



All-Party Parliamentary Group on Legal Aid

Inaugural Meeting: Wednesday 12th July 2017, Jubilee Room

Attendance: See sign-in sheet

Chair: Karen Buck MP

Others: Lord Beecham, Kate Green MP, Alex Chalk MP, Andy Slaughter MP, Ian Murray MP

Apologies: Lord Willy Bach, Dominic Grieve MP, Lord Low, Yvonne Fovargue MP

1. Welcome, address and formation of the APPG

Karen Buck MP (in the Chair) noted that she was delighted to welcome all attendees, not least as she was one of the founder members of the APPG ten years ago. She noted that it is a great pleasure to return.

Ms Buck MP asked the qualifying members in attendance to sign the attendance sheet to ensure the meeting was quorate and could then turn to the formalities.

Ms Buck MP noted that this current Parliament will run for two years so the formalities of this meeting will not need to be repeated next year.

In response to a question from the floor, Ms Buck MP confirmed that membership of the APPG is open to all parliamentarians. However attendance at meetings and interaction with the APPG from members of the public and representative bodies will be at the discretion of the officers and secretariat.

2. Group's Name

It was agreed that the Group's name shall be: "All-Party Parliamentary Group on Legal Aid."

3. Statement of purpose

It was agreed that the purpose of the Group should be stated as "To promote parliamentary and public understanding of the importance of the role of publicly funded legal services."

4. Category into which the Group falls

It was agreed the group falls into the "subject group" category of APPGs. (The other categories are country-specific and social groups).

5. Inaugural Election of Officers

Chair: Karen Buck MP (Labour) stood for election to the position of Chair. She was proposed by Kate Green MP and seconded by Alex Chalk MP. Her election was unopposed.



Vice-Chairs: it was agreed that a number of officers would be elected and that these should aim to have a balance across the parties, Houses and gender. All would hold the title of Vice-Chair. The following were nominated and elected unopposed.

Lord Willy Bach
Yvonne Fovargue MP
Dominic Grieve MP
Andy Slaughter MP
Alex Chalk MP

6. Secretariat

The Legal Aid Practitioners Group (LAPG) and Young Legal Aid Lawyers (YLAL) offered their joint services as Secretariat.

This offer was accepted.

7. Public enquiry point

It was agreed that a public enquiry point would be the following LAPG staff member:

Ms Rohini Teather
Project Worker
All-Party Parliamentary Group on Legal Aid
Legal Aid Practitioners Group
12 Baylis Road
London, SE1 7AA

8. The Group's web address

LAPG and YLAL agreed to keep the Group's website www.apg-legalaid.org updated on the Group's behalf. This offer was accepted.

9. Details of any benefits which the Group has received if the value exceeds £1,500

Karen Buck MP noted that the APPG itself has no income or expenditure, but receives Secretariat support from LAPG and YLAL (both not-for-profit organisations), which would require disclosure on the register of APPGs. LAPG indicated that it receives a grant from the Legal Education Foundation of £12,600 paid in quarterly instalments for the provision of this support and to meet the direct costs of the meetings in 2017.

Carol Storer, Director of LAPG, thanked the sponsors, The Legal Education Foundation, for their funding and continued support.

10. First meeting of the APPG

It had been agreed that the theme of the first meeting would be an update of current issues in Civil and Criminal legal aid with a focus on the issues arising out of the Grenfell Tower fire. This would take place after the registration formalities were concluded.



11. Future meetings

It was agreed that there should be four or more meetings each year.

The suggested format for the Group's meetings will be for two to three speakers to speak for five to ten minutes each followed by discussion, with speakers to cover a range of views. LAPG will liaise with the Chair to arrange dates and propose speakers.

12. Announcement of establishment of Group

It was agreed that the announcement of the Group's establishment would be arranged by LAPG (in liaison with the Chair).

13. Any Other Business

It was noted that it was important that meetings of the Group canvas a wide spectrum of views and that they engage other interested bodies in the sector.

14. APPG on Legal Aid Meeting

Karen Buck MP noted that a range of interesting speakers were in attendance and invited the first to address the meeting.

Greg Powell, President of the London Criminal Courts Solicitors' Association and Managing Partner at Powell Spencer & Partners Solicitors

Mr Powell noted that criminal legal aid faced austerity before austerity. There have been no increases in fees since the 1990s and since then there has been two decades of inflation. He explained that there are two outstanding consultations awaiting response from the MOJ one of which threatens a further cap on fees for large cases.

Mr Powell highlighted the legal aid statistics (circulated at the meeting and attached as Appendix A to these minutes) and pointed out that the Crime Higher value is £329m whereas Very High Cost Cases account for £32m. He explained that the government introduced a mechanism where VHCCs have been decanted into other others schemes. However this counters the government concerns that VHCCs are out of control and that this reasoning underpinned recent consultation which sought to introduce fee cuts.

Mr Powell noted the impact of technology to the cost of the criminal justice system – it underpins what the Police do in relation to social media, face recognition technology, etc. Technology is a major cost driver that the MOJ is blind to. He noted that the MOJ cannot continue to cap costs when costs are rising. And that demography – such as the baby boom post-millennium which means a large cohort of 15 year old boys are about to enter the CJS (crime tends to be committed by 15-25 years olds) – will be another cost driver.

He noted that the MOJ always talks about the importance of the rule of law but will not pay for it. The politics of austerity has trumped the politics of access to justice. He explained that it wouldn't cost much to transform the system including legal aid and that investment would make a significant positive difference. But the big question for criminal lawyers in the immediate future is whether the MOJ will impose the proposed 8.75% cut or not.

Simon Cliff, The Justice Team, The Law Society

Mr Cliff introduced The Law Society's recently published report – "Access Denied, LASPO 4 Years On" (available [here](#) and circulated at the meeting) He noted that the report is based on existing data, not on new research, as there is plenty of existing documentation analysing the impact of LASPO (such as the Justice Select Committee report and the LAA's own statistics).

Mr Cliff noted that there are 4 main themes ([see report](#)) and that from those themes he wanted to highlight a number of key issues:

- The significant impact of LASPO on children. The JCHR report in 2015 commented on this calling the denial of legal aid 'lamentable'. Young people can be affected directly as they may be litigants in care proceedings or trafficking cases for example. But they can also be affected indirectly, for example in private family law. The impact is greater because disputes are prolonged as parents cannot get legal aid.
- Changes to the means test – the gross income cap hasn't been increased for many years so people are dropping out of eligibility. The introduction of the capital means test for recipients of means-tested benefits creates another barrier.
- Law Society research regarding existing advice deserts, for example in housing. There are now whole areas with no or very limited supply of legal aid contract holders. He noted this is not limited to housing.
- The mandatory telephone gateway restricts access in some areas.
- There are wide gaps in provision – a significant example is mediation. Referrals have plummeted post LASPO because solicitors were a large source of referrals to mediation.
- There are significant problems with the Exceptional Case Funding scheme. The government estimated there would be 5000-7000 cases per annum. The reality has been that the application volumes are far lower than predicted, peaking at 1,516 in 2013/14. The scheme is particularly difficult for those without representation.

Mr Cliff explained the wider impacts:

- The huge increase in litigants in person (LIPs) in the court system (most of whom haven't chosen this option). This is creating a serious strain on court system. Research indicates LIPs achieve poorer outcomes.
- The loss of early advice, especially in family and housing cases, combined with the knock-on effect of Housing Benefit being taken out of scope and the impact that this has had on unresolved rent arrears and possession proceedings.
- The link between advice and health outcomes – there are significant health benefits to be gained if people can access advice and access it early but this is undermined by LASPO.

Mr Cliff explained that the report contains 25 recommendations (see report) – which focus on access to advice for children, the provision of early advice in relation to family and housing, reintroduction of Housing Benefit, the Exceptional Case Funding scheme and a review of means testing.

Mr Cliff noted that the report concludes that LASPO has undermined access to justice for the poorest and most vulnerable. It has put considerable strain on court system and has created additional cost for other public bodies. The MOJ was planning to review LASPO prior to the election. The Law Society is hoping to hear that the review will proceed shortly and that the MOJ will take note of their report.

Carol Storer, Director LAPG and Bach Commissioner

Ms Storer noted that excerpts from the recently published legal aid statistics are available for the meeting and paint a sorry picture:



- over 900,000 civil legal help cases were started in 2009/10 but this dropped to 146,000 in 2016/17. Do those people not need advice? If so, where are they going? The government said Shelter and CABx will see them but both organisations are overrun.
- Page 3 – table 1.2 shows that in 2009,10, 200,000 civil representation applications were made , a figure which had dropped to 100,000 by 2016/17.
- The Exceptional Case Funding (ECF) scheme – the ‘safety net’. The government had originally expected 5000-7000 cases. The figures are shocking as Simon Cliff covered in his talk. Thank you to the Public Law Project for all their work on the ECF as the number would be much lower than 1,344 without them.
- Page 4 – sets out the number of Legal Aid providers that remain– this figure is not easy to understand because of the way that these providers are organised. This is the number of offices and some firms have many offices. There are now very few Not-for-Profits with legal aid contracts. The overall number of providers has plummeted. It is an impossible workload without the right level of funding.

Ms Storer asked if we want to live in a society where people with no money do not matter? Where the rich and powerful or simply the richer and more powerful can behave with impunity because their former partners, employees, their tenants, the people seeking a service from them have no redress? Do we want a landlord to be able to rent out sub-standard accommodation or evict someone regardless of what the law is? Do we want a government department to treat the people applying to it for benefits or education or to process immigration status – to be unchallengeable because they cannot access their rights because they cannot afford to enforce them? Do we want an employer to be able to sack an employee in breach of the law and for the employee to have no redress because Legal aid has been taken away and then there are the prohibitively expensive tribunal fees. It is worth noting as a postscript to this that in an application for judicial review brought by trade union Unison (*R (on the application of UNISON) (Appellant) v Lord Chancellor (Respondent)*), the Supreme Court unanimously found that the Employment Appeal Tribunal Fees Order 2013 broke the law because it denied the public access to justice. The judgement can be read in full [here](#).

Ms Storer noted that civil legal aid is about ensuring a fair, just society where the rule of law is part of society and not just a theoretical concept. Politicians have cut budgets, fed stories to the press to discredit legal aid, portrayed this as money for overpaid lawyers. It's not – it's about cutting off lifelines for the just-about-managing and the people who have always struggled to manage.

Ms Storer quoted the President of the Supreme Court, who last week said:

'The sad truth is that in countries with a long peaceful and democratic history such as the UK (and, I suspect, Australia), we face the serious risk that the rule of law is first taken for granted, is next consequently ignored, and is then lost, and only then does everyone realise how absolutely fundamental it was to society. 'It is peculiarly ironic that this is happening at a time when we have never been more concerned to ensure that all citizens enjoy rights.' Neuberger said it 'verges on the hypocritical for governments to bestow rights on citizens while doing very little to ensure that those rights are enforceable. It has faint echoes of the familiar and depressing sight of repressive totalitarian regimes producing wonderful constitutions and then ignoring them'.

Ms Storer noted that so much damage is being done to society and that we must engage with the LASPO Review when it is announced. As a Commissioner on the Bach Commission, she assured the meeting that the final report will be thoughtful and suggest ways forward. She also called on those present to give the Law Society examples of cases where legal aid funding is no longer available or the system isn't working. She also asked attendees to see their MPs and champion legal aid.

Ms Storer ended by noting that the APPG is grateful for the support of politicians such as Lord Bach, Lord Beecham, Andy Slaughter, and Karen Buck we should all look to them for inspiration.

Alison Mohammed, Director at Shelter

Ms Buck MP noted that MPs are debating the Grenfell fire this afternoon in parliament. She thanked Ms Mohammed for stepping in at short notice as Victoria Vasey, Director of North Kensington Law Centre, was unable to attend at short notice. Ms Buck MP praised NKLC for the work they have done.

Ms Mohamed noted that there has been a great outpouring of support since the event of four weeks ago. It reminded her of the medical sector's response to a disaster. Lawyers from all over the legal sector have come to help. There has been a great level of collegiality and services are being delivered from various centres in and around the area. Services are trying to go where the need is. They have been stressing to residents that they are here for the long haul as the issues won't go away anywhere soon.

Two important issues:

- Refusal of offers of temporary accommodation (which has confused some) but those refusals are for a number of understandable reasons. There are strong feelings of mistrust of authority as promises are not being kept, i.e. offers out of area or people are concerned that they will be forgotten in temporary accommodation. Also people are traumatised and not necessarily in a good frame of mind to make big decisions.
- Advising people in other towers or from the surroundings areas because children can't sleep at night as they heard the fire or friends were killed in the fire. They want to know their housing options so lawyers are trying to clarify and reassure.

Ms Mohammed noted that the deadline has been extended to 28.07.17 for comments on the Terms of Reference for the inquiry. It is important that those affected are involved.

Ms Mohammed added that another point to clarify is whether any charitable lump sum the victims are given will be taken into account in legal aid means assessment? Shelter and partners are pressing for an answer to this question.

A further issue lies with the rights of undocumented residents Shelter is pressing for grants of Indefinite Leave to Remain as otherwise it is unlikely that those victims will come forward.

She also noted that impact of the disaster on those giving advice. Ms Mohammed noted it is not the same as for the victims and those affected but it is still very traumatic. One adviser broke down when giving out clothing as the family in question only wanted black clothes so as to be in mourning for those they have lost.

And finally Ms Mohammed asked the Group, has the politics of austerity trumped the voices of tenants as well?

Karen Buck MP

Ms Buck MP noted that the LASPO Review will dominate what we look at now. The legal aid statistics are available but more work needs to be done to document the impact of LASPO, particularly where legal aid does not meet the needs of those elsewhere in the system, i.e. LIPs. For example we are seeing the impact on the number of appeals that unrepresented people are losing.



Ms Buck MP asked for questions or contributions from the floor

Laura Janes, Legal Director, Howard League for Penal Reform

Ms Janes noted that she heard today that every sector of society has been affected by cuts to legal aid. She noted that we know that there is, on average one suicide every three days in the prisons. The Howard League has challenged the cuts to prison legal aid brought in by Michael Gove that were challenged at their inception by Jeremy Corbyn. After three years, the Court of Appeal have now agreed that those cuts are unfair. The government has challenged this decision in the Supreme Court, not on the basis of an error of law but on the way Court of Appeal looked at the facts, which is of real concern. Ms Janes explained that there is no place for ideological debates when it comes to legal aid as it simply must be there.

Roger Ralph, Council Member, CILEx

Mr Ralph explained that the legal aid cuts have had a ripple effect, i.e. on court duty solicitors in criminal cases. He noted that there is an increasing number of unrepresented defendants and an increasing use of technology by the courts. He provided an example from a recent court attendance when he was given 15 minutes to scan 150 pages of evidence. He explained that this is not justice. Duty solicitors cannot always provide the service they want to, or a service commensurate with Access to Justice, because of these restrictions.

Steve Hynes, Director, Legal Action Group

Mr Hynes noted that when LASPO was introduced the government said that CABx and other agencies would step in to fill the void. But there was a 'double whammy' because local government has experienced 40% cuts in funding and a crisis in adult social care which is soaking up any spare cash. As a result there is no money for advice so organisations are closing or reducing their services. It is clear we cannot rely on local government to support advice.

Secondly, Mr Hynes referenced the Courts Bill and noted it needs amendment in relation to access to justice: he quoted the Dutch example (Rechtwijzer) which failed because there wasn't enough advice and support supporting the digital services. He concluded that there is an opportunity with the Courts Bill to seek access to justice amendments in context of digitisation.

Andy Slaughter MP

Mr Slaughter MP welcomed the announcement yesterday about the inquiry into contaminated blood. He asked why it was agreed yesterday after such a long campaign and noted that six opposition leaders supported the call for the inquiry, including the DUP.

Regarding the Grenfell disaster, he asked those in attendance that if they have specific matters relating to legal aid and public inquiries, to actively let MPs know and not to assume that they do. He noted this was particularly important in relation to the Terms of Reference of both of these inquiries. He noted that in relation to the Grenfell inquiry it appears a mistake has been made in the way the chair was appointed, not in the choice of chair.

Julie Bishop, Director, Law Centres Network



Ms Bishop noted that from a law centre point of view, the response to Grenfell from the entire legal profession was amazing. Big firms were supporting the efforts within 24 hours – with laptops, photocopying etc. She said that this is the profession at its best and shows the very heart of the sector.

Regarding the LASPO review, law centres are telling us that across the country people are deeply distressed about the quality of their housing. There are some mechanisms for dealing with public housing but nothing in terms of private housing. Law centres have seen a surge in requests for advice for out of scope matters such as rehousing requests which are crucial to quality of life.

Maggie Ellis, Occupational Therapist in independent practice

Ms Ellis noted that she is concerned not only by the reduction in the number of suppliers, but that some of the remaining suppliers are often without sufficient or relevant experience and so cases get inappropriate handling. She provided one case example where the lawyer was happy that evidence from an expert said the client was not disabled where it turned out that the expert had never met the client.

James Sandbach, Director of Policy and External Affairs, LawWorks

Mr Sandbach noted that the pro bono response was an important element of the overall response to Grenfell. However he stressed that the pro bono community does not want pro bono to be seen as the answer to the problems of a lack of resources and access to legal advice. He will be working with those in the room to make the case for adequate public funding to be the appropriate response.

Richard Nixon, Families Need Fathers

Mr Nixon noted that he is currently supporting two men who are seeking access to their children. There have been allegations of domestic abuse by their former partners and this leads to the grant of legal aid. However the men don't have the resources to respond and can't get legal aid to instruct a solicitor. He is concerned that it is mostly men who are affected by this.

Katy Sheridan, Paralegal, Simpson Millar Solicitors

Ms Sheridan noted that there is a general lack of awareness of rights even if legal aid is available. She explained that she works in community care and education law and is aware that some of her clients believe that Social Services can act with impunity. These clients don't seek advice because they don't know they are entitled to it – they are not aware of the availability of legal aid.

Nimrod Ben-Cnaan, Head of Policy and Profile, Law Centres Network

Mr Ben-Cnaan noted Ms Storer's point about the legal aid statistics when considering the LASPO Review, explaining that LASPO has been very successful even by its own terms. He explained that if you compare the statistics with government's own pre-LASPO impact assessment, the expected outcomes in relation to a reduction in access has been exceeded in everyway. The government predicted a saving of £350m but has actually saved over £600m. They predicted 600,000 clients would not be able to access advice as a result of LASPO, whereas 848,000 fewer cases have been started. In relation to the Exceptional Case Funding scheme – there were only 1314 applications granted last year when the government predicted 5000-7000 per annum – this cannot be seen as a functional safety net. He noted that all those interested also need to look at how legal aid is considered in relation to the Courts Bill and digitisation, which is missing opportunities to reduce impact on litigants in person.

Karen Buck MP then closed the meeting. Ms Buck MP asked those in attendance to note the date of Wednesday, 1 November 2017 from 5-7pm for an important APPG event. She added that the APPG will also seek to have a meeting when the LASPO review is announced.

As a final postscript to these minutes, we are very pleased to welcome that Bob Neill MP back as Chair of the Justice Select Committee. The APPG looks forward to more excellent work by the new committee over the next five years.

Appendix A

Tables from ‘Legal Aid Statistics in England and Wales – January – March 2017’ (published 29 June 2017)

Table 1.1: Legal aid criminal workload summary since 2001-02

Financial Year	Crime Lower Volume	Crime Lower Value	Higher Crime Volume				Crime Higher Value (£000's)			
	Total Volume	Total Volume (£000s)	Crown Court litigator schemes ¹	Crown Court advocate schemes ¹	Very high cost cases (VHCCs)	Ct of Appeal, Senior Ct Costs Office + Supreme Court	Crown Court litigator schemes ¹	Crown Court advocate schemes ¹	Very high cost cases (VHCCs)	Ct of Appeal, Senior Ct Costs Office + Supreme Court
2001-02	1,685,094	500,801
2002-03	1,549,626	506,619
2003-04	1,579,751	515,697
2004-05	1,505,674	497,203
2005-06	1,528,383	518,810	81,129	134,013	256,856	312,519	103,124	..
2006-07	1,462,987	517,454	79,483	137,179	234,628	265,087	104,568	..
2007-08	1,381,424	473,093	87,462	132,695	..	7,363	264,315	281,740	124,614	11,964
2008-09	1,521,547	486,441	126,916	131,288	..	7,142	281,288	290,138	112,094	10,879
2009-10 (r)	1,503,011	475,726	136,617	129,797	..	5,891	325,485	292,041	95,309	11,416
2010-11 (r)	1,430,874	438,806	135,989	122,913	..	5,704	323,487	270,202	93,087	9,792
2011-12 (r)	1,332,949	409,876	138,009	140,678	..	5,778	353,084	253,603	91,739	8,738
2012-13 (r)	1,234,825	387,520	128,884	123,501	..	5,643	325,898	243,707	67,665	8,491
2013-14 (r)	1,203,850	377,047	117,684	122,064	..	5,219	307,284	229,161	56,776	7,491
2014-15 (r)	1,130,743	332,692	121,245	114,717	..	4,382	322,882	216,338	36,179	8,245
2015-16 (r)	1,037,388	285,845	114,514	112,782	..	4,089	346,939	228,297	26,789	7,235
2016-17	986,958	283,108	106,833	105,297	..	4,089	329,683	225,428	31,685	6,685

¹ Figures before the higher crime schemes transferred to the Legal Aid Agency are included based on previous HMCTS systems and are on a similar but not closed-case basis so care should be taken when comparing over time using these figures

(r) Revised from previous published figures.



Table 1.2(a): Civil legal aid workload summary since 2000-01 – Legal Help

Financial Year	Legal help (volume) ¹						Legal help (value £'000) ¹				
	New matters started ²	Claims submitted	Housing Possession court duty scheme starts (HPCDS)	Completed HPCDS	Mediation assessments	Mediation outcomes	Claims submitted	Completed HPCDS	Telephone Operator Service	Mediation assessments	Mediation outcomes
2000-01	803,828	761,583	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2001-02	764,697	748,890	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2002-03	811,848	798,033	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2003-04	709,769	756,569	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2004-05	654,267	715,837	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2005-06	783,455	786,522	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2006-07 (r)	851,023	876,071	-	-	22,758	13,612	-	-	-	4,014	6,508
2007-08 (r)	807,459	735,436	-	-	22,665	13,468	-	-	-	4,556	6,547
2008-09 (r)	886,862	756,446	33,842	-	24,152	13,364	-	-	-	5,433	6,698
2009-10 (r)	933,815	905,948	31,831	-	27,137	14,235	255,820	-	-	6,151	7,234
2010-11 (r)	785,436	812,920	29,625	-	26,387	14,019	255,581	-	-	6,277	6,997
2011-12 (r)	679,771	674,061	33,752	-	31,336	14,622	217,701	-	-	7,796	6,906
2012-13 (r)	573,744	599,922	33,575	-	30,665	13,983	188,754	-	-	8,054	6,268
2013-14 (r)	173,587	316,101	44,860	47,384	13,390	9,632	134,354	4,121	2,769	3,194	4,273
2014-15 (r)	171,602	194,443	46,745	45,858	15,078	7,824	106,924	4,352	1,638	3,697	3,127
2015-16 (r)	157,992	166,606	38,730	41,443	13,347	8,655	97,797	3,604	1,228	3,267	3,518
2016-17	146,618	162,995	39,028	40,820	11,927	7,484	96,380	3,550	1,089	2,979	2,934

¹ Figures exclude determinations made by Specialist telephone advice service (available in the underlying data file)

Figures for the telephone operator service are currently under review. Figures will be published next quarter that more accurately reflect the nature of how the service operates

² Figures exclude Housing possession court duty scheme, Telephone operator service and Community legal advice centre

(r) Revised from previous published figures.

Table 1.2(b): Civil legal aid workload summary since 2000-01 – Civil Representation

Financial Year	Civil representation (volume)					Civil representation (value £'000)		
	Applications received	Certificates granted	Certificates completed	Where all costs met by the LAA	Where some costs met by opponent	Where all costs met by the LAA	Where some costs met by opponent	
							Costs met by opponent	Portion of costs still met by LAA
2009-10 (r)	203,329	168,408	137,599	132,742	4,857	634,240	129,889	3,453
2010-11 (r)	187,592	153,616	129,406	124,731	4,675	653,351	133,732	2,500
2011-12 (r)	176,377	148,294	137,967	133,720	4,247	712,976	144,696	2,420
2012-13 (r)	191,135	150,535	137,027	132,996	4,031	766,701	140,349	2,294
2013-14 (r)	117,551	108,595	147,545	143,563	3,982	799,626	126,579	1,962
2014-15 (r)	107,788	92,876	119,086	115,124	3,962	694,575	125,254	1,979
2015-16 (r)	111,162	100,797	94,820	91,277	3,543	578,252	130,486	2,605
2016-17	116,401	106,962	96,558	93,485	3,073	571,702	136,242	2,351

(r) Revised from previous published figures

Table 8.2: Exceptional Case Funding (ECF) categories

Applications

Financial Year	Category of Law											Total
	Debt/ Consumer/ Contract	Discrimination	Education	Family	Housing/ Land Law	Immigration	Inquest	Inquiry/ Tribunal	Other	PI/Clinical Negligence	Welfare Benefits	
2013-14	6	1	2	819	80	234	201	13	84	65	11	1,516
2014-15	0	0	3	464	29	334	225	3	94	2	18	1,172
2015-16 (r)	0	0	0	394	54	493	240	0	154	1	7	1,343
2016-17	2	4	0	303	48	1007	283	0	195	8	20	1,870

Grants

Financial Year	Category of Law											Total
	Debt/ Consumer/ Contract	Discrimination	Education	Family	Housing/ Land Law	Immigration	Inquest	Inquiry/ Tribunal	Other	PI/Clinical Negligence	Welfare Benefits	
2013-14	0	0	0	9	1	4	54	1	1	0	0	70
2014-15	0	0	0	48	3	57	110	1	7	0	3	229
2015-16 (r)	0	0	0	156	2	326	163	0	16	1	2	666
2016-17	0	0	0	98	7	688	145	0	6	1	8	953

Application made by provider: 1438, 1118, 1186, 1521

Application made by individual: 78, 54, 157, 349



Table 9.1: Number of provider offices completing work in each period by legal aid scheme

Number of provider offices¹ 2011-12 to 2016-17

Crime

Financial Year	Providers across all Crime areas ²	Crown Court			Crime Lower Scheme			
		Litigators Scheme	Advocates Scheme ³	High Cost Case Scheme	All Crime Lower	Police Station	Magistrates' court	Prison Law
2011-12	6,879	2,173	4,532	536	2,209	2,150	2,162	477
2012-13 (r)	7,215	2,107	4,902	558	2,159	2,089	2,109	353
2013-14 (r)	7,015	2,018	4,799	545	2,078	2,019	2,023	307
2014-15 (r)	6,723	1,915	4,635	422	1,941	1,889	1,894	258
2015-16 (r)	6,200	1,807	4,242	314	1,810	1,763	1,749	221
2016-17	5,679	1,678	3,852	324	1,691	1,637	1,647	201

Civil

Financial Year	Providers across all Civil areas ²	Legal Help		Mediation		Civil Representation	
		Solicitor Firms	Not for profit organisations	Solicitor Firms	Not for profit organisations	Solicitor Firms	Not for profit organisations
2011-12	3,876	2,784	440	166	18	3,038	114
2012-13 (r)	4,173	2,732	440	185	18	3,315	145
2013-14 (r)	4,278	2,666	520	214	21	3,277	172
2014-15 (r)	3,773	2,323	315	212	20	3,025	168
2015-16 (r)	3,262	1,995	240	201	20	2,627	159
2016-17	2,902	1,751	213	175	18	2,350	145

¹ Provider office details are not available for central funds, Court of Appeal, Supreme Court, discretionary payments, and telephone data in crime lower and legal help

² Figures do not sum due to the nature of the calculation with each provider being counted only once in each category of legal aid but an individual provider can appear across multiple categories during the relevant period

³ Some payments relating to the first part of 2011-12 were processed in a previous separate payment system

