



ANNUAL REPORT

2016/17

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Foreword by Sir Terence Etherton, Chairman of the CJC	3
Overview of the year	4
Responses to consultations	5
Civil Justice Council Committees & Working Parties	9
Annex A: CJC Members 2016/17 – Biographies	14
Annex B: CJC Business Plan 2016/17	16
Annex C: Budget for 2016/17	22

**FOREWORD BY SIR TERENCE ETHERTON, MASTER OF THE ROLLS,
CHAIRMAN OF THE CIVIL JUSTICE COUNCIL (CJC)**

The Civil Justice Council (CJC) continues to play an important role in advising on improvements to civil justice in England and Wales.

CJC members have given freely of their time, plus their considerable expertise and experience. Their willingness to do so on a purely pro bono basis reflects their commitment to improving and modernising the system, and to improving access to justice. The same applies to the wider group of practitioners who also serve on various CJC working groups.

This is a significant and volatile period for civil justice. In addition to various policy reforms, the HMCTS reform programme will see dramatic changes to the way in which the civil courts are used, and technology will improve the speed and accessibility of services. The CJC is also paying attention to those at risk of digital exclusion and how they can receive assistance.

The reporting period of 2016/17 has seen a number of important CJC initiatives completed or in progress. These are described in greater detail in this report, but all offer illustrations of the benefits of the CJC's role and work.

One of the defining characteristics of the CJC's contribution is that it embodies and represents a range of interests in civil justice. A regular feature of the CJC's work is establishing areas of consensus between claimant and defendant interests, and an ability to feed different perspectives into a debate of civil justice policy issues.

I look forward to the next year's challenges and opportunities.

Sir Terence Etherton

Master of the Rolls and Head of Civil Justice,

Chairman of the Civil Justice Council

OVERVIEW OF THE YEAR

The CJC continues to consider and advise on a wide range of different civil justice issues in England and Wales. In some areas, the CJC is proactively leading the work on reviewing and analysing current issues and challenges in the system.

One such example was the *Civil Justice Review working group*, chaired by Professor Rachael Mulheron. This group assessed two major topics in this reporting period. It completed a report on '**Hot-Tubbing**', or concurrent expert evidence, and started a review of Before The Event (BTE) insurance which will be reported in next year's Annual Report.

The hot-tubbing report has led to consideration of court procedural changes by the Civil Procedure Rule Committee, an illustration of how the CJC's work can be put into practice.

Another important CJC report published in the reporting period was on the **scope of Qualified one-way costs shifting**, looking at further areas for reform following implementation of the Jackson costs reforms. The report examined a number of issues to assist the Government in its review of the system and in developing future proposals.

The CJC's now annual public forum on **access to justice for unrepresented parties** took place in December, and brought together a rich blend of front-line workers and policy makers. These examined the Briggs Review and future court reform programme, as well as a look ahead to issues to be addressed over the next decade.

The CJC convened seminars on two important topics in this period. One provided a wide-ranging discussion on the potential for extending **fixed recoverable costs** to other areas of civil litigation. This is 'unfinished business' from the Jackson reforms, and a lively debate covered a broad range of the pros, cons and likely effects of further reform.

The other was a discussion to help inform a forthcoming Government consultation paper on increasing the **limit for the value of small claims in the personal injury** field, currently set at £1000. Experts from all sides took part and discussed in some depth issues such as how unrepresented litigants would commission medical experts when bringing claims.

The final report of Lord Justice Briggs' *Civil Courts Structure Review* was published on 27 July 2016, following interim recommendations issued in January. The report made a number of important recommendations which the HMCTS reform programme is addressing. The CJC and its expert ODR group (which originally proposed the Online Court concept) fed views into the review.

A new group has been established to look at the use of **ADR in civil justice** – this will be a major piece of work, looking at the usage and potential of ADR.

As the following pages illustrate, the CJC continues to offer objective and informed comment in response to a range of consultation papers setting out proposals that reform or impact on civil justice in England and Wales.

The CJC published its new **Diversity Plan**, designed to ensure that diversity interests were reflected in the CJC's membership and work programme.

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/>).

1. CJC response to Consultation on Proposals to reform fees for grants of probate

These proposals sought to significantly increase probate fees. The CJC felt the scale of increases were exploitative when probate is an essential part of the fabric of the rule of law and much higher court fees could have an impact on access to justice. The CJC concluded there was no basis for an increase to reflect the investment in technology and user friendly online systems because the end product would be completely automated. These included increases of £215 to £4000 for estates valued at £0.5-1m and up to £20,000 for estates valued above £2m (a 9,202% increase).

The CJC made the decision to respond despite these cases usually being lodged within the Family Division, as probate disputes are commonly contested in civil courts.

2. Defendant's Duty of Candour and Disclosure in Judicial Review Proceedings

The CJC responded against a background of the recommendations made in relation to disclosure in general civil litigation in the Jackson Report (*Review of Civil Litigation Costs: Final Report 2009*) and in criminal proceedings in the report prepared by Lord Justice Gross, *Disclosure in Criminal Proceedings*, September 2011.

The consultation paper referred to the position of claimants and proposed setting out their duty of candour. Whilst considered fair and reasonable, not all claimants would have the benefit of legal aid or legal advice and representation. For that reason, the CJC recommended the preparation of a short, one page summary of the duty of candour and its application and relevance to claimants in judicial review proceedings with the advice sector being consulted in the preparation of any such document.

3. McKenzie Friends

This consultation response considered the increasing activity and range of services offered by paid McKenzie Friends. Proposals made by the judiciary included issuing a plain English guide, updating the terminology for McKenzie Friends and the adoption of formal rules of court which would restrict the activities and prohibit the remuneration of the paid practitioners. The consultation also proposed that any costs incurred by litigants in the use of court supporters for reasonable assistance (and if the court expressly grants permission for the granting of rights of audience and the conduct of litigation) would not be recoverable.

The CJC considered this was a stark approach, due to the high cost of conventional legal services; the lack of pro bono services and the limited availability of legal aid. However, the CJC did agree that there were a number of risks to the use of paid McKenzie Friends; including the lack of regulation, lack of professional indemnity insurance; potential for poor quality advice; varying fees and the safeguards over client privacy. The CJC therefore proposed that codification would protect court users against the risks, and agreed that adopting the approach of the Scottish courts would provide an effective system of safeguards, without inhibiting the valuable role and work of unpaid McKenzie Friend. A draft code of conduct was attached to the consultation response.

4. Reform of JR: provision of financial information

This followed an earlier public consultation, arising from reforms enacted in the Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015 to increase transparency in the judicial review process.

The CJC expressed concern that these proposals went a great deal further than the previous reforms, fundamentally changing their scope. Specific concerns included the requirement for an applicant to provide information on their funding to defendants and other parties absent a requirement that defendants and other parties provide details of their funding arrangements to applicants. This was a breach of the principle of equality of arms.

Secondly, the CJC recommended that the use of cost budgeting would require both applicants and defendants (and where appropriate third parties), to exchange details concerning their expected litigation expenses, thus: (i) properly promoting equality of arms; (ii) ensuring that the position in judicial review proceedings concerning the provision of costs information was consistent with that taken in Part 7 (CPR) multi-track proceedings, and did not rest on the approach set out in the Consultation paper.

5. Advanced driver assistance systems and automated vehicle technologies

The CJC agreed that Part 6 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 should be amended to include product liability for automated vehicles to preserve existing consumer rights against advances in technology and the potential impact of this on the legal position of such claims. The CJC proposed that existing compulsory third party cover should be extended to any situation where the third party injury or damage is caused by the Advanced Driver Assistance Systems (ADAS) or Advanced Vehicle Technology (AVT) and to include injury to the driver in defined circumstances where so caused.

The Council also proposed that an additional key requirement was that the legislation should provide rights for the insurer paying claims caused by ADAS or AVT to have a right of recovery against the vehicle manufacturer where appropriate.

6. Transforming our Justice System

The CJC regarded this as a particularly important consultation considering the prevalence of digital exclusion within society estimated at 18% of the population. This figure would be higher for court users due to the number of vulnerable groups involved in litigation.

The CJC welcomed the development of more accessible online court services and the Government's commitment to assisted digital. It asserted however, that achieving a transformation required other areas to be addressed too: for instance, increasing public legal education, the availability of legal advice, improving publicly funded legal assistance and addressing the impact of court fees.

The CJC emphasised the need for pilots to be undertaken, both for online processes and for the assisted digital service developed to support them, and that assisted digital would need to come in various forms and relate to a wide variety of factors, that some people would always require face to face assistance and that any system developed would not be providing legal advice.

7. Small Business Commissioner – process for handling complaints

The CJC agreed that the Small Businesses Commissioner (SBC) should have powers to review the complaints Regulations, and the Government should monitor and evaluate their efficacy after a period of twelve months, taking evidence from both complainants and respondents.

Although it was presumed the Regulations would not stipulate mediation or another form of ADR, the CJC held it would be sensible for it to be suggested to parties and time limits could be extended while a case is undergoing an ADR process, returning to the SBC process if unresolved. The CJC also felt it would be advisable to build in the complainant's ability to withdraw their complaint, for example if the respondent makes them an offer to settle and the SBC should publish performance targets for handling complaints.

CJC COMMITTEES AND WORKING PARTIES

Boundary disputes

This group arose following the introduction of Private Members Bills focusing on resolving these disputes without the use of ADR. Although these were unlikely to become statute, the Ministry of Justice welcomed further input on this topic. The CJC decided that there was no need to create a new working group following the work already completed. Instead a one-off discussion, chaired by DJ William Jackson and HHJ Barry Cotter, was held in September 2016 to discuss options for improving a resolution of these claims.

A range of attendees, including staff from the MOJ, The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) and members of the Property Bar Association all met. This was a stimulating and interesting meeting, with discussions about the disparate ways the courts and tribunals dealt with these claims. The group decided not to recommend a full Pre-Action Protocol as this may be unduly detailed or prescriptive, but agreed to a more 'light-touch' approach with more emphasis placed on early mediation and the use of single-joint experts. These recommendations were put in a letter to the MOJ, copied to the CPRC, the Property Disputes Working Group and the ADR working group. It was also agreed that a brief guide to litigants should be drafted focusing on the importance of ADR and mediation.

Impact of Jackson

This working group had originally been set up in April 2014 with its final report sent to the Ministry of Justice in April 2016 - its recommendations focused on 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 and its final report 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 (LiPs)

The Chairman described this work as one of the great achievements of the CJC.

The fifth Forum was held at the end of 2016 and was another success with excellent feedback and the Council agreeing to increase participants the following year. A seminar was also held on Public Legal Education (PLE) at the House of Lords.

The Litigant in Person Engagement Group (LIPEG) continued its work helping to bring attention to any blind spots in court reform. Much focus was placed on civil money claims but work also went into assisted digital, the use of language, unbundling and fixed recoverable costs. The group also had Welsh representation to ensure more remote areas of England and Wales were considered.

Noise-induced Hearing Loss (NIHL) claims

In the summer of 2015 a new working group was set up under the chairmanship of Andrew Parker to consider an improved a fixed recoverable costs process for NIHL cases with work continuing into the new business year. The background to the creation of this working group can be read the previous annual reports.

During this reporting year the report moved into second phase of work to address fixed costs (having previously looked at the process of these claims.) Due to the very diverse perspectives of the members of the group, it was agreed they would have the use of mediation under the joint chairmanship of Sir Alan Ward and Peter Hurst. This occurred in July 2016 with a final effort by a smaller core group to reach agreement with further mediation. Agreement was achieved in January 2017 although some types of cases had to be excluded from the recommendations to enable this.

Membership of the group was:

- Andrew Parker, Partner, DAC Beachcroft - *Chairman*
- David Marshall, Partner, Anthony Gold Solicitors - *Deputy chairman*
- Cenric Clement-Evans, Solicitor, NewLaw Cardiff
- Bridget Collier, Principal Lawyer, Fentons Solicitors (part of Slater & Gordon)
- Ian Harvey, Senior Claims Manager, Aviva plc

- Karen Jackson, Chief Executive, Roberts Jackson
- Roland Jackson, Head of Legacy Exposures, UKGI – Technical Claims Services
- John Latter, Director of Technical Centre, Zurich Insurance plc
- Nick Parsons, Partner and Head of Insurance & Public Risk, Browne Jacobson
- Dominic Weir, Principal Lawyer. Leo Abse & Cohen (part of Slater & Gordon)
- The group will also have a district judge member.
- Robert Wright, Ministry of Justice
- Heather Atkinson, Ministry of Justice

Property disputes

Siobhan McGrath, President of the property Chamber of the First-tier Tribunal continued to lead this group. The terms of reference for that group can be found on the CJC's website.

A report was published in April 2016 alongside a successfully run workshop with 50 specialist practitioners in attendance representing 21 organisations. The outcome was a clear preference for a single housing court or tribunal, although it was accepted this was unlikely to happen. Instead the group decided to focus on flexible deployment with further consideration on the often conflicting appeal routes which may require legislative reform.

Members of the group were:

- Siobhan McGrath (President, First-tier Tribunal (Property Chamber) (Chair)
- Professor Helen Carr
- Elizabeth Cooke (Principal Judge, Land Registration Division)
- Marc Dight (HHJ Central London Civil Justice Centre)
- Anthony Essien
- Graham French
- Kerry Glanville
- Professor Caroline Hunter
- William Jackson (District Judge)
- Professor Martin Partington
- Tim Powell (London Regional Judge)
- Philip Rainey QC
- Martin Rodger QC

Civil Litigation Review

The initial focus of this new working group was to address the issue of 'Hot tubbing' and to report back by July 2016. A survey elicited 100 responses from judges, experts and legal practitioners. The report was published in July 2016 with recommendations including the redrafting of PD35.11 and the production of guidance for judges and experts. A full copy of that report can be found on the CJC website.

Group membership:

- Professor Rachael Mulheron – Queen Mary University of London (Chair)
- Maura McIntosh (Deputy Chair) (Herbert Smith Freehills, commercial litigation specialist)
- Helen Blundell (Legal Services Manager, Assn of Personal Injury Lawyers (APIL))
- Roger Clements (Member, Expert Witness Institute)
- Nicola Cohen (Chief Executive, the Academy of Experts)
- Simon Hughes QC (of Keating Chambers, representing the Bar)
- His Honour Judge David Grant (Technology and Construction Court judge in Birmingham)
- Michelle McPhee (Senior Counsel, Dispute Resolution, BP, London)
- Guy Pendell (Solicitor and Litigation Advocate, CMS Cameron McKenna LLP)
- Alec Samuels (author and academic lawyer, University of Southampton)
- Michael Stephens (arbitrator, and member of the CI Arb)
- Duncan Rutter (Forum of Insurance Lawyers (FOIL) representative)

From October 2016, the group began work on Before the Event Insurance as a possible source of funding for litigation. The group planned to meet five times before August 2017 with a report ready for the Council's comments in October 2017.

Group membership:

- Professor Rachael Mulheron (Chair) (Queen Mary University of London, and CJC member)
- Maura McIntosh (Deputy Chair) (Commercial litigation specialist, Herbert Smith Freehills)
- Lesley Attu, Product Development Manager, ARAG
- Steven Beahan, Commercial Litigation partner, Irwin Mitchell Solicitors
- Kate Fairhurst, Policy Advisor, Law Society
- Michael Hall, Aviva, ABI
- Peter Holland, Head of Legal Expenses, DWF Law
- Richard Miller, Head of Justice, Law Society
- Rocco Pirozzolo, Underwriting Director, Harbour Legal Costs Cover
- Rebecca Scott, Citizen's Advice, and member of the Civil Justice Council
- Dr John Sorabji, Principal Legal Adviser to the Lord Chief Justice and Master of the Rolls, and member of the UCL Judicial Institute
- Matthew Williams, Head of AmTrust Law, AmTrust Europe
- Robert Wright, Head of Policy, Civil Litigation Funding and Costs, and Access to Justice, Ministry of Justice, was an observer of the Working Group's discussions.

ADR

This group was established in April 2016 under the chairmanship of William Wood QC. Their first meeting was held in May 2016. Terms of Reference can be found on the CJC website. The report was expected to be completed by the next April Council meeting in 2017.

Group membership:

- William Wood QC (Chair),
- Tony Allen, Professor
- Neil Andrews,
- Graham Ross,
- Stephen Lawson,
- DJ Richard Lumb,

- Peter Farr
- Andrea Dowsett.

CJC membership at 31 March 2016

Current Civil Justice Council Membership

Category	Member	Appointment Started	Term of office
(1) Judiciary			
(a) Court of Appeal	The Master of the Rolls (Chairman)		Ex officio
	The Deputy Head of Civil Justice		Ex officio
(b) High Court	The Hon Mr Justice Knowles CBE	4 th January 2016	3 rd January 2019
(c) County Court	Vacant		
	District Judge William Jackson	6 th September 2012	4 th September 2018
(2) Legal Profession			
(a) Solicitor	Andrew Parker	31 st July 2014	30 th July 2017
	John Spencer	1 st October 2013	30 th September 2016
(b) Barrister	Vacant		
(c) Legal Executive	Craig Budsworth	16 th April 2012	16 th April 2018
(3) Civil servant concerned with administration of justice			
Ministry of Justice	Richard Mason		Ex officio
(4) Consumer Affairs			
	Christopher Warner	1 st January 2013	31 st December 2018
(5) Lay Advice Sector			

	Rebecca Scott	1 st January 2013	31 st December 2018
(6) Specific Interests			
(a) Insurance	Vacant		
	Vacant		
(b) Trade Union	Vacant		
(c) Business	Elizabeth Silver	1 st October 2013	30 th September 2016
(7) Other			
(a) Policy Director in a Solicitors' Practice	Vacant		
(b) ADR Provider	William Wood	1 st July 2014	30 June 2017
(c) Legal Academic	Rachael Mulheron	1 st May 2009	30 April 2018
(d) Lay Member	Matthew Smerdon	1 st October 2013	30 th September 2016

CJC Business Plan 2016/2017

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 particular areas
To support the Civil Courts Structure Review in its work leading to the preparation of its final report, and in specific projects resulting from that report	CJC and Exec Comm	To help inform the recommendations in that report, and to conduct further detailed work as recommended by it.	Jul 16	To assist in making well-informed recommendations on the structures in which the fruits of the HMCTS reform programme may be best integrated into the civil court structure
To prepare at least three reports on specific areas of civil litigation funding making recommendations as appropriate on areas for targeted modification and improvement.	Working group	To consider a series of discrete topics arising from the Jackson costs and funding reforms, with a focus on issues of concern to the legal marketplace	Feb 17	To recommend, where appropriate, ways of facilitating and further embedding the aims and recommendations of the Jackson reforms.
To prepare a short report on the parameters of any scheme for the extension of fixed recoverable costs, recommending the	CJC Council and Exec Comm	To gather the views of civil courts users on the advantages, disadvantages, exceptions to and practicalities of such a scheme of FRC and	Dec 16	To help ensure that litigation costs are reasonable, proportionate and that all parties to civil litigation can proceed with greater certainty

process and key principles to be followed in establishing such a regime.		facilitate and early discussion of the principles of such a scheme.		
To explore a piece of collaborative research with the LSE in the field of civil justice.	CJC Council and Executive Committee	To fulfil the CJC's statutory role and explore previously unidentified issues of concern	March 17	To identify areas for review and of further work for the Council in considering possible reforms to improve the system.

Strategic Objective 2

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 2015 National Forum	LIP WG and Secretariat	Produce a strategy for narrowing the gap between consumers and the provision of free and affordable legal advice Arrange a fifth National Forum on LIPs in 2016	Nov 2016	To better equip LIPs and professionals in obtaining effective access to the civil justice system
To support Mrs Justice Asplin in her judicial coordinating role	CJC and Secretariat	To maintain contact and support the network of 80 liaison judges by sharing ideas and good practice from around England and Wales	Ongoing	To encourage country-wide consistency and reduce duplication in initiatives in courts in England and Wales to promote access to justice for LIPs
To work with the Judicial College to develop and produce a training module on hearing cases with LIPs	Asplin J working group and planning group	To facilitate a piece of learning that can be undertaken by judges in all jurisdictions and at all levels individually or in small groups.	April 16	To clarify for judges what they can do – and what they can't – to promote a fair hearing in a case with one or more LIPs
To work with the	Working	Work on priorities in	Ongoing	To create better links

Government, judiciary, LIP support strategy, professions and advice sector to develop services and resources for LIPs	group	WG strategy for 2016 including: National and local database Improving system for early initial advice Improving PLE	Dec 16	and networks between advice and service providers To improve the accessibility and reliability of reference material To enable litigants to resolve their disputes at the earliest opportunity
---	-------	--	--------	--

Strategic Objective 3

To continue supporting the work of the working group on Property disputes

Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
To prepare a report to the CJC on modifications to the way in which specific types of property case are heard by court and tribunal, taking into account the views of stakeholders in those cases.	Working group	To advise the CJC and respond to the Civil Courts Review Structure on: - options for streamlining the hearing of cases in some areas of property law - some of the practical details relating to the preferred recommended option	April 2016	By informing the work of the Civil Courts Structure Review, to rationalise and improve the way in which specific types of property case are heard by the county court and First-tier Tribunal.
To consider the scope for improving the decision-making process in relation to boundary disputes	CJC and working group	To make recommendations on ways of: a) Improving court and tribunal procedure b) Encouraging mediation c) Making better	October 2016	To improve the process by which boundary disputes are resolved

		information available when useful		
--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--

Strategic Objective 4

To continue supporting the work of the working group on claims for noise-induced hearing loss (NIHL)

Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
To prepare a report for the MoJ on a streamlined process and fixed costs structure for NIHL cases.	Working group	To advise the MoJ on: - how the handling of NIHL cases might be improved - how a fixed costs regime for those cases might work.	July 2016	To encourage greater openness between claimants and defendants in preparing for NIHL cases, and thus improve the efficiency with which such cases are resolved and to reduce the costs of those cases.

Strategic Objective 5

To continue to support the work of HMCTS and other Government departments in their work to promote ADR and ODR.

Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
To support HMCTS project group in the consideration and establishment of HM Online Court (HMOC) in resolving lower value civil disputes.	Working Party	To establish and support a reconstituted working group under the chairmanship of Richard Susskind.	October 16	To identify and draw up detailed arrangements for possible ODR pilots
To review current incentives to ADR	New working group	To consider issues arising from the Review of the EU	October 16	To consider whether proposals for reform

		<p>Mediation Directive.</p> <p>To consider the proposals of the Centre for Justice for a change in the CPR on whether courts can mandate mediation if just one party requests it.</p>		<p>should be put to the CPRC</p>
--	--	---	--	----------------------------------

Strategic Objective 6

To respond to Government and other consultation papers that affect the civil justice system

Supporting activity	Body Responsible	Aim	Target Date	Outcome
<p>To respond to all relevant MoJ and other departments' consultation papers relating to the civil justice system</p> <p>To review other consultation papers affecting civil justice, e.g. on consumer or housing law</p>	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

Strategic Objective 7

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 undertake engagement activities to promote and encourage access to the CJC</p> <p>To engage with equivalent civil justice review bodies, whether</p>	Secretariat and Council Members	<p>To publish summaries of Council meetings and working group reports.</p> <p>To publish Annual Report 2016/17.</p>		Increased Council efficacy through increased visibility of the work which it is doing, in particular in relation to objective 1

in the United Kingdom or elsewhere, to exchange views and experiences relevant to civil justice				
---	--	--	--	--

Strategic Objective 8

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

CJC expenditure 2016/17

Description	Original Budget	Expenditure for 2016 to 2017
Judicial - Travel	1,000	768
Catering - Non-Contracted	350	319
Judicial training	22,000	10,700
Non-Staff Travel Other	6,000	7,717
Grants	0	11,000
Staff T&S	0	1,183
Professional fees (research & legal services)	10,650	4,188
	40,000	£35,875