

**Minutes of the Meeting of the VHCC Steering Group  
held on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> June 2008**

**Present:** Derek Hill (DH)  
Cris Scotter (CS)  
David Keegan (DK)  
Keith Milburn (KM)  
Rodney Warren (RW)  
Alice Mutasa (AM)  
Martin Chalkley (MC)  
Richard Miller (RM)  
Adrian Vincent (AV)  
Desmond Browne QC (DB)  
Paul Mendelle QC (PM)  
Mark Lucraft QC (ML)  
Barbara Ann Tweedie (BT)  
James Mac Millan (JM)  
Simon Hayllar (SH)  
Sarah Albon (SA)

**Action**

**1. Apologies**

Apologies were received from Richard Collins, Michael Bowes QC, Simon Garrod, John Harding, Nick Turner, Sally O'Neill QC, and Gary Brown

**2. Notes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes from the previous meeting were agreed. However CS did note that the timeframe set out in 3.2 should be flagged up. The 8<sup>th</sup> of July being the proposed deadline but that it was likely that work would identify issues rather than a complete future scheme.

**3. Matters Arising**

**3.1 *Update of experts meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> May:***

A small group discussed the idea of the stage process in regards to complex cases and whether we are going down the right track. MC established that different stages present different obstacles. There is to be three stages instead of five with stage one and three having the potential to move forward at full pace with quick progress to be made. Stage two

presents more difficulty and a more detailed proposal is required. It is hoped that if stage one and three move adequately then stage two may fall into place for a future scheme.

SH noted that stage four [post trial/confiscation] needs revising. While we do have fixed fees it is not ones we would want to introduce for the new scheme. SH also noted concern over a separate group dealing with stage four and would this work? SA stated that there is not a natural flow between the stages although as long as they mesh it should be fine.

MC noted that whilst there is silence on the details both branches feel that case categorisation could work.

SH raised his concern over the sufficient number of experts dealing with the project, as there is a danger that with only one expert a restricted view might be given and data might be produced that no one recognises. It was suggested that experts could change as and when required.

### **3.2 Update by MC, SH and JM on exploratory visit to LSC:**

#### ***Data:***

There is a shortage of data and there is a need to match what we have got to what we need. SH noted that there is difficulty in extracting sample case data from the courts, as the courts do not recognise the same court numbers as the LSC. SA stated that we could facilitate this, as there are only a few hundred cases. SH noted that we should get the courts to focus their attention on this if possible. DK to send data on VHCC's. With those cases that we cannot obtain electronically will need to be extracted manually. RM stated those doing the extraction will be required to have a certain level of expertise therefore temporary staff would not be able to contribute to this task unless they meet the criteria. SA requested that a list of what data we need to obtain, for example trial start date, number of defendants etc needs to be set up and she can then explore this list and obtain the necessary data. SA and MC to draw up list.

DK, SA  
&MC

RW noted a need to take into account the categorisation of cases. JM agreed with the concern raised over sufficient time to ensure that the figures presented are correct.

MC stated that the critical stage is being able to break cases down which is potentially time consuming. Concern was also raised over some T numbers not being obtainable electronically and that the courts T numbers do not match the LSC. SH

offered up the suggestion of using the defendants name to help identify cases because if we have the T numbers and the defendants name we can obtain the information electronically using either system. KM noted that a short paper to scope this work would be helpful stating what resources are required, what sort of information is needed etc. SA stated that Keith Milburn might be able to assist on the record of page numbers.  
Action on SH to set out list of what is needed

SH

### **3.3 Impact on 25/40-day cases:**

RW raised the point that most data covers 40+ cases. It was requested by CS that some awareness that the payment scheme was different for 25-40 day cases so the data available will be limited.

DK stated that these cases accounted for 5% of the overall project and need to be realistic as to where we focus our energy and what was prioritised

SA noted that CREST could be used to compare the two schemes to assess what contract unit would have been paid.

DK stated that whatever was on the computer in regards to the list of cases SA could have today. The additional information needs to be chased from CREST and provided to SH by the end of the week.

DK

### **4. Feedback from meeting with Lord Chancellor on 15<sup>th</sup> May**

A brief synopsis was provided by SA.

### **5. Any other business:**

DB noted that there should be progress for the next meeting and towards an outline to move forward. DH indicated that if stage one and three could be "cracked" progress could be made on stage two. CS noted we would hope to produce a framework to work towards.

### **6. Date for next meeting:**

9am on Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> of June 2008.

The Law Society to host.

