsor (Confederation of British Industry)

Robert Wright and other Ministry of Justice officials attended some meetings as observers. The Committee was supported in its work by two professional economists: Professor Paul Fenn of Nottingham University Business School, and Professor Neil Rickman of the University of Surrey. The contribution of those two expert advisers was extensive and extremely valuable to the Committee at every stage of the exercise.

## **Damages-Based agreements (DBA) working group**

In October 2014, Lord Faulks wrote to the CJC, requesting its assistance in relation to DBAs, and particularly in relation to certain drafting points in relation to amending the DBA Regulations 2014. A working group was set up under the chairmanship of Rachael Mulheron and met for the first time late in 2014 to agree its terms of reference and the process to be followed.

The group was keen to tackle the subject in two phases – first, to discuss and make recommendations on the 20 or so specific drafting points raised in the letter from the Minister, but in a second phase, and as part of its role to review the civil justice system, to look more widely at some of the policy issues relating to DBAs. During the first phase the working group considered matters such as what fell within and

outside the DBA cap, the use of DBAs by Defendants, the position regarding appeals, heads of damage for Personal Injury DBAs and the effect of set-offs and counterclaims. Phase II was to concentrate on areas such as the treatment of recoverable costs, the ongoing application of the indemnity principle and the absence of any requirement for independent advice before the DBA is entered into. By the end of the period under report, the group was well on track to publish its recommendations in May 2015.

The terms of reference for the group can be found on the CJC's website. The members were:

- Professor Rachael Mulheron (Chair) (CJC member)
- Andrew Parker (CJC member)
- Peter Smith (CJC member)
- Stuart Kightley (APIL)
- Nick Parsons (FOIL)
- Mark Friston (Bar Council)
- David Greene (Law Society)
- Maura McIntosh (commercial litigator)
- Hardeep Nahal (Commercial Litigation Forum)
- David Taylor (Employment law specialist)

## **‘Impact of Jackson’ working group**

This working group was set up in April 2014, in the light of the discussion at the Impact of Jackson conference held by the CJC in March 2014 and described in the previous Annual Report. The group met three times during the course of the year, and discussion centred principally around the transitional problems encountered by claimants, defendants and their legal representatives in pursuing claims whose procedural processes straddled the costs regime pre-dating the Jackson reforms and the new system that came into place in April 2013. Members also considered the extension of the system of costs protection known as qualified one way costs shifting (QOCS) to other areas, such as certain actions against the police.

The terms of reference for the group can be found on the CJC's website. The members were:

Alistair Kinley (Chairman) District Judge Ayers Steven Green Mark Harvey David Johnson David Marshall Maura McIntosh John Mead Professor Rachael Mulheron Jenny Screech Peter Smith

## **Litigants in person**

There were a number of different initiatives in this area during the course of the year, focusing increasingly around a small group set up, at the invitation of the Master of the Rolls in December 2013, under the lead of Mrs Justice Asplin. The other members of that group are:

- Mr Justice Knowles
- DJ Chris Lethem.

Its purpose is to look at judicial coordination of the various projects across the country relating to LIPs relating to courtroom practice and made increasingly apparent by the CJC's series of National Forums.

During the course of the year, there were three main strands to the group's work:

1. Judicial training. Liaising with the Judicial College, the group discussed ways of producing a short training programme designed to help judges explore the ways in which they might manage a hearing to ensure a fair hearing when one or more parties was unrepresented. With that in mind, at the end of the period under report, a planning group was set up tasked with taking work on the format of that short training module forward during 2015.
2. Role of the professions. Following positive discussions with the Bar Council, CILEX and the Law Society on joint guidance for practitioners acting against LIPs, draft guidance was produced and circulated for discussion and amendment. The professional bodies refined and published the guidance in June 2015.
3. LIP liaison judges. A group of 80 liaison judges had been nominated in courts across England and Wales, with the aim, first, of encouraging local meetings to establish links with professions, universities and the advice sector and more broadly to act as a link in harnessing good practice and disseminating it more widely. A first in a series of occasional updates was produced for that group of judges in January 2015 with the aim of pointing them to particular pieces of work around the country and helping them to further expand their own local sources of help and information.

Mrs Justice Asplin also led on a piece of work for the Judicial Executive Board, helping the judiciary to set out their initial thoughts on the approach of the courts to McKenzie Friends - and with a particular focus on unpaid McKenzie friends. This piece of work was undertaken as the first part in a wider consultation and debate among other judges, the professions, regulators, Government, court users and others on the topic - and will continue into 2015.

## National Forum

The CJC held the third in its series of annual National Forums on Access to Justice in November 2014, and in doing so brought together 130 judges, lawyers, advice workers, academics, regulators and civil servants to discuss progress made on improving access to justice for LIPs.

Chaired as in previous years by Mr Justice Knowles, the event started with opening remarks from the Master of the Rolls. The programme included short talks from a variety of speakers on topics such as the LIP Support Strategy (and the opportunity it presented for a new working relationship) pro bono advice - including examples of duty representation schemes in the Chancery Division, and judicial coordination of initiatives. These included the promotion of fair hearings where one or both parties are unrepresented.

Broadly put, the theme of the day was collaboration, and recognising that it did not happen by chance, but required hard work and continued commitment.

A summary of that event and the talks given and discussion held can be found on the website at - [www.judiciary.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/web-summary-of-lip-forum-2014.pdf](http://www.judiciary.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/web-summary-of-lip-forum-2014.pdf).

Finally, the CJC held another in its series of regional workshops in Cardiff in July 2014 with the intention of introducing judges and court staff to the range of different people and local organisations involved in providing pro bono advice and other services for LIPs.

## Annex A CJC membership at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015

Category	Member
(1) Judiciary	
(a) Court of Appeal	The Master of the Rolls (Chairman)
	The Deputy Head of Civil Justice
(b) High Court	Mr Justice Foskett
(c) County Court	His Hon Judge David Grant
	District Judge William Jackson
(2) Legal Profession	
(a) Solicitor	Andrew Parker
	John Spencer
(b) Barrister	Vacant
(c) Legal Executive	Craig Budsworth
(3) Civil servant concerned with Ministry of Justice	Richard Mason
(4) Consumer Affairs	
	Christopher Warner
(5) Lay Advice Sector	
	Rebecca Scott
(6) Specific Interests	
(a) Insurance	Martin Saunders
	Peter Smith
(b) Trade Union	Vacant
(c) Business	Elizabeth Silver
(7) Other	
(a) Policy Director in a Solicitors' Practice	Alistair Kinley
(b) ADR Provider	William Wood
(c) Legal Academic	Rachael Mulheron
(d) Lay Member	Matthew Smerdon

## Annex B Civil Justice Council: 2014 - 15 Business Plan

### Strategic Objective: 1

To consider areas for improvement in the operation and delivery of the civil justice system, and to make recommendations for improvements

Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
To review the operation of the civil justice system, highlight problems and make recommendations for improvements	CJC Council and Executive Committee	To ensure the CJC is fulfilling its statutory role and drawing on the expertise and experience of members and other professionals	Ongoing	To identify areas for review and to take steps to assess and report on possible reforms to improve the system in areas, such as the pressures on law firms of conducting larger litigation.
To consider the outcomes of the March 2014 'Jackson' conference, including Professor Peysner's report	CJC Council and Executive Committee	As above, to ensure that the CJC is fulfilling its statutory role	October 2014	To identify specific pieces of work to be carried out by the CJC in the light of discussion at the March 2014 event

### Strategic Objective 2

To continue supporting the work of the Costs Committee

Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
To prepare new GHR, along with accompanying report, guidance and covering note	Costs Committee	To make recommendations to MR on new GHR	April 2014	To provide advice to the Master of the Rolls on new Guideline Hourly Rates

To identify alternative methods of establishing an updated GHR in future	Costs Committee	To put in place a detailed plan for updating the guidelines hourly rates (GHR)	November 2014	To establish an effective mechanism for annual review of the Rates
To provide advice on other aspects of costs, as described in its terms of reference		To identify issues relating to costs on which evidence-based research and guidance would be of benefit		To provide guidance to the MR in those areas

### Strategic Objective 3

To continue to implement the CJC report on access to justice for Litigants in Person (LIPs) and work with Mrs Justice Asplin, the MoJ and advice sector to put in place activities that will assist LIPs

Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
To continue to work to implement the recommendations of the report and the conclusions of the 2013 National Forum	LIP WG and Secretariat	Arrange a third National Forum on LIPs	Nov 2014	To better equip LIPs and professionals in obtaining effective access to the civil justice system



To support Mrs Justice Asplin in her new judicial coordinating role	CJC and Secretariat	To build a network of 170 nominate judges throughout England and Wales	May 2014	To encourage country-wide consistency and reduce duplication in initiatives in courts in England and Wales to promote access to justice for LIPs
		To initiate local court-focussed meetings on LIPs, and gather the lessons and outcomes of those meetings	Sept 2014	
		To facilitate the production of draft pan-professional guidance on the role of a lawyer in cases with one or more LIPs.	July 2014	To increase the confidence and understanding of professionals of their duties when acting for or against an LIP
To consider the functioning of the MoJ's exceptional funding scheme	LIP WG, CJC and Secretariat		Sept 2014	
To work with the Government, judiciary, professions and advice sector to develop services and resources for LIPs	CJC	Work with judiciary on producing McKenzie Friends guidance	Sept 2014	To create better links and networks between advice and service providers
		Work with HMCTS on review of court forms and leaflets	Ongoing	To improve the accessibility and reliability of reference material
		Continue to develop regional links	Ongoing	

<b>Strategic Objective 4</b>				
To make recommendations on the use of online dispute resolution (ODR) in resolving lower value civil disputes				
Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
To support Professor Richard Susskind in conducting a review of the potential and limitations of the use of ODR in England and Wales for disputes of value less than £10,000.	Working Party	To consider a report in October 2014 and make recommendations on the use of ODR in civil disputes	October 2014	To encourage effective and efficient methods of resolving lower value civil disputes

<b>Strategic Objective 5</b>				
To respond to Government and other consultation papers that affect the civil justice system				
Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
To respond to all relevant MoJ and other departments' consultation papers relating to the civil justice system  To review other consultation papers affecting civil justice, e.g. on consumer or housing law	CJC and Secretariat	To seek advice from members to co-ordinate suitable and representative consultation responses	Varied	To ensure that the CJC contributes to civil justice policy and decision making by adding expert views on proposals and their impact on civil justice

<b>Strategic Objective 6</b>				
To prepare the CJC for, and assist with, Stage 2 of the Triennial Review of the Council				
Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
To ensure that the CJC is able to provide up-to-date information concerning its governance arrangements	CJC Secretariat	<p>To prepare and implement a business plan and budget</p> <p>To ensure CJC governance arrangements are effective</p> <p>To put in place a plan to prepare for Stage 2 of the review</p>	To be completed by October 2014	The completion of Stages 1 and 2 of the Triennial Review.

<b>Strategic Objective 7</b>				
To improve communications and outreach work to promote the work of the Council and to engage effectively with other bodies in the civil justice system				
Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
<p>To improve the CJC web content in the light of the transfer to a new supplier</p> <p>To undertake engagement activities to promote and encourage access to the CJC</p>	Secretariat and Council Members	<p>To put together a communications plan.</p> <p>To implement that plan, in order to raise profile of Council and increase stakeholder engagement</p> <p>To ensure web content is clearly laid out and kept up-to-date.</p> <p>To publish Annual Report 2014/15.</p>	<p>May 2014</p> <p>October 2014</p> <p>December 2014</p>	Increased Council efficacy through increased visibility of the work which it is doing, in particular in relation to objective 1

<b>Strategic Objective 8</b>				
To provide Secretariat support for the work of the Council				
Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
To ensure that the Council works in line with the guidelines for public bodies	Secretariat	To follow guidelines for recruitment and appraisal	Ongoing	To comply with the guidelines of the Office for the Commissioner of Public Appointments

<b>Strategic Objective 9</b>				
To review and report on ADR training in further education institutions. (This is a collaborative project with the Civil Mediation Council and the Chartered Institute of Arbitrators.)				
Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
To review and report on ADR training in further education institutions	Working party	To oversee research project and report findings to the Council	October 2013	Gather evidence regarding the provision of existing ADR training to further education institutions to help inform debate in the profession and by Government of standards of ADR provision
To agree a programme of work based on the report's findings				

## Annex C Budget 2014/15

The Council is an independent public body, funded by the Ministry of Justice and sponsored by the Judicial Office. As an arms length body, it does not prepare a separate account but is accounted for as part of the Judicial Office.

During the year under report, the CJC handed back £26,000 of its budget as it became clear that the Costs Committee would not require the amount originally envisaged and set aside for further independent research as part of its work on the revised guideline hourly rates.

It remains important to note that the CJC continues to carry out its work as such a low cost as a result of the willingness of its members and other experts across the civil justice system to volunteer their time, expertise and knowledge free of charge. The CJC remains indebted to all those individuals whose considerable, and on occasion indefatigable, talents enable it to achieve its aims.

	<b>Original</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Research</b>	23,000	1000
<b>Events (Judicial training)</b>	5,500	5,200
<b>Prof fees</b>	2,800	1000
<b>Non-staff travel to meetings</b>	4,400	4500
<b>Transcripts</b>	300	300
<b>Printing (Graphic services)</b>	1500	1000
<b>Judicial – travel to meetings</b>	225	1500
<b>Staff training</b>	500	nil
<b>Publications</b>	2000	nil
<b>Staff travel</b>	800	550
	£41, 025	£15,050