



SENIOR PRESIDENT
OF TRIBUNALS

Tribunals Judicial Ways of Working

CONTENTS

[Introduction](#)

[Summary](#)

[Tribunals Judicial Ways of Working Positions: The Plan](#)

- [Open Justice](#)
- [Safeguard the rule of law by facilitating access to justice / fairness](#)
- [Assisted Digital](#)
- [Case Officers](#)
- [Pre-Hearing Supervision / triage](#)
- [Change \(including digital\) Delivery](#)
- [Digital Training](#)
- [Tribunals Estates](#)
- [Support Services for CTSCs, courts and Tribunals and national/regional offices](#)

[Appendix A – Cross-jurisdictional positions](#)

- [Staffing in Courts and Tribunals; the CTSCs and Listing](#)
- [Fully Video Hearings](#)
- [Effective Digitised Systems](#)
- [Judicial User Interface](#)

[Appendix B – Tribunals Judicial Working Group Members](#)

Introduction

Many of you responded to the exercise that we commissioned earlier this year to seek your views on Tribunals Judicial Ways of Working (JWoW). Thank you. There were more than 40 meetings arranged in courts and Tribunal buildings across Scotland, England and Wales. Survey responses were received from or on behalf of over 10,000 judges, panel members and magistrates and almost 800 judicial office holders attended local meetings. Our aim was to understand what interests you and concerns you about the modernisation programme and what you would like us to do about it.

In July the Lord Chief Justice and I sent a [message to all judicial office holders](#) about the key themes that were emerging from an analysis of the survey responses and the meetings and discussions which many of you participated in. In our more recent [November message](#), we shared progress on how the leadership judges and those engaged in the various modernisation projects are taking forward your views.

This message is to tell you more about what you, collectively, said about the modernisation proposals and specifically those relating to the Tribunals' jurisdictions, how this is being acted on, and what you can expect to see over the course of the next year. The details are set out below. Each element of the modernisation programme is set out separately with a short statement of the fundamental principle that underpins each element; how that translates into a design idea and then the identified solution and the actions that have been agreed. What is described below has been discussed between myself, on behalf of each Tribunal, and the HMCTS Chief Executive, Susan Acland-Hood and her Director of Change, Richard Goodman. These positions will only be departed from by agreement with the judiciary. The document also includes, where appropriate, the cross-jurisdictional positions reached in Crime, Civil and Family where they apply to us in the Tribunals.

There are two overarching principles which we all agree are fundamental; the first is that access to justice must be improved not reduced. Judges are responsible for safeguarding the rule of law and we will ensure that whatever process is used, in each Tribunal and in each individual case, it is both fair and will facilitate effective access to justice that is open to public scrutiny. The second, which came very clearly out of our discussions, is that 'one size does not fit all' – modernisation has to be and will be jurisdiction specific. There is a great deal of good work being done by Tribunal judges from across all of our jurisdictions to ensure that modernised process and technology will be chamber and jurisdiction specific so that it will work for our users and for you.

The plans which we set out in this document are intended to illustrate where we are going and how we intend to get there. I will be describing those plans in greater detail in my Annual Report which will be published at the end of the year. In this document you will read that there are 'identified solutions': where you have identified a potential problem, we have suggested a solution based upon what you have said. That solution is not fixed in stone. It is in the nature of a change programme that we learn as we move through the programme.

What follows is the solution that is being worked on at the moment. We will continue to be flexible, both as we learn from the projects that are successfully completed and also as we adapt new processes and common components to our jurisdictions, recognising the changing needs you identify and those of the public we are here to serve.

Summary

The detailed positions set out below are grouped into the clear themes that emerged from your feedback and our discussions. This summary is only intended to set the scene.

Judges will shape and lead reform in each of our jurisdictions to ensure that the rule of law is safeguarded and, in particular, that **effective access to justice** is improved. New process or the use of digital tools should never lead to less fair procedures or less effective access to justice. We must strive to ensure that our decision making is no less **open to public scrutiny** than it is at present, that is, the careful balance we strike between open justice and the privacy of an individual's personal information is maintained.

We have looked at how we ensure that systems are designed to meet the needs of the people who use them, for example how digital access is facilitated for the digitally excluded (a new service known as **Assisted Digital**). That solution is presently being trialled alongside the SSCS project. The SSCS jurisdiction has users who we expect to be vulnerable and/or digitally excluded. We will learn important lessons about their needs from this aspect of the modernisation programme. Alongside this trial, case officers, working with judges in the IAC project, will develop an idea known as **Case Supervision**. Working under the direct supervision of their judges, they will ensure that digital bundles are put together in the way you want them to be and that parties are given instruction to ensure that directions are complied with, that issues are identified, that documents are relevant to the issues identified and are uploaded in time. We expect the benefits of this project to include improved timeliness and preparation, better access to justice for litigants in person, better issue identification, case progression and compliance.

The Tribunals led the way in the use of **Case Officers** before the modernisation programme began. Many of our jurisdictions have had Registrars, legal officers and advisers and proper officers working with our judges for a number of years. We successfully trialled a new generation of tribunals case workers as part of the modernisation programme and we have now developed a career structure for all 'Authorised Officers' (the description that will in future be used in Rules and Practice Directions that permit their use). They play a crucial role in Tribunals and they are highly valued for the work they do with us. We recognise that different models with differing levels of responsibility will work in each Tribunal and that how and where authorised officers are used should be determined by each jurisdiction but subject to the overall protection of permissions that I will give based on clear authorisations contained in Rules and Practice Directions. Authorised officers will never make decisions that are reserved to judges or tribunal panels, in particular substantive decisions in

contested cases, and there will always be an automatic right of review of an authorised officer's direction to a judge.

Implementing change is a specialist task. There will be identified HMCTS managers and teams who are responsible for delivering successfully piloted projects in each jurisdiction. The **Delivery of Change** will depend on the agreement of an 'end-to-end' model for each jurisdiction which will provide individual solutions to digital working in each Tribunal. We will carefully consider how the Common Components, new process and ways of working fit together to meet the particular needs of each Tribunal. Our judges are very closely involved in the detailed designs. There is work to be done to agree the important features of the hardware and software that will be used to support us. We have paid particular attention to the requests of our varied and diverse fee-paid colleagues and we have asked for an IT solution that works for them. We have negotiated the necessary funding for **Digital Training** that will be overseen by the Judicial College and our judge trainers. The training will be available to judges and non-legal members and will include opportunities for authorised officers to be trained with us. Training will be designed around needs analyses which will capture the diverse variety of needs that have been identified.

In jurisdictions where video hearings are to be enhanced and **fully video hearings** tested, great care is being taken to make sure the system is designed with the needs of judges and users front and centre. Judges must not, for example, be expected to operate the equipment without appropriate support from staff, the judge will need to know (and will know) whether the hearing is being observed, and judicial and user feedback about the system will be captured and analysed to provide quality assurance feedback and research and development opportunities. The same approach to evidence based testing and feedback will be used in our **continuous online resolution** pilot in SSCS.

The work towards a **Tribunals Estates Strategy** which considers each building in the Tribunals estate is an immense task but is nearly complete. The strategy and the principles which will determine how the leasehold estate is managed and how we plan for the future is expected to be agreed by February 2019. Circumstances may change over time and that may cause us to alter our plans but this project is designed to ensure that the diverse needs of Tribunal jurisdictions are met. There is acknowledgement that some judges and members are currently in unsuitable accommodation; there is acceptance that provision for the Tribunals should in no way be inferior to that provided for the courts and a real desire to ensure that modernisation secures improvements to our working environment within limited but identified budgets. Tribunals and their users have differing needs from each other as well as from the courts and that is understood.

There is also agreement that there will be no reduction in the **Support Services** provided for judges in hearing centres and for leadership judges nationally and regionally as HMCTS re-organise their local services and back office functions into Courts and Tribunals Service Centres. There is a great deal to do to identify the functions that we must preserve and to agree how the new working arrangements will work together but the essential message is

that the Tribunals have been working in this way since the creation of the unified Tribunals after the 2007 Act.

There is, of course, a considerable amount of detail and what is set out below are only the headlines. If you are interested in a particular area then more information on each of the projects can be found on the reform pages of the judicial intranet at <https://intranet.judiciary.uk/hmcts-reform/about-reform/>. You should also feel free to speak with members of the Tribunals Change Network (listed in appendix B) who bring together all of our project judges and working groups with your association representatives and leadership judges. They can and will feed your thoughts into the various projects and programmes.

Modernisation will only succeed with the involvement of our judges and members and by using your knowledge and experience. In truth, change is all about leadership, communication and engagement to make sure the Tribunals justice system continues to provide for the needs of its users. This is a time of uncertainty for all of us not just about modernisation, ways of working and possible building closures but also about pay, pensions and expenses. I am committed to being as transparent as possible about the progress we are making and to continue to encourage a process of listening to the views of judges and members. The continued efforts of the Tribunals judiciary in the modernisation programme are greatly appreciated.

I want to thank you for your involvement so far and give you my assurance that the senior judiciary are working hard to reflect your views and maintain the fundamental principle of access to justice.

Sir Ernest Ryder
Senior President of Tribunals

Tribunals Judicial Ways of Working Positions: The Plan

The responses from the Tribunals judiciary to JWoW, and the feedback given through our regional meetings, was brought together for members of the Tribunals Change Network to consider over the summer. The issues raised, and problems underpinning them, were discussed in detail, and a plan to provide solutions to those problems was identified. That plan has now been settled by the Change Network, and agreed by HMCTS. It is summarised below, including reference to the principles identified by the Change Network as being of central importance to the Tribunals judiciary and the users of our system.

- **Open justice**
 - The principle is that (subject to any overall cross jurisdictional agreement) the process should be no less open than the Rules and Practice Directions presently provide
 - The design concept is to afford appropriate scrutiny to the public by digital means as an alternative to or in addition to open hearings
 - The identified solution is to record all Tribunal hearings as the primary ‘record of proceedings’ under the Rules, to identify a recording solution for video hearings and continuous online resolution and to identify which hearings are to remain face to face and open and which are to be digitally open
 - Recording will be made available to be watched or listened to by members of the public. A protocol for transcript provision is to be agreed that is no less stringent than at present used in the courts or in the Glasgow pilot.
 - **Actions:**
 - Identify all types of case management and hearings and whether they are open or article 6 dependent
 - Agree a recording and transcription protocol
 - Consider any Rules changes about the ‘record of proceedings’
 - Draft a model Practice Direction for open justice provision

- **Safeguard the rule of law by facilitating access to justice / fairness**
 - The principle is no less access to justice than the Rules and Practice Directions presently provide
 - The design concept is ‘to enhance access to justice including substantive and procedural fairness by digital means’
 - The identified solution is to make provision by a Practice Direction in each jurisdiction which describes the methods including the digital channels that are available for use (for example: online continuous resolution, fully video hearing, paper or face to face) and the choice / directions / considerations which will apply so that it is the responsibility of the judge in each case to apply the Rules (including the overriding objective), the Practice Direction and any binding decisions to the facts of the case
 - **Actions:**
 - Identify a way of cross checking access to justice implications that arise out of each new way of working (for example: effectiveness, efficiency, speed, innovation, expert decision making including observational satisfaction: availability, comprehensibility, whether the remedy solves the problem and user acceptance)

- Draft a model Practice Direction that identifies how to make the decision for each step in a theoretical process
 - Draft a Practice Direction for each tribunal jurisdiction
 - Cross check case officer Practice Directions for levels of authorisation
- **Assisted Digital**
 - The principle is to facilitate access to justice for the digitally excluded
 - The design concept is to provide a service known as ‘assisted digital’ to meet the access to justice needs of those who are digitally excluded
 - The solution is identified but must now be trialled in Social Security and Child Support
 - **Actions:**
 - Cross-check the recommendations of the JUSTICE report with the service and publish the principles on which it will work
 - Trial the service including the face to face provision
 - Develop the model for other Tribunals
- **Case officers**
 - The principle is that authorised officers (formerly known as case officers) including our Registrars, legal officers / advisers and tribunal case workers are authorised to undertake judicial functions appropriate to their skills and abilities that do not determine the substantive outcome of a case
 - The design concept is that authorised officers are only to be used when authorised by the Senior President of Tribunals at the request of Chamber Presidents under Rules and Practice Directions to be made in each jurisdiction by the SPT. They are supervised in their judicial functions by nominated judges in accordance with a protocol.
 - The identified solution has been proved in Tribunals. In order to successfully implement the solution and maximise operational effectiveness a protocol is to be agreed with the SPT and each Chamber President dealing with the following:
 - In each jurisdiction, the functions of each type of authorised officer
 - The supervision of and the locations at which the functions are to be performed which are to be directed by Chamber Presidents and supervising judges
 - A funding formula for the complement of authorised officers in each jurisdiction
 - The recruitment competencies which are to include the skills and abilities framework for Judicial Office Holders as applied to the authorised functions
 - The training in authorised functions which is to be agreed with the Director of Training for Tribunals at the Judicial College and will contain annual opportunities for training with supervising judges
 - A career development scheme which provides opportunities to obtain professional qualifications
 - **Actions:**
 - Finalise from the pilots and put in place a model Practice Direction for use in all jurisdictions dealing with each level / type of authorised officer and their functions
 - Agree the protocol for operational use
 - Agree funding for complements and training with judges

- **Pre-hearing supervision / triage**

- The principle is that in a authorised officer facilitated process like the Court of Appeal, the Upper Tribunal and some but not all First-tier Tribunals, authorised officers will be permitted to assist the judge to facilitate access to justice by helping prepare materials (including standard directions, the agreement of issues and the compilation of an electronic bundle) before each hearing
- The design concept is to permit authorised officers to provide assistance with documentary preparation during pre-hearing supervision / triage
- The identified solution is to mirror the functions of Upper Tribunal Registrars (and Court of Appeal Deputy Masters) in a Practice Direction which preserves the limits that already exist both on proportionality grounds and in the adversarial party-party context
- **Actions:**
 - Collate and refine the Court of Appeal and Upper Tribunal (inc Employment Appeal Tribunal) Registrar Standard Operating Procedures into a model Practice Direction that is incorporated into the authorised officer Practice Directions
 - Identify the cost implications and the extent to which the practice is already in place
 - Identify the circumstances in which the facilitation should not be provided

- **Change (including digital) Delivery**

- The principle is that individual jurisdictions should agree the way in which new ways of working (common components, projects and process) are to be used in their Tribunals
- The design concept is that once proved in pilots, new ways of working that deliver agreed principles by agreed design concepts are to be implemented by a joint team of judges and HMCTS operational teams in each Tribunal
- The identified solution is to have an implementation plan for each Tribunal with a named HMCTS manager working with the leadership judiciary in each Tribunal
- **Actions:**
 - Develop an end-to-end ways of working template for each Tribunal
 - Identify the ways of working changes by process, digital components and judicial function
 - Identify the hardware and software solutions most suited to the jurisdiction(s) of the Tribunal (including appropriate screens, laptops, tablets and presentation equipment)
 - Identify training needs (see digital training)
 - Identify digital / support needs (eg help desks, in-house Information technology liaison judges and digital support officers)
 - Agree the digital / reform proposition for the fee paid inc non-legal members

- **Digital Training**

- The principles that have been agreed in cross-jurisdictional discussion are as follows:

- Sufficient funding will be made available to the Judicial Office to permit the effective and proportionate training of all the relevant judiciary before new technology or a new way of working is introduced to them
 - Digital and associated reform training will be undertaken in accordance with training need analyses that are constructed by the Judicial College in the usual way i.e. they are signed off by judges. Training should be delivered in a way most suited to the recipient, rather than a one size fits all approach.
 - Reform Business Readiness Tests (BRT) will include an assurance that all relevant members of the judiciary have been offered the necessary training.
- The design concept is that reform training needs will be identified at milestones in each project which will then be agreed to be delivered by a range of methods including, where funded, by the Judicial College in order to prepare judicial office holders for new ways of working. That will include leadership training in change leadership, in particular engagement and communication.
- The identified solution is being developed into an agreement between HMCTS and the Judicial College. It will be led by the Judicial College.
- **Actions:**
 - Finalise the agreement which is to include:
 - The process by which a training need is identified as a milestone in each project
 - The creation of Training Needs Assessments for sign-off by training judges
 - Methods of delivery
 - The Funding principle for the Judicial College
 - Training propositions for the fee paid including non-legal members
 - Develop Judicial College delivery plans
 - Develop Judicial College leadership training

- **Tribunals Estate**

- The principle is to manage the Tribunals estate in accordance with criteria that accord the same public status, access to justice and quality of jurisdictionally appropriate accommodation for Tribunals justice as for other jurisdictions
- The design concept is to develop and implement a Tribunals estate strategy
- The identified solution is agreed and the strategy should include the following:
 - The Tribunals estate strategy will involve agreements between the SPT and the Chief Executive of HMCTS, whilst recognising that the Lord Chancellor is responsible for the provision and funding of the estate. All decisions about the estate will engage the four principles already agreed and, where appropriate, the principles for the closure of court and tribunal estate approved by the HMCTS Board
 - Implementation plans should be agreed with relevant Chamber Presidents before a closure takes place and the plans should include the identification of the HMCTS manager and leadership judges jointly responsible for taking forward the implementation, site plans for integration of the judicial office holders and their workload and a timetable
 - Buildings to which judges and work are moved will be appropriate to their jurisdictional use i.e. if not design guide then agreed for the jurisdiction and building concerned
 - Supplementary provision that is necessary to provide local access to justice that is jurisdictionally necessary (eg mental health, property or local Social

Security and Child Support hotspots) should be agreed in protocols for the use of alternative accommodation in each relevant tribunal

- **Actions:**
 - Finalise the Tribunals Estate Strategy
 - Develop protocols for the use of supplementary provision
- **Support Services for CTSCs, courts and Tribunals and national/regional offices**
 - The principle is that HMCTS support for judges in hearing rooms and Tribunals leadership judges nationally and regionally should be no less than that presently provided
 - The design concept is to agree the functions and scaling that are to be provided locally, regionally and nationally
 - The identified solution is to develop a plan that provides for the following:
 - A new relationship between regional offices and Tribunals
 - HMCTS support provided to judges and users in hearing rooms (clerks, ushers and face to face services) will not be less than at present
 - HMCTS support for Chamber President / jurisdiction board teams and regional judge teams will be identified and agreed by function and scaling
 - HMCTS services and support for judges which is provided in cross jurisdictional buildings should be managed by a named person in the building who is not jurisdiction specific i.e. Tribunals are no longer to be regarded as visitors in HMCTS buildings inc crown courts and magistrates' courts
 - HMCTS services that are moving to Courts and Tribunals Service Centres including from existing back offices will have a transition plan that is agreed with a named responsible manager for the jurisdiction concerned and criteria for the closure of legacy services which will include Business Readiness Tests for the transition
 - **Actions:**
 - Agree national and regional office functions and scaling
 - Agree local hearing centre functions and scaling
 - Develop support plans for each jurisdiction which describe the management and inter-relationship between Courts and Tribunals Service Centres, local courts and Tribunals and national/regional offices

Appendix A – Cross-jurisdictional positions

1. The following discussions took place with the Crime, Civil and Family jurisdictions of the courts on behalf of all courts and Tribunal judges and they will apply equally to the Tribunal jurisdictions.

2. **Staffing in Courts and Tribunals; the CTSCs and Listing:**
 - a. HMCTS is building the model for the future staffing of courts and Tribunals and the Courts and Tribunals Service Centres (CTSCs) by reviewing the workload of each of the administrative tasks which support us to reach an estimate for required staffing levels. The present business case assumptions will not be used as a ‘top down’ target to be met.
 - b. The Judicial Engagement Groups will discuss staffing in courts and Tribunals and will inform HMCTS of their views about the required roles and appropriate staffing levels needed to support the judiciary. All courts and Tribunals will be staffed to agreed minimum levels, and the staff will be carrying out agreed roles, to ensure that the judges can work effectively and efficiently.
 - c. Work is ongoing on the detailed design of the CTSCs. This will be discussed with the Judicial Engagement Groups and will include an agreed, effective and responsive system of communication between the CTSCs and courts and Tribunals, and a structure to deal with the handover from one to the other.
 - d. All courts and Tribunals will have an appropriate number of Listing Officers based at hearing centres; those fulfilling that role will be fully supported and any listing work performed at the CTSCs will be fully integrated with the listing at the hearing centre. This is designed to ensure that leadership judges retain proper judicial control of all listing functions.
 - e. Future decisions about where listing work takes place will be taken on the basis of an appraisal of the most suitable location in agreement with the judiciary. Detailed judicial knowledge at a local level is often critical to effective listing.
 - f. The Scheduling and Listing tool will support listing officers and leadership judges to make the process more efficient.

3. **Fully Video Hearings:**
 - a. New video technology will be robust and reliable. Judges will not be expected to conduct hearings with unsuitable technology.
 - b. Anyone appearing before a court or Tribunal must be clearly seen and heard throughout the hearing, as would be the case if they were physically in a hearing room. The video technology should ideally capture the entire person, rather than a head-and-shoulders-only caption.
 - c. Broadband speed, Wi-Fi, and equipment used by those taking part in the hearing must be of a sufficient quality to enable their appearance without screen freezing or the signal dropping out.

- d. HMCTS will set out its practical proposal/s for securing open justice in fully video hearings. It is expected that this will be achieved by a live link from the video hearing to viewing areas in court and Tribunal buildings in which the cases are listed. Access to the proceedings will only be by this means. Members of the public will be supervised in the viewing areas by HMCTS staff.

4. **Effective Digitised Systems:**

- a. HMCTS will provide reassurance about the future development of the Common Components programme including the rationale for any delay where that is agreed to be beneficial.
- b. The new digital case system will be better than the legacy systems: in terms of speed, robustness, user-friendliness, effectiveness and flexibility.
- c. All persons using the new systems will be trained.
- d. Data security and confidentiality issues will be adequately provided for.

5. **Judicial User Interface:**

The Judicial User Interface will be able to carry out the following functions:

- Remote access;
- Indexing functionality and information to aid document filing;
- Search;
- Note-taking, highlighting, cutting, and pasting (editable PDF if PDF is file format);
- Allowing for multiple documents to be opened simultaneously;
- Allowing for early accessibility for allocated parties;
- Allowing for the adding or subtracting of documents without altering the established pagination;
- Access to court calendars via icons;
- Date and directions functionality;
- Alerts / notification systems;
- Consistent pagination for all parties to ensure the smooth-running of referring a witness to a document;
- Case summary; and
- Miscellaneous categorisation for papers that do not fit elsewhere.

Appendix B

Tribunals Judicial Working Group Members

Group	Member	Base/Region
Tribunals Change Network	Gillian Fleming	North East
	Judge Adrian Rhead	Midlands
	Judge Alison McKenna	London / South West
	Judge Anne Curran	Wales
	Judge Barbara Mosedale	London
	Judge Barry Clarke	Wales
	Judge Brian Doyle	London / North West
	Sir Brian Langstaff	London
	Judge Christa Christensen	South West
	Mr Justice (David) Holgate	London
	Judge David Zucker	North East
	Judge Fiona Monk	Midlands
	Judge Greg Sinfield	London
	Judge Hugh Howard	South East
	Mrs Justice (Ingrid) Simler	London
	HH Judge (Jennifer) Eady	London
	Judge Jeremy Bennett	London
	Judge John Aitken	North East
	Judge John Brooks	Wales
	Judge Judith Gleeson	London
	Chief Commissioner Kenneth Mullan	Northern Ireland
	Judge Kevin Poole	Midlands
	Judge Libby Arfon-Jones	London / Wales
	Judge Manjit Gill	London
	Judge Mark Rowland	London
	Judge Martin Rodger QC	London
	Judge Mary Clarke	North West
	Judge Meleri Tudur	London / North West / Wales
	Judge Michael Clements	London / Midlands
	Judge Michael Tildesley	South West
	Judge Neil Froom	London
	Judge Paul Swann	Midlands
	Judge Paula Gray	London
	Mr Justice (Peter) Lane	London
	Mr Justice (Peter) Roth	London
	HHJ (Phillip) Sycamore	North West
Judge Richard Byrne	South East	
Judge Jeremy Rintoul	London	
Judge Russell Campbell	London	
Judge Sehba Storey	London	

Group	Member	Base/Region
	Judge Shona Simon	Scotland
	Judge Siobhan McGrath	London
	Judge Stewart Wright	London
	Judge Swami Ragehaven	London
	Judge Tim Powell	London
	Judge Verity Jones	London
	Judge Will Rolt	South West
	Lady (Anne) Smith	Scotland
	Lord Justice (Keith) Lindblom	London
	Mr Justice (Tony) Zacaroli	London
	Sir Wyn Williams	Wales
Tribunals Judicial Engagement Group (TJEG)	HHJ Phillip Sycamore (Chair)	North West
	Judge Shona Simon	Scotland
	Judge Meleri Tudur	Wales
	Judge Mary Clarke	North West
	HHJ (Jennifer) Eady	London
	Judge Judith Gleeson	London
	DJ (Tim) Jenkins	London
	Mr Justice (Peter) Lane	London
	Judge Fiona Monk	Midlands
	Judge Kevin Poole	Midlands
	Judge Timothy Powell	London
	Judge Will Rolt	South West
	Judge Paul Swann	Midlands
	Judge David Zucker	North East
Video Hearings Working Group	Mrs Justice Cutts	London
	Mr Justice Cobb	London
	DJ Marshall Phillips	Wales
	DJ (MC) Crane	Midlands
	Judge Paul Swann	Midlands
	Thura Win JP	South West
Judicial User Interface Group	HHJ Berkley	North West
	DJ Corkill	North East
	Judge Carlin	London
	Judge Froom	London
	DJ Nightingale	South East
	HHJ Pearce	North West
Scheduling and Listing Working Group	Judge Brooks	London
	HHJ Chambers	Midlands
	Mr Justice Cobb	London
	DJ(MC) Ikram (Dep SDJ)	London
	HHJ Richardson	North East
	Judge Paul Swann	Midlands
	Lady Justice Thirlwall	London

Group	Member	Base/Region
IAC Project Working Group	Judge David Zucker	North East
	Judge Mark Blundell	London
	Judge Tim Thorne	North West
	Judge Russell Campbell	London
	Judge Julian Phillips	Wales
SSCS Project Working Group	Judge Jeremy Bennett	London
	Judge Manjit Gill	London
	Judge Verity Jones	London
	Judge Mark Rowland	London
	Judge Mary Clarke	North West