



25 BEDFORD ROW
RESPONSE TO AGFS CONSULTATION
MARCH 2017

Who We Are

25 Bedford Row is arguably the leading specialist set of criminal defence practitioners. We only defend. We have been representing defendants in the criminal courts at every level for over 40 years. Our 69 members range from the most junior to leading juniors and QCs and we are culturally and ethnically diverse.

Qualified Support for Principles of Scheme

We are in favour of a payment scheme that seeks to reflect work undertaken, as well as the complexity and the seriousness of the offence. We recognise that PPE as a proxy for these features can be inconsistent, inaccurate and unreliable. We accept that the current AGFS scheme can be improved upon.

We agree that the new scheme ought to seek to capture work done on any given case although we think that the statement at paragraph 1.12 of the paper “*At its core that “work done” is the advocacy conducted in the Crown Court.*” is something of an oversimplification. In almost every case the work done will be the work carried out in preparing the case for presentation in the Crown Court whether as a plea or a trial. The actual advocacy is often no reflection of the amount of preparation for the

appearance in court. This is part of the difficulty in adopting a proxy for the amount of work done, other than measuring the hours spent, and we agree that even that is inaccurate and prone to becoming a perverse incentive.

So broadly speaking, we agree that the principles of the new scheme, with its move away from PPE to better proxies for the work involved in different cases is a step in the right direction.

Scheme is Under-funded

However, our view is that any attempt to introduce a scheme that seeks to redistribute what is an inadequate pool of funds, is ultimately destined to fail in creating a fair system of payment. So our concern is that if we were to accept this current proposal as being a proper scheme for payment, we would be agreeing to a pay structure which fails properly to remunerate our profession.

A sufficiently well-funded legal aid scheme lies at the very heart of a properly functioning criminal justice system. If legal aid is not properly funded, the risk is that a second rate service will be provided at every stage of the criminal justice process, to the detriment of society as a whole. AGFS has been underfunded for years. Between 2007 and 2013, AGFS prices reduced by 21% in cash terms equating to 37% in real terms.¹ Those figures will be even worse today, after four years of inflation. This cannot go on, more money needs to be put back into the scheme.

This new scheme is not sufficiently well funded to achieve its goals, no matter how laudable they are.

So our starting point is that the MoJ should increase rates of pay for those areas that are presently underpaid, rather than take from areas of the profession, as all this does is lead to a different type of unfairness.

There Must Be Index Linking and Review

Any new scheme must include index linking to prevent future erosion by inflation. Without this the profession will become unsustainable.

The original Bar Council scheme said there should be: “A *fair and permanent mechanism for reviewing of the operation of this Scheme.*” We agree. There is no such mechanism in the paper. There should be.

¹ Research undertaken by Prof Martin Chalkley, “Bar Council response to the Transforming Legal Aid: next steps consultation”, page 52.

Scheme Not Cost Neutral

We do not accept that the scheme is cost neutral. The cost neutrality was based on 2014/15 case mix. The 2015/16 data has been available for months. Paragraph 69 of the Impact Assessment states *“Using 2015-16 data the proposed scheme was estimated to cost around 3% less than the current scheme.”*

We have not seen the underlying data but according to the MoJ’s own figures, in 2015-2016 there were 111,000 cases by volume which cost £226m. This compared with 2014-2015 where a volume of 112,900 cases cost £213m. This seems to represent an increase in cost per case of 7.92% in 2015-16. i.e. an apparent cut in real terms of nearly 8%, not 3%.

It may be a full and proper analysis of the figures would make clear why there is a significant discrepancy. However, even if the 3% figure is correct, there has still been a 3% overall cut in fees. At the very minimum, all the rates in the tables in the consultation should be increased by 3% to restore the rates to what they were.

Even if we accept that all the paid cases for 2014/15 have been correctly recorded, analysed and mapped against the new scheme, so that no or very little sampling has taken place, this is still only one year’s data and, as such, is or may be unrepresentative. We want to see more data analysed. The analysis of the 2015/16 data could be done very quickly, we have been told It could be done in about a month. That would help us understand what the differences are. The MoJ should let the dust settle and give us three months to produce this analysis. There could be no principled objection to this course.

Unacceptable Impact on Junior Bar

We are particularly concerned about the impact of the proposals on the junior bar. Paragraph 35 of the Impact Assessment says that: *“For example, advocates conducting guilty pleas and cracked trials would be likely to receive lower fees under the proposed scheme than at present.”* Paragraph 48 and Table 5 show that fees for guilty pleas and cracked trials will reduce by 11% and 7%.

These are most often conducted by junior tenants at the start of their practices and this proposal would adversely affect new entrants into the profession struggling to establish themselves. At a time when the numbers of new entrants to the profession has fallen dramatically, this is entirely wrong and we do not support it.

There is a real risk that unrealistic fees for the most junior work will hinder attempts to make the profession more diverse and representative of society, by discouraging entrants who lack independent means.

Scheme is Structurally Flawed

Further, we have a number of principled objections to the scheme.

Assuming for the moment that QCs are better paid under the proposed scheme, we do not accept that they should be if it is at the expense of others within the profession. While we agree that QCs fees should increase, we cannot support a scheme that proposes a 10% increase at the expense of the junior bar.

We do not accept the justification, that the new scheme encourages career progression. By the MoJ's own figures, a leading junior will suffer a 6% reduction in pay. For most practitioners, leading junior is the realistic ceiling of their career and so the proposed rates of pay cannot be said to encourage them to progress to that level.

Some Offence Categorisation and Banding Flaws

We take issue with some of the offence categorisations e.g. murders. Cases that fall into 1.1 are so few in number that the rates of pay for them have a negligible impact on overall spending but it is these cases that see the most significant increases in remuneration.

We do not see the need to differentiate between offences of murder at all, we do not accept that the gravity of murders is such an indicator of complexity that there should be any differentiation.

We have similar reservations about other offence categorisations and bandings for other offences of violence; for sex cases; for drugs cases and so on.

Page Cap for all Offence Categories

Although we accept that PPE is not a reliable proxy per se, we believe pages of evidence served is a factor that should be given greater weight than the proposed system allows.

The page count thresholds set for when a special preparation claim is appropriate are too high. We would suggest a single threshold of 5,000 pages across all cases so as to recognise cases involving many pages of evidence may require a lot of

additional work. Payment would only be made in such cases if it could be shown that the work undertaken was necessary.

Moreover, if PPE is all but abolished, there is no indirect incentive to limit the service of material categorised as used. Introducing a cap of 5,000 pages before special preparation claims can be made will discourage the unnecessary service of material categorised as such.

25 BR Does Not Support Scheme

We have carried out our own analysis of the proposed rates of pay, and for our members, the reduction in earnings is considerable, and averages at around 16% (see annex A). We accept that there may be others who see moderate increases in their earnings but cuts as severe as those with the sorts of work that we do, cannot be justified and will cause extraordinary hardship, as would be the case in most sectors of any profession, were cuts of 15-20% to be imposed.

All in all, despite its good intentions and despite its many improvements to the existing scheme, we cannot give this scheme our approval as it has been presently drafted. There can be no doubt that 25BR will be worse off, individually and collectively, and so we oppose the new scheme on that basis. It would make no sense for us to do otherwise. Even if the new scheme really is cost neutral over the entirety of the 112,000 paid cases in 2014/15, it most certainly is not cost neutral for us.

It is not difficult to see why. For example, the Statement of Risks at paragraph 44 of the Impact Assessment says *“Summing the total fees for high end fraud cases indicates that on aggregate cases within these categories cost less under the proposed scheme.”* The same statement of risk is made about drugs cases. We do a significant amount of these cases and these risks are consistent with our own analysis, that we would suffer unsustainable reductions in our fee levels under the new scheme. They would not be compensated by the small increase in fees for murder/manslaughter cases.

It seems that our case mix must be very different from the overall mix of cases. Since we do the very best work at the highest levels, it is simply not an option for us to move down market so that our case profile more closely matches the overall profile, whatever that is

Even assuming the best of intentions, the MoJ has in fact created a scheme for cutting our fees overall by a very significant amount.

Q1: Do you agree with the proposed contents of the bundle? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes.

The factors that guide payment should be: seriousness of the offence, complexity of the case and the amount of time required to prepare it. Page count does not adequately reflect these issues.

We agree that PPE can be an inconsistent, inaccurate and unreliable mechanism by which to judge the basis on which a case should be paid and so support efforts to create new scheme.

In a multi-handed case, two advocates working on the same set of papers for two defendants may very well not do the same amount of work and neither pages nor numbers of witnesses nor any other proxy, such as that suggested in the new scheme, will satisfactorily represent the differing amounts of work.

We agree that if fewer hearings and days of trial are included in the basic fee, then it becomes a fairer and more sensitive reflection of the work involved.

Q2: Do you agree that the first six standard appearances should be paid separately? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes.

Since most of the trial management takes place at the early stages and there is often little the defence advocate can do to influence let alone control the numbers of these early hearings, including the first four hearings means that, in effect, there are four unpaid hearings. Unbundling the hearings and paying for them separately is to be welcomed.

Q3: Do you agree that hearings in excess of six should be remunerated as part of the bundle? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes.

For most cases, it should be possible to bring a case to trial readiness with fewer than six hearings. Since these hearings are to be paid separately, there would obviously be a perverse incentive to increase the number of hearings. Capping them at six by making those in excess part of the bundle would seem a sensible solution. However, in some cases, there should be payment for further hearings above six. Interim hospital orders and post sentence POCA (Proceeds of Crime Act) standard

appearances, both of which fall outside of the normal Crown Court trial regime, should be separately remunerated and not 'count' towards the six. Repeated hospital orders are required under the legislation and neither the defence nor the prosecution have any influence to reduce the number of those particular hearings. Consideration also needs to be given to hospital order cases in general, because these require a great deal of additional work unrelated to the difficulty of the case itself. One suggestion is for a final hospital order to be paid as a refresher commensurate to the Band of the case. We agree.

Q4: Do you agree that the second day of trial advocacy should be paid for separately? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes.

Including the first two days of trial in the basic fee always stuck in the craw since it was widely perceived as simply a back-door fee cut. The restoration of a separate fee for the second day of a trial is sensible and fair.

Q5: Do you agree that we should introduce the more complex and nuanced category/offence system proposed? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes.

We agree that a more nuanced and complex categorisation is a necessary step on the way to achieving the goal of this scheme, of recognising and rewarding the work involved in any given case.

Q6: Do you agree that this is the best way to capture complexity? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes.

However, while the complexity is probably the most important factor determining the work involved in a case and hence the remuneration, it is not the sole determinant. The gravity of the offence and the circumstances of the defendant also play a significant part.

Q7: Do you agree that a category of standard cases should be introduced? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

No.

We do not agree that a category of standard cases should be introduced. When we have analysed the offences that are included under this section on the revised Table of Offences, there are far too many of our cases which could fall under this section and have an adverse effect on the incomes of junior tenants.

Q8: Do you agree with the categories proposed? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Q9: Do you agree with the bandings proposed? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Q10: Do you agree with the individual mapping of offences to categories and bandings as set out in Annex 4? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

We answer these three questions together as they overlap and separate answers would be difficult.

Yes to all three, subject to the following caveats.

We do not necessarily accept the distribution of offences in the revised Table of Offences is correct and it may need adjustment.

While we agree the basic structure of the categories and bandings, we, along with others, believe adjustments should be made to some categories.

I. Offence Category I

- a. Band 1.1: We do not agree that the murder of a police officer, prison officer or equivalent public servant is necessarily more complex than the murder of any other individual. These murders are rare and almost always high profile but they are not necessarily more complex. Most murders would fall into Band 1.3 which would mean reduced fees for these murders, contrary to the assertion in paragraph 44 of the IA.
- b. Band 1.2: Knife murders are more frequent than firearm murders; in 2015, 36% of murders were by knife or sharp instrument compared to 4% by firearm but infrequency is no measure of complexity. We fail to see why a knife murder should fall in to Band 1.3 with reduced fees when the same amount of work needs to be done.

- c. All in all, we do not agree that there should be any banding in murders.
2. Offence Category 3 – Band 3.1 & 3.2: The large difference in fees between attempted murder and actual murder does not seem justified on the basis of relative complexity or work required but is rather based on the comparative gravity.
3. Offences contrary to Section 20 and s.47 Offences against the Person Act 1861 should be Band 3.4, not 16.1 because the of work required for these cases is greater than other Standard Category cases.
4. Sexual offences in Band 4 should be re-categorised to recognise the extra work involved in cases with child witnesses, multiple complainants, multiple defendant child exploitation cases, and historical cases. Many cases which currently would be a category J would now fall under these bands. When category J was introduced some years ago, it was done so to ensure that counsel were being remunerated fairly for the most serious sexual offences. In our opinion, the banding does not achieve this.
5. Bands 5.3 and 5.4 Daily Attendance Fee rates should be the same as Band 5.2
6. Category 8: Drugs offences.
 - a. The accuracy of the weight of the drugs in the cases in this offence category will be vital, as will be the page count. The defence are reliant on the CPS putting either the correct weight of the drugs on the indictment or in a case opening/summary or to make sure that the evidence that is served in the case is recorded properly on an NAE. Our experience, especially with the latter of these requirements, is that the CPS do not prioritise assisting defence counsel to be paid properly. In terms of value, it is not clear if the value is the “street value” of the drugs seized, which is a figure often cited by the Crown as part of sentencing hearings or wholesale figures. We foresee that there will be problems with regards to the banding of the offences in this category.
 - b. The following amendments could be made by simplifying Category 8 into three bands - 8.1, 8.4, and 8.7.
 - i. Class B or Class C offences with over 5,000 pages of evidence should be remunerated in Band 8.1.
 - ii. Class B or Class C offences with over 1,000 pages of evidence should be remunerated in Band 8.4.

- iii. Daily Attendance Fee rates for Bands 8.6 & 8.7 should be the same as Bands 8.2-8.5.
 - iv. Permitting premises to be used under the Misuse of Drugs Act should be Band 8.7
7. There are many other offences that fall into Offence Categories 9 & 10 that are not mentioned in the bands being proposed. We assume this means that these cases will all fall under category 16 -Standard Cases. We do not feel this category provides fair remuneration for the various offences that our clients are charged with.
 - a. The definition of Armed Robbery in Band 10.1 should be amended to armed robbery, regardless of the nature of the weapon.
 - b. High value burglaries. The Bar Council Working Group's original 2015 draft scheme proposed that a burglary over a value of £500,000 should go into the highest burglary category. Band 10.1 should be amended accordingly.
8. Affray should not be Band 16.1 but 14.2 as they can frequently be lengthy cases with many lay witnesses and involve much work.
9. Violent Disorder should be between 14.1 and 14.2
10. Offence Category 16 is far too large and the variety of offences listed under this section covers nearly every category of case on the current Table of Offences. We feel this will cause a number of problems when it comes to the assessment of our claims because the LAA's Determining Officers will probably be instructed that when in doubt of the offence, pay category 16. This will increase the workload on counsel and our staff as this would then mean that we will have to draft redeterminations for a number of our claims and also provide even more documentation than we currently have to.
11. The "elected cases not proceeded" fixed fee should be abolished and such cases should be paid as a guilty plea or cracked trial in the normal way.
12. Ground Rules Hearings should be paid at the same rate as Disclosure and Admissibility of Evidence Hearings

Q11: Do you agree with the individual fees proposed in Annex 2 (Indicative Fee Table)? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

No.

The fees are generally too low as we set out in our introduction. The scheme is underfunded and there should be an increase in rates overall.

Q12: Do you agree with the relativities between the individual fees proposed in Annex 2 (Indicative Fee Table)? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes

Although no method is perfect, this method of scoring a case between 5 and 100 based on its complexity seems rather subjective. With the introduction of offence category 16, it would appear that too many offences are deemed to be low in complexity.

Q13: Do you agree with the relativities proposed to decide fees between types of advocate? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes

It seems in line with current differentials.

Q14: Do you agree that we should retain Pages of Prosecution Evidence as a factor for measuring complexity in drugs and dishonesty cases? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes

We feel that there are arguments for and against this question. For the most complex drugs and dishonesty cases, we will be remunerated in line with the documents that we provided to evidence the complexity of the case (final NAE for pages, case opening for value/weight) and this should mean that there will be no arguments when it comes to the payment of the fees that we have submitted. However, as previously mentioned, we will be extremely reliant on the CPS to provide the documents that are required and for these documents to be factually correct so that we can be paid properly.

Q15: Do you agree that the relative fees for guilty pleas, cracks and full trials are correct? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

No.

The new system is premised on the idea that barristers should be paid for time spent in court meaning that the brief fee for the vast majority of cases is lower. Therefore as cracked and guilty pleas are calculated as a proportion of the already reduced brief fee, they are not satisfactory remuneration. This is particularly so for cracked fees. The new regime recognises that by the time the certificate of trial readiness is submitted, the trial from the defence perspective, has been prepared. The advocate will likely have had conferences with the solicitor and lay client, have drafted the defence statement, considered any responses from the prosecution. If one follows the logic of the new regime, then surely the cracked trial fee should be 100% of the brief fee?

Q16: Do you agree that the point at which the defence files a certificate of trial readiness should trigger the payment of the cracked trial fee? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

No.

We understand the logic behind this and take no issue with the reasoning. It makes sense to attach the cracked trial fee to a point at which it can be seen that the defence have prepared as much as they can. However, our concern is that it is the solicitor and not the advocate that files a certificate of trial readiness and the filing of a certificate can be delayed by the actions/inaction of the CPS. If it is something that will affect the advocate's payment, it should be attached to events within our control. For example, perhaps it could be linked to the stages timetable. Something becomes a cracked trial fee once the date for stage 3 (responses to DS) that was set at PTPH has passed.

We note that the Bar Council proposes either:

- a.) Retain the current method of calculation of 'thirds'.
- or:
- b.) A cracked trial could be triggered by the Stage 3 date under Better Case Management, which is after the defence statement (Stage 2) and therefore after the advocate will have properly reviewed the case and worked on the basis that the trial would be effective

Q17: Do you agree that special preparation should be retained in the circumstances set out in Section 7 of the consultation document? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

In relation to the first criterion we support the removal of the words “very unusual”. With regard to the second criterion we are concerned that the abolition of the page count as a means of increasing the fees paid for cases will lead to some paper heavy cases being paid vastly less than before, and that the additional work required for such cases will not be adequately rewarded. We believe that the only way to address this unfairness under the new proposed scheme is to lower the amount of pages required to be served, before special preparation fees can be paid. We would suggest a figure of 5,000 pages. Otherwise, and to give an extreme example, a case that involves 9,990 pages would be paid the same as one involving 99 pages with no means to claim for an uplift.

We have seen the data that demonstrate that it is cases involving PPE above 5,000 suffer the most under the new scheme. We recognise that PPE does not necessarily reflect the amount of work required by way of preparation but there should be greater scope than a qualifying figure as high as 10,000 allows, for payment to be made in paper heavy cases where such work can be justified.

We also believe that the current rate of £39 an hour for a junior alone (the vast majority of cases) is far too low for special preparation.

Q18: Do you agree that the wasted preparation provisions should remain unchanged? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes.

However, we believe that the current rate of £39 an hour for a junior alone (so a vast majority of cases) is far too low for wasted preparation.

Q19: Do you agree with the proposed approach on ineffective trials? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes.

The principle of a separate fee payment for an ineffective trial is welcome. However, the fee is too low and ought to be made equal to that of the normal daily refresher. Making the ineffective trial fee equal to that of the daily refresher for the category of

case concerned would better reflect the work undertaken in preparation and attendance for the case in question.

Q20: Do you agree with the proposed approach on sentencing hearings? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes.

The principle of a separate fee for sentence hearing is welcome. However, the proposed fee is too low and/arbitrary. £100 for a sentence may be appropriate for very simple cases. However, in sensitive or complex cases, £100 is disproportionately low, particularly if the advocate happens to be a substitute advocate.

It is noted that there are no proposals for Newton Hearings or Hospital Order Cases.

Newton Hearings could be paid in the following way. The main fee would be defined by the stage at which the plea was entered, i.e. guilty plea or cracked trial fee. The date of the trial of issue would be paid at the appropriate refresher for that class of case, irrespective of whether or not the trial of issue was effective.

We dealt with Hospital Order cases in our answer to Q.3

Q21: Do you agree with the proposed approach on Section 28 proceedings? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Yes.

The first day of the trial in such cases ought to be the first day of the s28 cross-examination.

Q22: Do you agree with the design as set out in Annex I (proposed scheme design)? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

No.

We gave our reasons in the introduction.

Whilst there are some aspects of the proposals that are individually acceptable in principle, and we welcome the attempt to addressing inequities in the current

system, such as separate fee payments for sentence hearings and for the second day of trial, the present scheme is so flawed that it is not acceptable.

Remuneration is simply too low overall and does not reflect the work undertaken for sensitive or complex cases, particularly for Junior Alone cases.

The simple fact is that by redistributing the overall pot upwards does not achieve its aims of acting as an incentive for career progression. Indeed, this new scheme will almost certainly deter those candidates of modest means looking to enter the Criminal Bar

The current fee system is unfair to senior advocates but the solution is not to make it even more inequitable to junior advocates. Simply, the pot needs to be increased.

Q23: Do you agree that we have correctly identified the range of impacts of the proposals as currently drafted in this consultation paper? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

Q24: Have we correctly identified the extent of the impacts of the proposals, and forms of mitigation? Please state yes/no and give reasons.

We answer 'No' to both questions.

The documents show that the forms of mitigation are insufficient. The impact assessment and equality statement are both based on 2014/15 figures. Not only do they use old data but data from the year in which the bar operated the no returns policy. It is not made clear in the paper what, if any, impacts that had on the data, e.g. whether it affected the case volumes, types or outcomes. We cannot be sure that the selected year is typical and a sound statistical base. This undermines the value of the analysis.

The sensitivity analysis in section H does not provide reassurance. Paragraph 63 states that trial volumes increased by 5% in 2015/16 compared to 2014/15. Which of these years is typical? Was the earlier year atypical and 2015/16 showed a more normal distribution? Or vice versa? The same comments can be made in relation to cracked trials, guilty pleas, sexual offences, and burglary & dishonesty offences which are dealt with in paragraph 64-68. This is the problem with basing the scheme on one year's data only; is that year representative or is it itself anomalous? We have no means of knowing.

However, we have seen no reason why the data from 2015/16 could not have been used, it has been available for months. We are particularly troubled by this omission as paragraph 69 of the sensitivity analysis in the impact assessment does not make

encouraging reading- the proposed scheme would cost 3% less using the 2015/16 data. To our eyes, this seems like a cut in fee income by the back door.

Even taking that into account, the equality and the impact statements still highlight the areas of concern that we have come across through our own calculations. As we have already pointed out, the new scheme is most certainly not cost neutral for 25BR.

The document acknowledges that silks will see a 10% pay rise and that leading juniors will receive a 6% pay decrease. It asserts that led juniors and juniors alone will effectively remain on the same income (table 6, page 14) but this needs to be looked at in context: Further down, the impact assessment highlights that those who have practices that have fewer effective trials and more cracked and guilty pleas will likely see a drop in income and our chambers' income analysis supports that conclusion.

Table 9 at page 19 of the impact assessment shows that those who are 0-10 years of call typically have practices in which 47% of their cases result in cracks and guilty pleas while only 18% consist of effective trials. It is not clear what the remaining 35% of practice consists of. Furthermore, led juniors in employed practice are projected to see a 3% increase in their income which seems to mean a movement of money away from their self-employed equivalent.

If the proposed new scheme will or may all divert led junior money away from the bar and towards employed advocates, the most junior barristers will see their income drop; ambitious leading juniors in self-employed practice i.e. those who are likely to become the next generation of silk, will see a drop in their income. This means that at two key transitional stages – moving from being a pupil to a tenant; and moving towards leading junior work, barristers will be worse off. Taking money away from the bar at those key stages will only ever make the bar less diverse.

Many criminal barristers enter the profession with significant levels of debt due to the high cost of bar school and the relatively low levels of pupillage awards compared to other areas of law. This can only mean that those who do not have independent sources of income will find it increasingly difficult to get by.

Calculations show that the work that forms the bread and butter of the very junior end of the bar is particularly badly hit by the new scheme. As chambers, we cannot support a scheme that results in the very junior end of the bar in particular being financially worse off.

Moving money away from leading junior work at the self-employed bar and towards employed advocates means that advocates have less opportunity to prove

themselves through leading work, making the silks' application process less meritocratic. Further, leading juniors are more likely to be of an age where they have dependents. Taking money away from those practitioners would make it more difficult for them to provide for young families and could lead to more people at that level leaving the bar for better remunerated work, which in turn would reduce the pool of quality advocates to choose new silks from.

We should also highlight that we do not have precise figures for the number of silks' certificates that are now being awarded but we know from our experience that there are fewer and fewer. Therefore, shifting money to that end of the bar will not solve the problem of there being too little work, indeed, it will exacerbate it if the greater reward encourages more juniors to become silks.

Q25: Do you consider that the proposals will impact on the delivery of publicly funded criminal advocacy through the medium of Welsh? Please state yes/no and give reasons

No.

**25 Bedford Row
WC1R 5HD**

2 March 2017

Key

SAF = Standard Appearance, TNP = Trial Not Proceed, HDW = Whole Day Disclosure, ADH = Half Day App to Dismiss

Advocate Type	Case Type	Offence	PPE	Witnesses	PTPH, Standard Appearances & Other	Current Category	Fees Received	Offence Band under AGFS Proposal	New Fees under AGFS Proposal	Difference (£)
QC	Trial (17 Days)	Attempted Murder (Knife)	10,000	52	0	A	£34,033.76	3.3	£18,000.00	£16,033.76
QC	Trial (21 Days)	Murder (Knife)	3,151	84	1 (SAF)	A	£26,994.85	1.3	£28,220.00	£1,225.15
QC	Trial (19 Days)	Murder (Gun)	7,381	73	7 (PTPH, 5 x SAF & Sentence)	A	£32,205.92	1.2	£30,200.00	£2,005.92
QC	Trial (5 Days)	Murder (Knife)	5,199	103	7 (5 x SAF & 2 x Sentence)	A	£15,312.16	1.3	£10,700.00	£4,612.16
QC	Trial (31 Days)	Poss. Class A with Intent (Over 5,000 pages)	10,000	115	3 (SAF & 2 x Sentence)	A	£44,286.15	8.1	£42,100.00	£2,186.15
QC	Trial (33 Days)	Kidnap	3,629	75	2 (SAF & Sentence)	B	£35,354.22	12.1	£34,920.00	£434.22
QC	Trial (14 Days)	Murder (Knife)	4,488	114	0	A	£22,517.06	1.3	£20,050.00	£2,467.06
QC	Trial (34 Days)	Rape	811	39	1 (Sentence)	J	£35,613.80	4.1	£39,300.00	£3,686.20
QC	Trial (61 Days)	Fraud (Over £10m)	10,000	145	0	K	£65,582.05	5.1	£79,000.00	£13,417.95
QC	Trial (48 Days)	Incitement to Terrorism overseas	9,170	108	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£53,696.54	2.1	£71,810.00	£18,113.46
QC	Trial (21 Days)	Support of a proscribed organisation	10,000	46	4 (3 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£35,265.58	2.2	£28,660.00	£6,605.58
QC	Trial (26 Days)	Assisting Illegal Entry	10,000	100	2 (SAF & Sentence)	C	£38,358.20	13.1	£30,820.00	£7,538.20
QC	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Murder (One Punch)	353	N/A	1 (Sentence)	A	£3,722.31	1.3	£4,535.00	£812.69
QC	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Murder (Beheading)	165	N/A	3 (PTPH, SAF & Sentence)	A	£3,160.55	1.2	£7,745.00	£4,584.45
QC	Trial (49 Days)	Murder (Knife)	10,000	132	2 (SAF & Sentence)	A	£60,556.16	1.3	£60,620.00	£63.84
QC	Trial (9 Days)	Corruption in Public Office	2,031	34	1 (PTPH)	I	£11,219.75	7.1	£10,600.00	£619.75
QC	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Murder (Knife)	575	N/A	1 (PTPH)	A	£4,004.25	1.3	£4,535.00	£530.75

Key

SAF = Standard Appearance, TNP = Trial Not Proceed, HDW = Whole Day Disclosure, ADH = Half Day App to Dismiss

QC	Guilty Plea	Poss. Class A with Intent (Over 5,000 pages)	10,000	N/A	N/A	B	£11,205.00	8.1	£5,000.00	£6,205.00
QC	(Trial 40 Days)	Rape	4,126	82	5 (PTPH & 4 x SAF)	J	£47,172.04	4.1	£45,230.00	£1,942.04
QC	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Rape	4,126	N/A	N/A	J	£9,795.68	4.1	£3,060.00	£6,735.68
QC	Trial (6 Days)	Manslaughter	328	34	1 (PTPH)	A	£7,381.86	1.4	£10,200.00	£2,818.14
QC	Trial (21 Days)	Corruption in Public Office	6,637	104	2 (1 x SAF & Sentence)	I	£28,976.63	7.1	£22,720.00	£6,256.63
QC	Trial (40 Days)	Fraud (£2.5m)	10,000	106	2 (1 x SAF & Sentence)	K	£56,903.38	5.2	£49,320.00	£7,583.38
QC	Trial (57 Days)	Fraud (£2.5m)	10,000	106	1 (SAF)	K	£63,671.38	5.2	£66,120.00	£2,448.62
QC	Trial (12 Days)	Child Destruction	10,000	144	4 (PTPH, 2 x SAF & Sentence)	A	£30,235.30	1.2	£21,790.00	£8,445.30
Leading Junior	Trial (32 Days)	Concealing Criminal Property	10,000	374	5 (PTPH, 2 x SAF, Sentence & TNP)	B	£34,761.10	5.2	£31,530.00	£3,231.10
Leading Junior	Trial (20 Days)	Fraud by False Rep (Over £100k but under £1mill)	1,858	60	N/A	K	£17,822.84	5.3	£14,400.00	£3,422.84
Leading Junior	Trial (40 Days)	Kidnap	3,751	141	3 (3 x SAF)	B	£31,525.13	12.1	£31,470.00	£55.13
Leading Junior	Trial (57 Days)	Kidnap	5,746	117	4 (4 x SAF)	B	£39,663.38	12.1	£44,310.00	£4,646.62
Leading Junior	Trial (7 Days)	Fraud (£1.5mill)	6,035	59	4 (PTPH & 3 x SAF)	K	£13,413.65	5.2	£12,420.00	£993.65
Leading Junior	Trial (35 Days)	Perverting the Course of Justice	5,763	118	1 (PTPH)	I	£29,956.19	7.1	£26,700.00	£3,256.19
Leading Junior	Trial (21 Days)	Fraud (£2.2m)	10,000	122	5 (4 x SAF & Sentence)	K	£29,005.30	5.2	£23,010.00	£5,995.30
Leading Junior	Trial (34 Days)	Money Laundering (£134,610)	10,000	188	5 (PTPH & 4 x SAF)	B	£36,869.70	5.2	£32,760.00	£4,116.70
Junior	Trial (17 Days)	Attempted Murder (Knife)	942	54	3 (PTPH, 1 x SAF & Sentence)	A	£10,671.76	3.3	£9,260.00	£1,411.76
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	ABH	37	N/A	5 (PTPH, 4 x SAF & Sentence)	C	£753.47	16	£910.00	£156.53
Junior	Guilty Plea	Poss. Class A with Intent (1.18KG)	92	N/A	1 (Sentence)	B	£768.52	8.4	£1,100.00	£331.48

Key

SAF = Standard Appearance, TNP = Trial Not Proceed, HDW = Whole Day Disclosure, ADH = Half Day App to Dismiss

Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	GBH s.18	69	N/A	8 (PTPH, 6 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£1,383.59	3.3	£1,410.00	£26.41
Junior	Trial (8 Days)	Fraud (£3million)	10,000	82	7 (PTPH, 5 x SAF & Sentence)	K	£15,089.80	5.2	£9,000.00	£6,089.80
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Sexual Activity - Child (Sec 9)	313	N/A	4 (1 x PTPH, 2 x SAF & Sentence)	J	£2,569.30	4.2	£1,510.00	£1,059.30
Junior	Trial (3 Days)	Threats to Kill	30	5	2 (1 x SAF & TNP)	B	£1,904.00	16.1	£1,510.00	£394.00
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Burglary (Domestic)	276	N/A	8 (PTPH, 6 x SAF & Sentence)	E	£1,033.38	16	£1,030.00	£3.38
Junior	Trial (2 Days)	Robbery	384	13	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & TNP)	C	£1,370.02	10.2	£1,615.00	£244.98
Junior	Cracked Trial (First Third)	Theft	50	N/A	6 (PTPH, 4 x SAF & Sentence)	F	£522.00	5.4	£815.00	£293.00
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Armed Robbery	401	N/A	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & TNP)	B	£1,904.45	10.1	£1,400.00	£504.45
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Attempted Arson	58	N/A	2 (PTPH & Sentence)	B	£714.98	6.3	£840.00	£125.02
Junior	Guilty Plea	ABH	32	N/A	3 (2 x SAF & Sentence)	C	£468.20	16	£495.00	£26.80
Junior	Guilty Plea	Fraud (Over £100K but under £1mill)	429	N/A	3 (3 x SAF)	K	£1,416.58	5.3	£1,180.00	£236.58
Junior	Guilty Plea	Bladed Article in Public	35	N/A	2 (1 x SAF & Sentence)	H	£508.90	16	£435.00	£73.90
Junior	Trial (2 Days)	Bladed Article in Public	23	4	3 (PTPH & 2 SAF)	H	£816.00	16	£1,070.00	£254.00
Junior	Trial (3 Days)	Robbery	57	11	3 (PTPH, SAF & Sentence)	C	£1,317.76	10.2	£1,655.00	£337.24
Junior	Trial (4 Days)	Armed Robbery	121	11	4 (PTPH, 2 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£2,317.48	10.1	£2,870.00	£552.52
Junior	Guilty Plea	Sexual Assault	29	N/A	1 (Sentence)	D	£728.51	4.2	£800.00	£71.49
Junior	Trial (6 Days)	False Imprisonment	70	10	8 (PTPH, 6 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£3,461.60	12.1	£4,610.00	£1,148.40
Junior	Trial (2 Days)	Armed Robbery	86	10	4 (PTPH, 2 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£1,340.28	10.1	£1,970.00	£629.72
Junior	Guilty Plea	Poss. Class A with Intent (63.4g)	89	N/A	2 (1 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£766.09	8.7	£560.00	£206.09
Junior	Trial (7 Days)	Cruelty to person under 16	170	8	4 (1 PTPH, 2 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£3,767.60	3.4	£4,070.00	£302.40

Key

SAF = Standard Appearance, TNP = Trial Not Proceed, HDW = Whole Day Disclosure, ADH = Half Day App to Dismiss

Junior	Guilty Plea	Poss. Class A with Intent (Over 1,000 pages)	1,369	N/A	4 (3 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£1,655.29	8.4	£1,280.00	£375.29
Junior	Trial (9 Days)	Rape	534	3	4 (PTPH, 2 x SAF & HDW)	J	£6,054.32	4.1	£6,458.00	£403.68
Junior	Trial (29 Days)	GBH s.18	2,622	67	5 (PTPH & 4 x SAF)	B	£16,767.86	3.3	£15,340.00	£1,427.86
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Poss. Class A with Intent (Under 1 KG)	264	N/A	2 (PTPH & SAF)	B	£1,705.80	8.7	£840.00	£865.80
Junior	Trial (35 Days)	Rape	2,574	39	7 (PTPH & 6 x SAF)	J	£21,911.62	4.1	£20,050.00	£1,861.62
Junior	(Trial 4 Days)	Sexual Activity - Child (Sec 9)	169	7	4 (PTPH & 3 x SAF)	J	£2,808.62	4.2	£3,180.00	£371.38
Junior	Trial (4 Days)	Fraud False Rep (Over £100k but under £1mill)	311	12	2 (PTPH & Sentence)	K	£2,957.58	5.3	£3,400.00	£442.42
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Perverting the Course of Justice	226	N/A	7 (PTPH & 6 x SAF)	I	£1,268.38	7.1	£1,480.00	£211.62
Junior	Trial (8 Days)	Attempted Murder (Knife)	675	42	7 (PTPH, 4 x SAF, 1 x TNP & 1 x ADH)	A	£5,841.30	3.2	£6,270.00	£428.70
Junior	Trial (2 Days)	Burglary (Domestic)	1,035	17	N/A	E	£2,304.60	16	£850.00	£1,454.60
Junior	Trial (4 Days)	Threats to Kill	43	12	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£2,252.80	16	£1,830.00	£422.80
Junior	Trial (2 Days)	Death by Dangerous Driving	78	14	7 (PTPH & 6 x SAF)	B	£1,526.04	9	£3,185.00	£1,658.96
Junior	Trial (19 Days)	Fraud by False Rep (Over £100k but under £1mill)	1,858	60	7 (PTPH & 6 x SAF)	K	£12,832.84	5.3	£9,660.00	£3,172.84
Junior	Trial (14 Days)	Attempted Murder (Knife)	378	36	5 (PTPH & 4 x SAF)	A	£8,440.84	3.3	£7,840.00	£600.84
Junior	Trial (8 Days)	Assault by Penetration	236	23	9 (PTPH, 6 x SAF, 1 x TNP & Sentence)	J	£5,361.98	4.1	£6,860.00	£1,498.02
Junior	Guilty Plea	GBH s.18	76	N/A	1 (Sentence)	B	£755.56	3.3	£600.00	£155.56
Junior	Guilty Plea	Arson (Over £30K)	N/A	N/A	1 (Sentence)	B	£694.00	6.2	£500.00	£194.00
Junior	Trial (5 Days)	ABH	N/A	N/A	6 (PTPH, 3 x SAF, 1 x TNP & Sentence)	C	£2,256.90	16.1	£2,430.00	£173.10

Key

SAF = Standard Appearance, TNP = Trial Not Proceed, HDW = Whole Day Disclosure, ADH = Half Day App to Dismiss

Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Abduction of a Child by other persons	46	N/A	3 (PTPH, SAF & TNP)	C	£817.26	12.1	£1,565.00	£747.74
Junior	Trial (7 Days)	Possession of prohibited weapons	260	20	6 (PTPH, SAF, 3 x TNP & Sentence)	B	£4,294.80	11.2	£5,360.00	£1,065.20
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Fraud by False Rep (Under £30k)	418	N/A	2 (PTPH & TNP)	F	£1,319.28	5.4	£1,040.00	£279.28
Junior	Guilty Plea	Breach of Anti-Social Order	0	N/A	1 (SAF)	H	£490.00	16.1	£335.00	£155.00
Junior	Trial (5 Days)	Fraud by False Rep (£1.7mill)	835	16	5 (PTPH & 4 x SAF)	K	£4,020.70	5.2	£7,340.00	£3,319.30
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Bladed Article in Public	61	N/A	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & TNP)	H	£874.88	16.1	£1,050.00	£175.12
Junior	Guilty Plea	Dangerous Driving	15	N/A	3 (2 x SAF & Sentence)	H	£498.10	16.1	£495.00	£3.10
Junior	Trial (15 Days)	Kidnap	234	32	7 (5 x SAF, TNP & Sentence)	B	£7,994.12	12.1	£9,000.00	£1,005.88
Junior	Trial (4 Days)	Sexual Assault	75	7	3 (PTPH, SAF & Sentence)	D	£1,965.50	4.2	£3,160.00	£1,194.50
Junior	Guilty Plea	Fraud by False Rep (£260K)	8,915	N/A	3 (SAF & 2 x Sentence)	K	£6,035.65	5.3	£1,260.00	£4,775.65
Junior	Trial (53 Days)	Rape	5,110	120	9 (PTPH, 6 x SAF, 1 x ADH & Sentence)	J	£31,088.80	4.1	£29,790.00	£1,298.80
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Concealing Criminal Property (Under £100K)	7,502	N/A	8 (PTPH, 6 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£6,154.96	5.4	£1,200.00	£4,954.96
Junior	Trial (2 Days)	Going Equipped to Steal	13	2	4 (PTPH, SAF & TNP)	E	£783.00	16.1	£1,310.00	£527.00
Junior	Trial (5 Days)	Child Cruelty	80	9	3 (PTPH & 2 SAF)	B	£2,741.40	3.4	£2,970.00	£228.60
Junior	Guilty Plea	GBH s.18	15	N/A	1 (SAF)	B	£706.15	3.3	£560.00	£146.15
Junior	Trial (4 Days)	Burglary (Domestic)	47	5	3 (PTPH, SAF & TNP)	E	£1,762.00	16.1	£1,910.00	£148.00
Junior	Trial (15 Days)	Robbery	6,261	39	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & Sentence)	C	£12,430.88	10.2	£6,095.00	£6,335.88
Junior	Trial (7 Days)	Blackmail	10,000	37	5 (PTPH & 4 x SAF)	B	£13,533.30	12.1	£4,640.00	£8,893.30
Junior	Cracked Trial (First Third)	Possession of Class A	52	N/A	2 (PTPH & SAF)	C	£480.20	16.1	£630.00	£149.80

Key

SAF = Standard Appearance, TNP = Trial Not Proceed, HDW = Whole Day Disclosure, ADH = Half Day App to Dismiss

Junior	Trial (12 Days)	Fraud by False Rep (Under £30k)	788	10	3 (3 x SAF)	F	£5,003.24	5.4	£4,900.00	£103.24
Junior	Trial (5 Days)	Poss. Class A with Intent (Over 5,000 pages)	7,758	50	2 (PTPH & Sentence)	B	£10,461.84	8.1	£7,100.00	£3,361.84
Junior	Trial (5 Days)	Threats to Kill	87	15	2 (PTPH & SAF)	B	£2,772.76	16.1	£1,910.00	£862.76
Junior	Cracked Trial (Second Third)	Violent Disorder	36	N/A	3 (PTPH, SAF & Sentence)	B	£1,019.96	14.2	£900.00	£119.96
Junior	Cracked Trial (Second Third)	Indecent Images	45	N/A	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & Sentence)	J	£1,510.40	4.3	£1,230.00	£280.40
Junior	Cracked Trial (Second Third)	Attempted Murder (Knife)	119	N/A	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & Sentence)	A	£1,844.88	3.2	£2,080.00	£235.12
Junior	Guilty Plea	Poss. Class A with Intent	20	N/A	1 (Sentence)	B	£710.20	8.7	£460.00	£250.20
Junior	Trial (9 Days)	Armed Robbery	8,167	83	7 (PTPH & 6 x SAF)	B	£13,074.36	10.1	£5,260.00	£7,814.36
Junior	Trial (13 Days)	Perverting the Course of Justice	6,999	244	4 (PTPH, 2 x SAF & Sentence)	I	£13,423.62	7.1	£7,520.00	£5,903.62
Junior	Trial (3 Days)	Indeceny with a Child	93	7	4 (PTPH, 2 x SAF & Sentence)	J	£2,204.14	4.2	£2,720.00	£515.86
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Affray	267	N/A	6 (PTPH, 4 x SAF & Sentence)	H	£1,241.49	16.1	£910.00	£331.49
Junior	Guilty Plea	False Documents	37	N/A	0	F	£427.98	16.1	£275.00	£152.98
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Fraud by False Rep (£260K)	672	N/A	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & Sentence)	K	£3,066.54	5.3	£2,080.00	£986.54
Junior	Guilty Plea	Arson (Endanger Life)	57	N/A	2 (SAF & Sentence)	B	£740.17	6.1	£860.00	£119.83
Junior	Trial (3 Days)	Theft (Under	104	10	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & TNP)	F	£1,202.92	5.4	£2,030.00	£827.08
Junior	Trial (9 Days)	Burglary (Domestic)	612	114	7 (PTPH, 5 x SAF & Sentence)	E	£4,082.36	16.1	£3,450.00	£632.36
Junior	Guilty Plea	Indecent Images	254	N/A	2 (SAF & Sentence)	J	£1,281.26	4.3	£660.00	£621.26
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Burglary (Domestic)	769	N/A	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & Sentence)	E	£1,169.97	16.1	£850.00	£319.97
Junior	Guilty Plea	Abstraction of Electricity (Under £30k)	0	N/A	1 (SAF)	F	£408.00	16.1	£335.00	£73.00
Junior	Trial (3 Days)	ABH	18	3	1 (SAF)	C	£1,306.00	16.1	£1,210.00	£96.00

Key

SAF = Standard Appearance, TNP = Trial Not Proceed, HDW = Whole Day Disclosure, ADH = Half Day App to Dismiss

Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Racially Aggravated Assault	76	N/A	3 (PTPH & 2 SAF)	C	£756.56	16.1	£690.00	£66.56
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Rape	80	N/A	3 (PTPH & 2 SAF)	J	£1,668.60	4.1	£1,750.00	£81.40
Junior	Guilty Plea	Perverting the Course of Justice	29	N/A	4 (3 x SAF & Sentence)	I	£583.18	7.1	£1,300.00	£716.82
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Blackmail	35	N/A	2 (PTPH & SAF)	B	£1,016.85	12.1	£1,265.00	£248.15
Junior	Trial (4 Days)	Allowing Cannabis to be grown on premises	135	16	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£2,485.70	16.1	£1,830.00	£655.70
Junior	Trial (8 Days)	Rape	622	14	7 (PTPH, 5 x SAF & TNP)	J	£5,609.16	4.1	£6,175.00	£565.84
Junior	Trial (15 Days)	False Imprisonment	1,404	43	4 (3 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£8,890.62	12.1	£9,280.00	£389.38
Junior	Trial (1 Day)	Racially Aggravated Assault	16	4	4 (PTPH, SAF, Sentence & TNP)	C	£946.00	16.1	£1,110.00	£164.00
Junior	Trial (27 Days)	Poss. with intent Class A (Over 5kg)	1,889	56	8 (PTPH, 5 x SAF & 2 x Sentence)	B	£15,318.62	8.1	£19,250.00	£3,931.38
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Assisting Illegal Entry	49	N/A	3 (PTPH, SAF & Sentence)	C	£694.19	13.1	£1,535.00	£840.81
Junior	Trial (8 Days)	Concealing Criminal Property	6,288	57	2 (PTPH & SAF)	B	£10,462.54	5.2	£8,660.00	£1,802.54
Junior	Trial (5 Days)	Armed Robbery	163	17	6 (PTPH, 2 x SAF, 2 x TNP & Sentence)	B	£3,117.04	10.1	£3,920.00	£802.96
Junior	Trial (5 Days)	Affray	55	14	8 (PTPH, 6 x SAF & ADH)	H	£2,368.50	16.1	£2,340.00	£28.50
Junior	Trial (7 Days)	Attempted Murder (Knife)	186	27	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & TNP)	A	£4,628.58	3.2	£5,580.00	£951.42
Junior	Trial (3 Days)	Breach of a Restraining Order	39	4	2 (PTPH & SAF)	H	£1,224.00	16.1	£1,310.00	£86.00
Junior	Trial (3 Days) - Newton	Poss. Prohibited Weapons	N/A	N/A	2 (2 x SAF)	B	£1,774.00	11.2	£2,320.00	£546.00
Junior	Trial (3 Days)	Assault by Penetration	72	10	5 (3 x SAF & 2 x TNP)	J	£2,443.56	4.1	£3,570.00	£1,126.44

Key

SAF = Standard Appearance, TNP = Trial Not Proceed, HDW = Whole Day Disclosure, ADH = Half Day App to Dismiss

Junior	Trial (6 Days)	Fraud (Under £100K)	347	12	6 (PTPH, 4 x SAF & TNP)	F	£2,428.86	5.4	£3,140.00	£711.14
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Handling Stolen Goods (£285,639)	2,305	N/A	PTPH	K	£4,359.50	5.3	£1,800.00	£2,559.50
Junior	Cracked Trial (Final Third)	Threats to Kill	12	N/A	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & Sentence)	B	£945.32	16.1	£850.00	£95.32
Junior	Trial (3 Days)	GBH s.18	49	12	2 (PTPH & SAF)	B	£1,783.80	3.3	£2,160.00	£376.20
Junior	Trial (13 Days)	Violent Disorder	210	18	2 (PTPH & SAF)	B	£6,660.00	14.2	£5,710.00	£950.00
Led Junior	Trial (6 Days)	Manslaughter	328	34	3 (PTPH & 2 x SAF)	A	£3,895.42	1.4	£5,220.00	£1,324.58
Led Junior	Trial (23 Days)	Murder (Plank of Wood)	6,581	154	0	A	£17,681.55	1.3	£15,200.00	£2,481.55
Led Junior	Trial (19 Days)	Murder (Gun)	7,381	73	7 (PTPH, 5 x SAF & Sentence)	A	£16,279.49	1.2	£15,100.00	£1,179.49
Led Junior	Trial (5 Days)	Murder (Knife)	5,199	103	6 (1 PTPH, 3 x SAF & 2 x Sentence)	A	£7,662.87	1.3	£5,330.00	£2,332.87
Led Junior	Trial (61 Days)	Fraud (Over £10m)	10,000	145	0	K	£33,364.60	5.1	£39,500.00	£6,135.40
Led Junior	Trial (41 Days)	Fraud (£2.5m)	10,000	106	6 (PTPH, 4 x SAF & Sentence)	K	£28,728.46	5.2	£25,440.00	£3,288.46
Led Junior	Trial (57 Days)	Fraud (£2.5m)	10,000	106	7 (PTPH & 6 x SAF)	K	£32,463.46	5.2	£33,460.00	£996.54
Led Junior	Trial (20 Days)	Fraud by False Rep (Over £100k but under £1mill)	1,858	60	7 (PTPH & 6 x SAF)	K	£12,049.48	5.3	£10,060.00	£1,989.48
Led Junior	Trial (40 Days)	Kidnap	3,751	141	3 (3 x SAF)	B	£20,525.87	12.1	£20,980.00	£454.13
Led Junior	Trial (57 Days)	Kidnap	5,746	117	7 (PTPH & 6 x SAF)	B	£25,586.58	12.1	£29,760.00	£4,173.42
Led Junior	Trial (7 Days)	Fraud (£1.5mill)	6,035	59	5 (5 x SAF)	K	£8,972.59	5.2	£8,300.00	£672.59
Led Junior	Trial (35 Days)	Perverting the Course of Justice	5,763	118	1 (PTPH)	I	£19,422.61	7.1	£18,300.00	£1,122.61
Led Junior	Trial (12 Days)	Child Destruction	10,000	144	3 (PTPH, SAF & Sentence)	A	£15,028.34	1.2	£10,835.00	£4,193.34
Led Junior	Trial (21 Days)	Fraud (£2.2m)	10,000	122	5 (PTPH, 3 x SAF & Sentence)	K	£19,162.62	5.2	£15,380.00	£3,782.62
Led Junior	Trial (34 Days)	Money Laundering (£134,610)	10,000	188	4 (4 x SAF)	B	£23,600.78	5.2	£21,680.00	£1,920.78
							£1,692,765.44		£1,590,563.00	£102,202.44

TABLE 5

	Volumes	Current	Proposed	Difference
Trial	101	£1,600,439.12	£1,520,538.00	£79,901.12 (5%)
Cracked Trial	30	£61,478.98	£51,535.00	£9,943.98 (16.5%)
Guilty Plea	19	£30,847.34	£18,490.00	£12,357.34 (40%)
Total	150	£1,692,765.44	£1,590,563.00	£102,202.44 (6%)

TABLE 6

	Volumes	Current	Proposed	Difference
QC	25	£777,224.58	£745,255.00	£31,969.58 (4%)
Leading Junior	8	£233,017.29	£216,600.00	£16,417.29 (7%)
Led Junior	15	£284,424.72	£274,545.00	£9,879.72 (4%)
Junior Alone	102	£398,098.95	£354,163.00	£43,935.95 (11%)
Total	150	£1,692,765.44	£1,590,563.00	£102,202.44 (6%)

Table 7

Current Offence	Volumes	Current	Proposed	Difference
A	22	£376,385.36	£341,410.00	£34,975.36 (9%)
B	50	£508,398.33	£492,260.00	£16,138.33 (3%)
C	13	£61,955.64	£50,760.00	£11,195.64 (18%)
D	2	£2,694.01	£3,960.00	£1,265.99 (32%)
E	6	£11,135.31	£9,400.00	£1,735.31 (16%)
F	7	£11,312.28	£12,535.00	£1,222.72 (10%)
G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
H	8	£8,021.87	£7,945.00	£76.87 (1%)
I	7	£104,850.36	£88,620.00	£16,230.36 (16%)
J	15	£177,093.28	£171,543.00	£5,550.28 (3%)
K	20	£430,919.00	£412,130.00	£18,789.00 (4%)
Total	150	£1,692,765.44	£1,590,563.00	£102,202.44 (6%)

Table 8

Proposed Offence	Volumes	Current	Proposed	Difference
1	15	£266,638.09	£250,280.00	£16,358.09 (6%)
2	2	£88,962.12	£100,470.00	£11,507.88 (11%)
3	13	£93,367.08	£76,140.00	£17,227.08 (19%)
4	17	£179,787.29	£175,503.00	£4,284.29 (3%)
5	30	£553,244.38	£519,885.00	£33,359.38 (6%)
6	3	£2,149.15	£2,200.00	£50.85 (2%)
7	7	£104,850.36	£88,620.00	£16,230.36 (16%)
8	9	£86,877.51	£77,690.00	£9,187.51 (11%)
9	1	£1,526.04	£3,185.00	£1,658.96 (51%)
10	8	£36,872.27	£24,785.00	£12,087.27 (33%)
11	2	£6,068.80	£7,680.00	£1,611.20 (22%)
12	11	£188,368.93	£191,800.00	£3,431.07 (2%)
13	2	£39,052.39	£32,355.00	£6,697.39 (16%)
14	2	£7,679.96	£6,610.00	£1,069.96 (14%)
15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
16	28	£37,321.07	£33,360.00	£3,961.07 (10%)
Total	150	£1,692,756.44	£1,590,563.00	£102,202.44 (6%)