

## **CCCG Meeting**

**17<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2004**

**Present:** Rodney Warren (Law Society/CLSA), Tim Collieu (Legal Services Commission), Alice Mutasa (Law Society), Steve Wedd (CLSA)

**Apologies:** Rob Brown (Law Society/CLSA), Katherine Pears (Legal Services Commission)

### **1. CDS Direct:**

A specific meeting to discuss CDS Direct had been held on 11<sup>th</sup> November 2004. A further meeting, originally scheduled for 24<sup>th</sup> November, has been rescheduled to the morning of 3<sup>rd</sup> December.

There were no further issues to relay in relation to CDS Direct. However, the Law Society pointed out that the £1million projected saving simply comes from not paying solicitors for telephone calls.

### **2. Competitive Tendering:**

The timetable remains as confirmed in the letter from Richard Collins to Evlynn Gilvarry of 28<sup>th</sup> October, but is subject to ministers.

The possibility of holding communication events in November and December was discussed. The Commission suggested that a meeting be held before the communication events to determine the best practical arrangements. The Law Society welcomed the idea of discussions and thought they should occur directly through this forum. There was some preference for the idea of holding several events as opposed to just one.

### **3. EU Directive:**

An internal Law Society meeting is scheduled in the next few weeks. In the meantime, the Law Society will keep the Commission informed as to any updates.

### **4. CDS Bill:**

A slot for the Bill is likely in early December.

The Commission reported that the response to the select committee report has gone to David Lammy and confirmed that an initial policy paper will accompany the Bill.

The Law Society asked if there would be any space in the Bill to deal with the issue of restrained funds. The Commission explained that it was aware of the issue but that necessary legislative changes could

probably not be fitted into this Bill, but that it would investigate whether the matter could be addressed later.

**5. Accredited Representatives:**

The Law Society expressed concern over where the accredited representative level stops (i.e. did it include solicitors or only those trained but unqualified representatives?) and whether another firm, instructed to act as agent, would be subject to the 50% cap. The Commission agreed to consider this point.

Since the paper had only just arrived, no particular issues were raised in relation to the rest of the consultation paper at this stage. However, the Law Society was doubtful that any solicitors are agreeing to do work that they do not have adequate skills to undertake.

**6. Schedule of Meetings:**

The Law Society and the Commission will verify the date for the next meeting in case it coincides with the Law Society Council.

**7. Any Other Business:**

The Commission advised that additional outcome codes would be needed for conditional cautioning.

The Commission explained that there would now be a single consultation on all civil *and* criminal changes for April. Since Christmas is a busy period the consultation period is slightly longer and it should be easier having just one consultation.

The Law Society asked for clarification as to whether changes would be made at the start or end of April and October each year. The Commission agreed to inform the Law Society as to this.