

Approved

Minutes of the Civil Procedure Rule Committee

Friday 9th June 2023, conducted in a hybrid format, namely, at The Rolls Building (Royal Courts of Justice), Fetter Lane, London and via Video Conference.

Members attending

Lord Justice Birss, Deputy Head of Civil Justice (Chair)

Mr Justice Kerr

Mr Justice Trower

Master Cook

His Honour Judge Jarman KC

His Honour Judge Bird

District Judge Clarke

Tom Montagu-Smith KC

Isabel Hitching KC

Ben Roe

Virginia Jones

Ian Curtis-Nye

Apologies

Dr Anja Lansbergen-Mills (maternity leave); David Marshall (annual leave).

Item 1

1. **Welcome:** The Chair welcomed all members and officials to the meeting, whether in person or joining remotely.
2. **Minutes:** The minutes of the meeting on 12th May 2023 were **AGREED** subject to three modest typographical amendments (one in paragraph 6 and two under paragraph 40 (in Q.9 and Q.28 respectively)).
3. **Action Log:** The action log was duly **NOTED**, with specific reference to the following: **AL(23)144 Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments (JCSI)**. The Chair was pleased to report that a very positive and productive meeting with counsel to the JCSI, Justin Leslie, had taken place. **THANKS** were expressed to Isabel Hitching KC for her input, in particular. It was agreed that the JCSI would be given notice of the s.2(7) Sub-Committee's rolling consultations, so that they could provide comments in advance of final amendments entering an SI. **Action:** Secretariat.

Item 2 Independent Monitoring Authority for Citizens' Rights Agreement's (IMA) proposed PD for claims relating to EU and EAA EFTA citizens' rights CPR(23)29

4. Rhys Davies, General Counsel to the IMA and Robert Ritchie (MoJ) were welcomed to the meeting.
5. The Chair set out the background, referring to when the matter was initially before the CPRC in November 2022. Since then, a revised drafting proposal to introduce a new PD had been produced, following input from District Judge Clarke and Master Dagnall, to whom **THANKS** were noted. Robert Ritchie confirmed MoJ's support for the proposal.
6. Mr Davies presented the matter, referring to the accompanying papers, which were duly **NOTED**. It was explained that the IMA was introduced as part of the UK leaving the EU. The IMA is a statutory body, independent of Government. Its purpose is to protect the

rights of EU and EEA EFTA citizens, and their families, in the UK and Gibraltar, by monitoring UK public bodies to make sure they implement citizens' rights and by identifying any underlying issues. The IMA's two overarching duties and its various functions, to enable it to carry out its duties, were explained. The ability to receive complaints and to conduct inquiries is particularly important.

7. The proposed new PD is suggested following issues in practice, namely a lack of notification when claims are made and thus restricting the opportunity for the IMA to discharge its statutory functions and to intervene in proceedings where necessary. The proposed PD seeks to address this by requiring litigants to send the IMA a copy of their claim form and/or statement of case. The intention being that notification will ensure the IMA can consider, at an early stage, where it can assist the court in determining novel and complex questions of interpretation. Mr Davies referred to some recent case law to support the proposed new PD.
8. It was further **NOTED** that (i) the proposal does not contain any provisions for sanctions against non-compliance (ii) no transitional provisions are necessary (iii) consultation had taken place between the IMA, MoJ, the Government Equalities Office (iv) the IMA provides its own operational guidance to assist the public and should the PD be approved, the IMA's communication channels can be utilised to help publicise it and encourage compliance.
9. The Chair ventilated some reservations in regard to introducing an additional, un-numbered PD within the CPR, given the ongoing work to simplify and reduce the rules. He also raised questions on the scope and potentially very wide range of cases which may be captured by the PD. This being in contrast to the Equality PD (on which the IMA's PD was based) because the Equality PD flowed from a long standing agreement and which is very narrowly defined. A discussion ensued. First, to address the point of principle as to whether the CPRC was content to consider introducing a PD of this nature, which was **AGREED**. Accordingly, a detailed discussion on the drafting followed in which it was explained that the text, "citizens' rights" forming the latest iteration of the PD's title, was derived from primary legislation. However, it was not a defined term. The aim to try and use plain language in the interests of accessibility was also explained. DJ Clarke added that a simple online search using those words did produce links to the IMA and the EU Withdrawal Agreement. However, in the interests of clarity, it was **AGREED** to make the PD's title more prescriptive and include, "EU and EEA EFTA" after "Claims relating to" and add in, "under Part 2 of the Withdrawal Agreement and Part 2 of the EEA EFTA Separation Agreement" after "Citizens' Rights".
10. Scope and interpretation were discussed and resulted in paragraph 1.2 being re-cast to incorporate, "any proceedings in which a citizens' rights issue ~~claim~~ arises" and at paragraph 1.3, the text "claim" should be replaced with "issue".
11. Paragraph 2.1 (Notice of proceedings) was changed to "When a party serves a statement of case which raises a citizens' rights issue, that party must send a copy of the statement of case to the IMA at the same time." It was also **NOTED** that the e-mail address at 2.2(a) is to be added to the e-mail list under agenda item 7 below. Finally, paragraph 2.3(2) is to be re-cast to read, "any such order or step must..." and include, "or other costs order" after, "costs penalty".
12. It was **RESOLVED** to:
 - **AGREE**, subject to final drafting, the introduction of a new (un-numbered) PD for claims relating to EU and EEA EFTA Citizens' Rights Under Part 2 of the Withdrawal Agreement and Part 2 of the EEA EFTA Separation Agreement;
 - matter to return to the CPRC on/around June 2025 to review its utility.

13. **Action:** In liaison with the IMA, Drafting Lawyers and Secretariat to incorporate into the next CPR Update, as part of the October 2023 in-force cycle.

Item 3 Notice of Change CPR(23)30

14. The Chair explained that the proposed amendment concerns the mainstream rules (PD 42 Change of Solicitor) but has been identified and agreed in principle by the Damages and Money Claims (DMC) Committee (at their meeting on 20th April) because it came to light during discussions regarding notices of change in the context of the Damages and Online Civil Money Claims pilot schemes. However, it presents an issue in the wider context.
15. The issue concerns the lack of digital integration between “MyHMCTS” and the different court systems and jurisdictions. Essentially, PD 42 states that the solicitor should use MyHMCTS to notify the court of the change, but the MyHMCTS system does not allow them to in all instances.
16. **THANKS** were conveyed to Katie Fowkes (MoJ Legal) for providing the proposed drafting, which was discussed. Referring to the proposed amendment to PD 42 paragraph 2.7A, Ms Fowkes, raised whether, “...that solicitor will be managing the claim...” was sufficiently wide as to include parties other than the claimant.
17. In summary, the points ventilated covered, that claim handlers are an established concept within civil litigation; the historical context in comparison with current practice, were CE filing and digital portals are in use; whether further clarity was needed in the interests of the lay user; that District Registries are part of the High Court; and the desire to avoid unintended consequences with any renumbering and cross references.
18. It was **RESOLVED** to:
- **approve** the proposed amendment to paragraph 2.7A of PD 42 (Change of Solicitor), save for substituting, “conducting” for “managing”;
 - **dispense with** paragraph 2.6 of PD 42, in the interests of simplicity, but to avoid unintended consequences, do not re-number the provisions in consequence; however the legacy paragraph 2.6 is to be marked up as, “omitted”.
19. **Actions:** Drafting Lawyers and Secretariat to incorporate into the next CPR Update as part of the 1st October in-force cycle.

Item 4 Amendments in consequence of HMCTS estate reforms: Civil National Business Centre CPR(23)31

20. The Chair explained the background. This topic was first before the CPRC in November 2022, when the HMCTS business change project to establish a Civil National Business Centre (CNBC) in place of the County Court Money Claims Centre (CCMCC) at Salford and the County Court Bulk Centre (CCBC) at Northampton, was explained.
21. The CNBC is based at Northampton and will carry out the work of the legacy CCBC and CCMCC units. In consequence, a suite of mechanical amendments are required to replace references to the former CCBC and CCMCC, with the new CNBC.
22. The Chair confirmed that he had discussed the proposed drafting, out-of-committee, with HMCTS, Drafting Lawyers and District Judge Ivan Ranson, to whom **THANKS** were conveyed. This has resulted in two proposed revisions, which were discussed, along with a package of other necessary amendments to update to CPR. The discussion highlighted

that it was necessary for the drafting to provide for applications flowing from the Online Civil Money Claims portal under PD 51R and the Damages Claims portal under PD 51ZB may be dealt with by HMCTS Legal Advisers affiliated to the new CNBC. Ben Roe also observed that the DX address for Northampton should be reflected in all the various amendments (it was currently only in some provisions) and this was **AGREED**.

23. It was **RESOLVED** to:

- **approve** the suite of amendments, as drafted, subject to the above and the adoption of the following two revisions which followed consultation with DJ Ranson, thus:

PD 2E (Jurisdiction of the County Court that may be exercised by a Legal Adviser)

paragraph 1.1

“This Practice Direction specifies the jurisdiction that may be exercised by a legal adviser and any restrictions that apply relating to –

- a. claims proceeding in the Civil National Business Centre; and
- b. applications which are required by a rule or practice direction to be made at that Centre”

the last part of paragraph 1.2(b)

“... with the consent of the relevant Designated Civil Judge or their nominee”.

- amendments in consequence to form EAC1 (Application for Certificate to act as an enforcement agent) were **approved in principle, subject to referral to Master Cook**.

24. **Actions:** (i) Drafting Lawyers and Secretariat to incorporate amendments into the next CPR SI and PD Update, to come into force at the earliest opportunity, allowing for the necessary Parliamentary processes (ii) HMCTS/MoJ to provide final drafting of form EAC1 (and any other forms) to the Secretariat for approval in readiness of publication in line with the CPR changes. **Post Meeting Note:** *earliest implementation date revised from 7th August to 14th August 2023.*

Item 5 Section 2(7) Sub-Committee

25. This item comprises two elements:

Part 14 Admissions: post consultation - proposed amendments revisited CPR(23)32 and process for requesting judgment following admission CPR(23)33

26. The Chair set out the background.

27. The Part 14 reforms have been ongoing since spring 2022. At the 13th May 2022 CPRC meeting, following public consultation, the CPRC agreed on a text for a new Part 14, with PD 14 to be revoked.

28. Subsequently it emerged that there were knock-on effects on other rules which needed to be considered before the reformed Part 14 was ready to enter into force. Some aspects concerned the Commercial Court. Revised text was approved at the 3rd March 2023 meeting. However, further drafting lawyer comments have arisen and a suite of revised amendments, across the CPR, including consequential amendments have been prepared

and, for the most part, are uncontroversial. However, a more substantive point concerning the process for requesting judgment following admission was raised by drafting lawyers and discussed in detail. It was explained that the process is currently highly prescribed (supported by form N225A) and embedded in court operations, playing a trigger role in proceedings. The issue does not seem to have been ventilated during the consultation and the existing provisions have not been imported into the reformed text. Clarity was sought as to whether this was intentional. An alternative drafting proposal was reviewed.

29. The general view of members was that the reformed Part was not changing the operational processes by removing these provisions, which were considered to be unnecessarily detailed, for what exists as a matter of law in any event. On balance, therefore, it was **RESOLVED** to:

- **NOTE** the report from MoJ Legal, but not adopt the alternative proposed text at rule 14.2 as part of the reformed Part 14;
- **ADOPT** all other proposed amendments as tabled, subject to the following:
 - delete rule 14.2(5);
 - renumber rule 14.2(6) to (12) as rule 14.2(5) to (11);
 - delete rule 14.4(2);
 - renumber rule 14.4(3) as rule 14.4(2);
 - from rule 26.2(4), remove the words, “or rule 14.4(2)”;
 - underneath rule 26.4(2), remove the whole of the bracketed signpost;
 - from rule 26.2(5), remove the words “or rule 14.4(2)”;
 - delete rule 45.16(2)(a)(ii);
 - renumber rule 25.16(2)(a)(iv) as 25.16(2)(a)(ii).
- **APPROVE** the revised Part 14 (Admission) which includes dispensing with the supplementing practice direction, PD14

30. **Actions:** (i) Drafting Lawyers and Secretariat to incorporate into the next CPR Update as part of the October 2023 in-force cycle; (ii) In consultation with the Chair, the Secretariat to arrange a meeting with HMCTS and Master Cook (Chair of the Forms Sub-Committee) to consider related consequentials in relation to prescribed forms etc.

Part 22 Statements of Truth: follow up and consequential amendments CPR(23)34

31. Isabel Hitching KC presented the matter.

32. At the 3rd March 2023 CPRC meeting, the Part 22 amendments were agreed, subject to the usual review by drafting lawyers for consequentials etc. As such, out-of-committee discussions have taken place between Ms Hitching KC, on behalf of the sub-committee, and Katie Fowkes (MoJ Legal) to whom **THANKS** were conveyed. Two suites of amendments were presented and discussed.

33. First, a suite of additional proposed amendments to the reformed text for Part 22 and PD 22, which MoJ legal have identified and consider would further improve the final text. Most

are editorial tidying up, such as numbering and paragraph breaks. Each was discussed. Attention centred on the revised paragraph 1.1 in PD 22, which the sub-committee viewed as not being strictly necessary, but were content for the revised amendment to be made. It was explained that the documents listed in this paragraph and the rule, do not comprise a definitive list. Instances exist elsewhere in the CPR that require a statement of truth but are not listed, for example, rule 3.13(5). Rule 22.1(f) expressly allows for this. It was **AGREED** to further revise PD 22 paragraph 1.1 to read, "In addition to those documents expressly referred to in any rule or practice direction, the following documents must be verified by a statement of truth." The intention being to make clearer to court users that this is not the only provision listing documents that will need to carry a statement of truth by virtue of rule 22.1(f).

34. The signpost (to PD 35) at (4) was raised but considered, on balance, to be the best location for it and is, therefore, retained.

35. The second suite concerns further consequential and cross-reference amendments across the CPR. When presented, the amendments were further revised to provide for gender neutrality.

36. In relation to Part 18 and PD 18, a consultee's response which raised a clarificatory point (as per the CPRC minutes of 3rd March 2023, paragraph 35) was revisited. It was **AGREED** to amend the first signpost at rule 18.1 to read, "(Part 22 requires a response (which is a statement of case) to be verified by a statement of truth)". However, PD 18 is considered to be clear and thus, does not merit amendment in this respect.

37. In addition to the amendments tabled and **AGREED**, it was **FURTHER AGREED** to:

- further revise rule 22.1((6)(a) in the interests of clarity and in particular, for litigants in person, to add, "being taken by the court" after, "account";
- retain, "states" in the signpost (to rule 32.14) under rule 22.4.

38. It was **NOTED** that:

- where signposts are removed or modified, it is in the interests of brevity and because those rules were now well established.
- Ian Curtis-Nye raised a point in relation to the interplay with digital schemes and users with particular needs, who are unable to sign a statement of truth. He undertook to raise it with the Damages and Money Claims Committee.

39. It was **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE** the revised Part 22 (Statements of Truth) which includes a reformed PD 22.

40. **Actions:** (i) Drafting Lawyers and Secretariat to incorporate into the next CPR Update as part of the October 2023 in-force cycle (ii) Ian Curtis-Nye to liaise with the DMCC as necessary.

Item 6 Lacuna Sub-Committee: LSC2023/3 Security for Costs and the Hague Convention CPR(23)35

41. The LSC's report was duly **NOTED** and Tom Montagu-Smith KC presented the matter (LSC2023/3).

42. The topic concerns security of costs and the Hauge Convention on Choice of Court Agreements 2005 ("Hague 2005"). It was raised by a practitioner member of the Private International Law Committee, chaired by Lord Mance. In summary, the possible lacuna

requiring consideration is whether the pre-conditions for an order for security for costs include the case where the claimant is resident outside the jurisdiction. However, that condition is subject to an exception where the claimant resides in a state which is party to Hague 2005. This appears unprincipled, because Hague 2005 only permits enforcement where there is a jurisdiction agreement.

43. Mr Montagu-Smith KC emphasised that Hague 2005 is not intended to be a comprehensive code. Hague 2005 is subject to a number of limitations and exclusions. For example, consumer and employment disputes are excluded. As a result, while Hague 2005 assists enforcement where it applies, it does not apply in every case where the claimant is a Hague 2005 state resident.
44. CPR 25.12 permits a defendant to apply for security for costs. On such an application, there are two stages to the assessment, one a matter of jurisdiction, the other of discretion. CPR 25.13(2)(a) in its current form came into effect on 31st December 2020 at the end of the transition period, following the UK's withdrawal, from the European Union. The pre-existing rule excluded, in addition to Hague 2005 state residents, those resident in Brussels or Lugano Convention or Judgment Regulation states.
45. The exception for Hague Convention states has been present for some time. However, aside from the EU, there are only a very small number of Hague 2005 member states. The exception of Hague 2005 has therefore become much more significant following the UK's withdrawal from the EU.
46. Mr Justice Trower drew attention to the policy perspective. The LSC observed that the original intention of the exclusion was to protect against covert discrimination against Brussels Convention nationals. The risk of discrimination on grounds of other nationality has however featured significantly. Where ground (a) and no other ground is satisfied, the Court will not exercise its discretion to order security unless the claimant's residence abroad gives rise to obstacles to enforcement or increases the burden of enforcement.
47. The LSC considers that there are broadly the following options available: (a) maintain the existing rule; (b) amend the rule by removing reference to Hague 2005; or (c) amend the rule to clarify that the exclusion only applies where there is an exclusive jurisdiction agreement in favour of England and Wales which falls within Hague 2005. Ben Roe raised a possible option (d) drafting a jurisdictional rule to implement a condition on courts out of jurisdiction to mirror case law.
48. However, sensitives exist and drafting solutions are likely to be complex. Given the work done by the case law at the discretion stage to focus the remedy on cases where enforcement is made more difficult or onerous by foreign residence, the LSC's considered view is that it may be safe to dispense with reference to Hague 2005 altogether and recommend that the CPRC consults on whether to remove reference to Hague 2005 from r.25.13(2)(a).
49. It was **NOTED** that:
 - CPR Part 25 (Interim remedies and security for costs) is widely used;
 - MoJ International Policy have received a copy of the LSC report and officials will need to consider these issues carefully before commenting on them;
 - The s.2(7) Sub-Committee could include this topic/draw attention to it as part of its rolling consultations programme.
50. It was **AGREED IN PRINCIPLE** that the issue merited further work and the rules may benefit from amendment; the issue will be revisited when the s.2(7) Sub-Committee's report on Part 25 returns (anticipated to be the next meeting) and so that the terms and scope of consultation can be considered.

51. **Actions:** Secretariat to liaise with MoJ Policy to established at what stage policy involvement is required; terms/scope of consultation to be revisited thereafter.

Item 7 CPR E-mail Address List CPR(23)36

52. This was last before the CPRC at the 31st March 2023 meeting, when it was agreed in principle to introduce a consolidated list of e-mail addresses contained in the CPR, together with an associated flagging provision.

53. The purpose being a process which avoided e-mail addresses being expressly included in the body of the CPR. By doing so, it aims to provide maximum flexibility if/when e-mail addresses are changed or created.

54. Alasdair Wallace explained that in order to incorporate a flagging provision in PD 5B (Communication and filing of documents by E-mail) its scope required amendment because it was currently limited to communications and filing of specified documents with the court by e-mail; it did not extend to e-mailing bodies outside the court.

55. A discussion ensued. Ian Curtis-Nye raised a question on the usability of the proposed reform, particularly for litigants in person. This led to a discussion regarding the feasibility options for implementation. The consolidated list identifies around 10 places in the CPR where e-mail addresses are currently quoted. The intention is to replace those references in the CPR with a hyper-link to the consolidated list, which is to be hosted online, alongside the CPR. As a means to assist users and the usability of the printed CPR, a destination table can be provided.

56. It was **NOTED** that:

- e-mail addresses in the list which include, “gsi” are still operational, by way of auto re-directs.
- the e-mail address “comp-amicus@cec.eu.int” appears to be defunct, because the secretariat’s test messages were returned undelivered. The intended use of the e-mail address was for when the court directed a copy of the transcript of the relevant judgment to be sent to the Commission. However, in any event, the related provisions (in PD 52D (Statutory appeals and appeals subject to special provision) and the EU competition law PD) were removed by the EU Exit PD (107th PD Update) and as such are no longer required. In consequence, they have been removed from the list.
- currently, the hyper-links in the document only take the user to the CPR Part, in which the provision is located. If it is possible to refine the hyper-link so that it takes the user directly to the specific CPR provision to which it relates, this will be done prior to implementation.

57. It was **RESOLVED** to approve, subject to the above, the consolidated list and the following amendments to PD 5B Communication and filing of documents by E-mail:

- **AMEND** the scope:

“This practice direction provides for parties to communicate and file specified documents with the court by e-mail in proceedings to which the Civil Procedure Rules apply. It also makes provision about the e-mail address to be used where a rule or practice direction states that communications or documents may be sent to or served on a body by e-mail.”

- **INTRODUCE** a flagging provision:

“Where any rule or practice direction states in relation to a body that a document, notice or other communication may be served on or sent to that body by e-mail but does not state an e-mail address, the e-mail address to be used will be the address given by that body for this purpose.

A list of such addresses may be found online at <https://www.justice.gov.uk/courts/procedure-rules/civil> .”

58. **Actions:** (i) Secretariat to confirm feasibility with MoJ web team (ii) Drafting Lawyers and Secretariat to incorporate into the next CPR Update as part of the October 2023 in-force cycle.

Item 8 Extension of pilot schemes and Contents of the summer SI and PD Update

59. This item comprised two elements:

Extension of pilot schemes PD 51R (Online Civil Money Claims pilot) and PD 51ZB (Damages Claims Portal pilot)

60. The Chair set out the background. The report to the Damages and Money Claims Committee (DMMC) was duly **NOTED**. The Chair had also discussed the matter with Mr Justice Johnson (DMCC Chair) out-of-committee.

61. Currently, PD 51R is currently due to expire on 30th November 2023 and PD 51ZB Damages is currently due to expire on 30 April 2024. It was **RESOLVED** to extend both pilot schemes to 1st October 2024.

62. **Action:** Drafting Lawyers/Secretariat to incorporate into the next available PD Update.

Contents of the summer SI and PD Update.

63. The Chair provided an overview of the anticipated content of the next mainstream CPR amendments and an oral update as to the indicative promulgation timetable. The instruments were, subject to Ministerial approval, due to be published on/soon after 14th July 2023, being the anticipated parliamentary laying date for the SI to enter into force on 1st October (save for any earlier in-force dates, by exception, such as the HMCTS (Civil National Business Centre) amendments (from item 4 above) which were due to come into force in August 2023. This was duly **NOTED**.

64. **Action:** In liaison with members (to secure the requisite signatures), Drafting Lawyers and Secretariat to facilitate promulgation.

Item 9 Any Other Business & Close

65. **Extending Fixed Recoverable Costs (FRC) CPR(23)37.** Mr Justice Trower explained that, following publication of the recent FRC reforms, the sub-committee had received useful feedback from stakeholders which has been carefully considered. Some points merit immediate action, others require further consideration by MoJ and are likely to be subject to consultation in due course. At this stage, a suite of minor changes to the amendments, made by the Civil Procedure (Amendment No. 2) Rules 2023 and related instruments, have been drafted in response to stakeholder feedback in order to address some missed/incorrect cross references and typographical errors, which were duly **AGREED**. The amendments are intended to come into force at the same time as the above reforms, namely 1st October 2023. **Action:** Drafting Lawyers/Secretariat to incorporate into the next CPR Update.

66. **Online Procedure Rule Committee (OPRC).** The Chair gave a brief oral update to advise that the OPRC's inaugural meeting is anticipated before the end of June, subject to confirmation of the public appointees. A fuller update is due to be provided by MoJ Policy following the OPRC's first meeting. MoJ intend to provide updates to the Tribunal and Family Procedure Rule Committees as well as the CPRC. **Post Meeting Note:** Further information on the launch of the OPRC, and confirmation of membership can be read here: [New Online Procedure Rule Committee launched - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk)

67. **Fundamental Dishonesty in QOCS.** The Chair referred to the public question on this point (question number 28 from the open meeting) and confirmed that it will be added to the CPRC's ongoing work programme to be considered as/when time allows. However, it was not possible to fix a timetable at this stage.

C B POOLE
June 2023

Attendees:

Carl Poole, Rule Committee Secretary
Master Dagnall, Chair, Lacuna Sub-Committee
Nicola Critchley, Civil Justice Council
Alasdair Wallace, Government Legal Department
Andrew Currans, Government Legal Department
Katie Fowkes, Government Legal Department.
Amrita Dhaliwal, Ministry of Justice
Andy Caton, Judicial Office
Terry McGuinness, Judicial Office
Rosemary Rand, HM Courts & Tribunals Service
Robert Ritchie, Ministry of Justice, Rights Policy (Item 2)
Rhys Davies, General Counsel to the Independent Monitoring Authority (Item 2)
Mark May, Ministry of Justice, International Policy (observing Item 6)