

Legal Services Commission Response to Cabinet Office's Green Paper on 'Modernising Commissioning'
5 January 2011

Introduction

The Legal Services Commission (LSC) is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). The LSC is the biggest single purchaser of legal services in England and Wales with an annual spend of £2.2 billion; we are responsible for the delivery of civil and criminal legal aid and the development of community legal services.

The LSC welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the Green Paper's proposals on 'modernising commissioning' by increasing the role of charities, social enterprises, mutuals and cooperatives in public service delivery.

Executive Summary

The LSC, and its predecessor the Legal Aid Board (LAB), have a history of working with Community Service Organisations (CSO) such as Citizens Advice Bureaux, Shelter and Law Centres under what we have called our 'Not-for-Profit' (NfPs) initiatives. We have also set about developing local commissioning strategies. This has built up to joint commissioning of legal and advice services with local authorities under the title of Community Legal Advice Centres (CLACs) and networks (CLANs). We consider that our experiences will be relevant to your consultation paper. For the purpose of this response, we will be using the term NfPs, which we take to mean CSOs.

The majority of the legal services commissioned by the LSC are provided by Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) legal firms and NfPs. Some are provided by joint ventures between law firms, NfPs and even private companies. The majority of the LSC contracts are for the provision of local 'face-to-face' services. We also fund national telephone services, presently provided by a private company (Capita Healthcare).

LSC contracts are placed through national bidding/tender rounds, with services covering the whole of England and Wales divided into 135 procurement areas, or where necessary, through specific targeted tenders for specialist services. Examples of the latter are our tenders for national telephone service, or our local CLAC contracts.

We have an independent research arm called the Legal Services Research Centre (LSRC). They carry out an extensive survey of legal advice needs across the country, the Civil and Social Justice Survey (CSJS). The CSJS has been used to produce a broad range of research output, including annual survey reports. Other research of relevance to this Green Paper is the LSRC's research and evaluation on CLACs and CLANs. The LSC has drawn on research for policy development routinely.

We consider there are two key issues for your consideration:

- **Working Capital.** It would be extremely beneficial for the Big Society bank to provide Working Capital to NfPs. We have found that NfPs consider they have restricted access to working capital, and their ability to service contracts with payment by results at the end of the process is weak.
- **Stability of Funding.** We have found that NfPs consider they need contracts for several years so as to obtain working capital and to limit their exposure to redundancy payments at the end of contracts.

Background History

The LSC engages with the NfPs in two distinct ways:

- There is a broad and wide ranging relationship in that NfPs can help improve public services and engage with clients.
- There is a smaller group of NfPs that we contract with to provide legal services. Our relationship with this second group is narrower and governed by contract and procurement law.

The LSC believes that the NfPs offer valuable insight and engagement opportunities with members of public, thereby giving us a range of information including the types of legal services needed in specific geographical areas. In 2007, the LSC voluntarily signed up to the Compact which is an agreement made at both national and local levels that sets out how government and voluntary and community organisations work together in all areas – including consultation, funding, and delivering better services.

In addition, the LSC has been working in partnership with the NfPs to deliver legally aided advice to members of the public since the 1990s under its predecessor, the LAB. This was done to fulfil the Lord Chancellor's objective for legal aid as set out in his Green Paper *Legal Aid – Targeting Need* in May 2004 that the advice sector should provide more of the services its members were qualified to deliver.

The first NfP pilot scheme ran in 1994 with 42 organisations where the LSC explored and investigated numerous forms of payment to achieve value for money, along with new quality standards specifically developed for NfPs.

From 1995 the NfP pilot was expanded so that by 1997/98 the LSC was spending £14m through 140 NfP providers providing advice and assistance in housing, debt, welfare benefit, employment and immigration. NfPs received start-up costs and quarterly payments in advance, eliminating the need to raise working capital. In return, they were expected to deliver specific hours of advice to clients each year within the set quality standards. If the hours were not achieved, the payments were adjusted down to reflect the work actually done.

In 2007, in order to ensure that clients are offered the same standard of quality whether they choose to obtain legally aided advice from a private contracted solicitor firm or an NfP provider the LSC decided to offer one single contract (with its corresponding quality requirements) to both the private and NfP providers. This also applied to the Law Centres who had previously been provided with grants by our sponsor department, MoJ.

Under this Unified Contract all providers are paid by results, in that they are paid a fee when the client's advice case is completed. It was recognised that this would delay payment to NfPs over the previous contract, but would more directly connect payment with delivery of the client service. In order to assist NfP providers in signing up to the new contracts, the LSC offered and agreed a set of transitional arrangements with the NfP providers allowing them extra time to adjust and restructure their management to improve business effectiveness. Ultimately, apart from raising the quality standards, the LSC, via the Unified Contract, encouraged and brought the NfP providers to a place where they can compete more effectively for funding against the private sector. By 2007/08 the LSC spent £60m through 442 NfP providers.

We are pleased to say that as at 2009/10, we have 403 contracts with NfP providers which amounted to £86m of legal aid fund.

Community Legal Aid Advice Centres (CLACs) and Networks (CLANs)

Building on the work set out above, from 2007 the LSC actively engaged with local authorities and key stakeholders, including NfP representative bodies, to deliver 'one-stop' local services which not only include legal advice but other essential services particularly social welfare law and family, including in some circumstances, mental health and immigration advice. These took the form of funding contracts for 'one-stop shop' Community Legal Advice Centres (CLACs) or linked services through provider Networks (CLANs).

The Community Legal Advice services aim to:

- Enable people to protect their **fundamental rights** and sort out legal disputes
- Tackle disadvantage and promote **social inclusion**
- Deliver legal advice services to local communities according to **local needs and priorities**
- Provide **quality integrated legal advice services** ranging from basic information to representation in court, which offer value for money and are supported by co-ordinated funding
- Be **independent** of funders and government
- Bring services to clients who do not currently **access legal services**.

The CLAC and CLAN concepts were first fully set out in the LSC's strategy paper *Making Legal Rights a Reality*, published in March 2006. The paper describes how, "working jointly with local authorities and other funders", the LSC intended to develop "a jointly-funded single entity that provides the whole bundle of core social welfare law services". Such CLACs were to be "clearly identifiable as a CLS service" and "readily accessible to the community". The key proposal was the creation of a single contract (with provision for sub-contracting) which would be the focus for LSC funding of social welfare law provision in an area, as well as the majority (if not the entirety) of local authority funding for advice and assistance on social welfare law issues.

The CLAC concept is the logical extension of the integrated services model. CLACs and CLANs are intended to provide the full range (in terms of levels of help, and categories of social welfare law) of assistance, in order to tackle the problems identified by various research studies¹, which conclude that advice seekers:

- Often experience problems in clusters, for example: a debt problem is often accompanied by a housing problem and a welfare benefit problem.
- In many cases are unaware of local services and therefore take action much less often.
- Tend to use the same advice seeking strategies, so will go to the advice provider they went to before. If this provider only offers advice in one or two categories, they are less likely to be able to help the client with all their problems.
- Suffer from 'referral fatigue': the more times a person is referred from provider to provider the less likely they are to attend and to get the advice they need.
- Choose their adviser based on where they or their family / household have previously sought advice. Where this is an individual category or niche provider it will almost

¹ A list of reference publications used is listed at **Annex A** of this response.

inevitably be the wrong provider although where it is an integrated service, the likelihood of it being the right provider is increased.

The problems of “clustering” and “referral fatigue” are believed to be attributable to, or exacerbated by, the fragmented nature of advice services, including the split between “generalist” advice and “specialist” advice, and the failure of advice providers to refer clients effectively. Since the publication of the *CLS Strategy*, providers have been actively encouraged to deliver work across all five social welfare law (SWL) categories. However only 26 out of 898 (2.9%) current SWL providers deliver advice across all five SWL categories (this includes the five CLACs opened so far), whereas 654 (72.8%) offer only one or two categories. There are a range of other “gaps in supply” which wider implementation of the CLAC or CLAN concept may help to fill.

Existing CLACs

The table below shows the location of CLACs as funded jointly by the LSC and the respective local authorities:

Area	Provider	Sub-Contractors	Opening Date	Length of Contract	Categories of Law
Gateshead	Gateshead Community Legal Advice Centre (Comprising Gateshead CAB)	- Ben Hoare Bell - David Gray & Co - Swinburne & Jackson	12/04/2007	3 years (plus a 1 year extension)	SWL Family
Derby	Access to Law (A2L)	- Citizens Advice & Law Centre - Derbyshire Housing Aid - Moody & Woolley Smith Partnership	01/04/2008	3 years (plus a 1 year extension)	SWL Family Immigration
Leicester	A4E	Howells	01/04/2008	3 years (plus a 1 year extension)	SWL Family
Portsmouth	You Trust (formerly the Southern Focus Trust)	Portsmouth CAB	01/04/2008	3 years	SWL Family
Hull	A4E	Howells	20/10/2008	3 years	SWL Family Immigration
East Riding	East Riding CAB	Switalskis Solicitors	01/03/2010	3 years	SWL
Barking & Dagenham	Edwards Duthie	Barking & Dagenham CAB	01/05/2010	3 years	SWL Family
West Sussex	West Sussex CLAS (Comprising of CABx around West Sussex)	- Adur & Worthing CAB - Central Sussex CAB - Arun & Chichester CAB - Shelter	01/04/2010	3 years	SWL

Wakefield	Switalskis Solicitors	Wakefield CAB	01/10/2010	3 years	SWL Family
Manchester	Manchester CAB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shelter - Glaisyers Solicitors - Platt Halpern Solicitors - Cheetham Hill Advice Centre 	14/10/2010	3 years	SWL Family

The introduction of CLACs and CLANs has had impacts beyond the areas where such services have been developed. For example, local providers and local authorities in non-CLAC areas have told us that they were establishing more formal referral networks, holding conferences to discuss amongst others, local provision. They are taking steps to achieve many of the perceived benefits of a CLAC. These activities did not appear explicitly to involve the LSC, although many of the providers involved received significant amounts of legal aid funding.

Tendering for Services

The LSC procures almost its entire £2.2 billion legal services through tenders. These range from registration type tenders which are non-competitive to competitive 'Best Value' tenders through which we select applicants based on a set of preference criteria linked clearly to quality and/or price.

The quality of the legal advice provided is at the core of what we commission. In fact, since the days of the LAB, we have developed quality assurance standards against which to assess services. These ranged from management standards for the provision of legal services (including supervisor experience standards, supervision and file review arrangements), to the development of new competence standards for Police Station Representatives. The LAB also introduced a voluntary quality assurance scheme in 1994, called Franchising. Providers were audited for compliance with the management standards and paper file "transaction criteria".

In 2000, when the LSC came into being, replacing the LAB, exclusive civil legal aid contracts were introduced for those who met the quality standards through a registration type process. Exclusive contracts were subsequently extended to criminal legal aid in 2001. With regards to ensuring quality standard, the pinnacle of developments was the LSC's Peer Review process, which involved assessment of the quality of work on cases by independent trained professionals. Of course, Peer Review is an expensive process when applied across some 4,000 service providers and the LSC has sought to target its use. These schemes have either been taken over by regulatory professional bodies or are planned to be handed over.

The LSC successfully introduced 'Best Value' tenders for specialist services such as the CDS Defence Solicitor Call Centre service which provides telephone advice for detainees at the police station. The service started in 2005 with advice for clients who requested the duty solicitor, and was extended in 2007 to cover all detainees. The approach was then applied to the new civil telephone and internet service CLS Direct (now Community Legal Advice). 'Best Value' tendering was also applied to Very High Cost Cases crime work in 2007/08, receiving bids from some 400 solicitors firms and 2,000 self-employed barristers. Bidders were judged on their experience of this complex work, their ability to work as teams, their capability to provide a material volume of work, and on price the discount they were prepared to work for against the existing rates. The tender was successful with solicitors firms, but not with self-employed barristers.

The LSC also began the successful tendering of CLACs in 2007. The criteria upon which providers have been selected were heavily focused on quality of service to clients, and then weighed against value for money. Firstly, the bidder's ability to deliver a high quality service to

clients in the relevant categories of law was assessed. Secondly, the bidder's understanding of the advice needs in the specific town or county was assessed. Thirdly, the bidder's ability to provide complementary services which will enhance the delivery of a CLAC or CLAN service was also assessed. Such selection criteria have aided the LSC in ensuring that CLAC and CLAN contracts achieve a high quality service for end users and also value for money for the taxpayer.

In 2007, Lord Carter carried out a review of legal aid and recommended the introduction of Best Value tendering for the LSC core representation services. In 2009/10 the LSC has completed a comprehensive national tender of civil and criminal services across 135 procurement areas. This has been a major exercise handling bids from some 4,000 service providers nationally. We have learned lessons about applying numerical selection criteria intended to improve quality, such as preferring those with higher qualified supervisors who are available to the office for a greater proportion of time, across such vast tenders.

It is worth recording that NfPs have greater experience of tendering for services than private practice solicitors. NfPs regularly tender for work from local authorities. They are experienced in identifying the benefits that will arise from contracts.

Our experience of best value tenders for telephone services and CLACs is that they produce a surprising mix of responses not only from traditional solicitor and NfP organisations but also private companies demonstrating our quality requirements and the ability to offer excellent value for money. Such tenders often bring providers into a market that they have not historically served if the tender is constructed correctly. For CLA telephone services, we currently have 16 such contracts with a total value of around £25 million; one delivering triage services and 15 delivering legal advice and all at competitive rates.

Consultation Questions

1. In which public service areas could Government create new opportunities for civil society organisations to deliver?

The LSC has a specific statutory responsibility. Our response is therefore limited to our experiences of commissioning services from NfPs.

1.1 What are the implications of payment by results for civil society organisations?

The LSC has operated contracts with NfPs with payment by results since 2007. They are paid on completion of cases. This would typically be 3 months, but in more complex immigration cases up to 2 years. Prior to this, the LSC paid working capital quarterly in advance. It was therefore necessary to put in place transitional financial arrangement whilst NfPs reorganised their working capital.

The critical factor for operating payment by results in ensuring there is a source of working capital for the NfPs.

1.2 Which public services areas could be opened up to more civil society providers? What are the barriers to more civil society organisations being involved?

The LSC has found over the last 20 years that it is possible for NfPs to take on legal advice. We have facilitated this by working with the sector to develop service standards for work not covered by regulatory bodies (such as the Solicitors Regulatory Authority).

As discuss above, raising working capital represents a significant barrier.

- 1.3 Should Government explore extending the right to challenge to other local state-run services? If so, which areas and what benefits could civil society organisations bring to these public service areas?**

No response.

- 1.4 Are there types of assets whose viability, when transferred to civil society management or ownership, would be particularly dependent on a continuing income stream from service contracts or public sector tenancies? What are the main barriers that prevent civil society organisations taking over asset-based services?**

No response.

- 1.5 How can we encourage more existing civil society organisations to team up with new employee-led mutuals?**

No response.

- 1.6 What other methods [other than 'right to provide' or 'right to challenge'] could the Government consider in order to create more opportunities for civil society organisations to deliver public services?**

No response.

- 2. How could Government make existing public service markets more accessible to civil society organisations?**

The LSC's experience is that the biggest problem for NfPs working under a 'payment by results' scheme is securing medium to long term financing.

Firstly, NfPs must raise working capital to fund new contracts. The LSC would support initiatives to encourage lending to CSOs, whether new or expanding. We would support the Big Society Bank being tasked to provide working capital.

Secondly, NfPs require contracts of sufficient length to provide them with a financial stable income stream, and limit their exposure to redundancy costs on conclusion of contract. The LSC places contracts for 3 years as a reasonable balance of security for providers with flexibility to reallocate our resources to new activities or to new entrants.

- 2.1 What issues should commissioners take into account in order to increase civil society organisations' involvement in existing public service markets?**

The LSC's predecessor (LAB), recognised in the 1990s the potential for NfPs to provide legal advice from the existing Citizens Advice Bureaux, Law Centres and charities such as Shelter. This was developed with the Lord Chancellor into his Green Paper *Legal Aid – Targeting Need* objective published in May 2004, that the advice sector should provide more of the services its members were qualified to deliver.

It is clear that NfPs (and SMEs) are well placed to provide direct client services in many areas of social services. These services only require relatively little capital, and there are few economies of scale.

2.2 In the implementation of the abovementioned measures [Contract Finder], what issues should the Government consider in order to ensure that they are fully inclusive of civil society organisations?

We would wish to comment on quotas. We would suggest that the proportion of work being placed to NfPs depends upon the type of service being commissioned. The LSC procures nearly all its £2.2 billion in legal services from SMEs and NfPs. This is because we are procuring 'face-to-face' legal services which are provided locally, services which require limited capital investment and few economies of scale. These services match themselves to SME/NfP provision.

2.3 What issues should the Civil Society Red Tape Taskforce consider in order to reduce the bureaucratic burden of commissioning?

No response.

2.4 How can commissioners achieve a fair balance of risk which would enable civil society organisations to compete for opportunities?

It is true that NfPs are considered by many commissioners to represent a higher risk. Their performance is variable, some succeed and others fail like other new start enterprises. They do not have the motive for the better performing ones to take over failing ones. It is therefore necessary to work with umbrella organisations to develop support and training materials. The existence and performance of umbrella organisations is therefore very important (such as the Advice Service Alliance).

2.5 What are the key issues civil society organisations face when dealing with TUPE regulations and what could government do, within existing legislation, to resolve these problems?

The LSC experience is not of TUPE constraint restricting the operation of NfPs. The risk of redundancy costs at the end of contracts is considered to be a greater risk. This requires provision of contracts of sufficient length to attract investment. See our summary response.

2.6 What issues should Government consider in order to ensure that civil society organisations are assessed on their ability to achieve the best outcomes for the most competitive price?

The LSC's experience of tendering with NfPs has been for its Community Legal Advice Centres (CLACs). These are tenders for the provision of local services against generic specifications. They are assessed on existing capability or the credibility of proposed new services.

We have found that NfPs are quite capable of tendering effectively for such work against private practice solicitors or private companies. We have found that they often choose to tender in partnership with private practice solicitors or private companies.

2.7 What issues should Government consider in the development of the Big Society Bank, in order to enable civil society organisations to take advantage of public service market opportunities?

The LSC's experience is that raising working capital represents the biggest constraint on the growth of NfPs. The LSC recognises the strong work Future Builders have done in the past. We would support the Big Society Bank being tasked to provide working capital.

2.8 What issues affecting civil society organisations should be considered in relation to the extension of the Merlin Standard across central government?

The LSC supports the development of a standard for supply chain management and prime contractors investing in the capacity and performance of their delivery partners. We will consider the adoption of DWP's Merlin in commissioning of our services in future. We note that other Agencies within the MoJ are considering the adoption of Merlin.

2.9 What barriers prevent civil society organisations from forming and operating in consortia? How could they be removed?

The LSC's CLAC procurement has involved groups of solicitor partnerships, private companies and NFP bidding together. The LSC experience is that consortia only work if there is not a dilution of accountability. We have found that they are successful when there is a clear lead organisation or special vehicle to operate the contract with clearly accountable officers. Our form of consortium therefore requires clear contractual accountability and indemnities.

3. How could commissioners use assessments of full social, environmental and economic value to inform their commissioning decisions?

Assessing full social, environmental and economic value in a robust way is a challenging endeavour. To consider full social, environmental and economic value, research and evaluation needs to be built into policy operations. It needs to be understood by commissioners and used to modify decisions if necessary.

At the LSC, we have been committed to evidence-based policy and have a long tradition of supporting high-quality research on vulnerable groups, many of whom are eligible for legal aid. This has included the LSRC's research on the clustering of civil justice problems (see e.g. Pleasence et. al (2004) *Causes of Action*), which in turn led to our policy of commissioning CLACs and CLANs – to provide an integrated and seamless advice service to help clients with multiple problems. The client research on CLACs and CLANs highlights the benefits of an integrated advice service model, specifically the benefits conferred from commissioning services that have a range of advice expertise 'under one roof' (Buck et al. 2010). These benefits for clients need to be weighed against some of the challenges encountered in the commissioning and set-up of CLAC, such as the resource and time intensiveness of this process (see Fox et al. 2010).

3.1 What approaches would best support commissioning decisions that consider full social, environmental and economic value?

We note that the Cabinet Office has published *A Guide to Social Return on Investment* setting out a framework for evaluating social return. The LSC primarily provides services specified under statute of the Access to Justice Act 1999. Many are specific in providing representation of clients in legal proceedings.

This needs to be considered. Firstly, for these very specific representation services the SROI has implicitly been evaluated by the MoJ in setting the regulations. Secondly, legal aid part of the wider criminal justice and the wider child care systems. SROI assessments would need to carry out.

The LSC has also commissioned services for which there is more flexibility in delivery, such as the CLACs and CLANs. These contracts have been tendered under more flexible and generic specifications. The criteria upon which suppliers have been selected have been heavily focused on quality of service to clients, and hence improve the social benefit to the clients and local community. Firstly, the bidder's ability to deliver a high quality service to clients in the relevant categories of law was assessed. Secondly, the bidder's understanding

of the advice needs in the specific town or county was assessed. Thirdly, the bidder's ability to provide complementary services which will enhance the delivery of a CLAC or CLAN service was assessed.

3.2 What issues should Government consider in taking forward the Public Services (Social Enterprise and Social Value) Bill?

No response.

4. How could civil society organisations support greater citizen and community involvement in all stages of commissioning?

CLACs and CLANs are jointly commissioned by the LSC and local authorities, thereby ensuring that local perspectives are taken into account. However, more could have been done on user involvement and local needs assessment at the early stages of CLAC/CLAN development, as one of the evaluation reports showed (Fox et. al 2010). As pointed out earlier, however, in general the LSC supports research on users and potential users of its services – in order to make informed decisions and target user needs. Research the LSRC has conducted on citizens and their legal needs includes both quantitative, qualitative and cost-effectiveness analyses. The research is valued as independent and organisations such as the Advice Services Alliance, Citizens Advice and the Law Centres Federation regularly draw on the LSRC's research results.

The LSC has produced a *Client and Public Engagement Strategy*. One of its main objectives was that users of legal services are empowered to access the services they need. The strategy was published in 2009 and is available on our website at www.legalservices.gov.uk. The key activities the LSC has undertaken under this Strategy are:

- **Client Diversity Group.** This group is part of the LSC's compliance with the Equalities Act.
- **Journey mapping.** We have produced mapping for our CLA telephone service, to identify the optimal path for legal aid clients accessing advice through this delivery method. This will help with the future design of the service.
- **Domestic Abuse and BAME Women.** Following a series of workshops with clients we published a report on these clients needs. This is available on our website as part of Family Law Strategy. The aim was to improve our understanding of the obstacles faced by BAME women in accessing legal advice and how we can reduce these. A number of recommendations were implemented as a result of this work.
- **Literature Review.** The purpose of the review was to evaluate research already completed regarding accessing legal services, with a specific emphasis on legal aid advice. Specific emphasis was also given to different vulnerable client groups. A final report has been agreed. However, this has not been published, but can be made available.

All client engagement and segmentation work has moved to MoJ and they have a comprehensive programme on research/analytical work on justice system clients. The MoJ contact is Annabelle Chalker in their Strategic Communications team.

4.1 What role and contributions could civil society organisations place, through Local Health Watch, in informing the local consumer voice about commissioning?

No response.

4.2 What issues relating to civil society organisations should the Government consider when refreshing the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment Guidance?

No response.

4.3 How could civil society organisations facilitate, encourage and support community and citizen involvement in decision making about local priorities and services commissioned?

In late 1990s the LSC set up Regional Legal Services Committees and Community Legal Services Partnerships. These were intended to increase local involvement in the prioritisation and commissioning of services. We found these were unsuccessful. Firstly, they did not include clients, but were dominated by service providers focused on obtaining funding for their services. This may be due to the nature of legal services, where clients are occasional users rather than regular and knowledgeable. Secondly, our services are predominantly prescribed by statute to cover representation.

In 2007, the LSC switched to working with local authorities to developing local integrated advice services, in the form of CLACs and CLANs. By working together to define the advice services to be jointly funded, we have been much more successful. Local authorities and their counsellors provide a more accurate and focused assessment of local needs.

4.4 What forms of support will best enable statutory partners and civil society organisations to improve their working relationships?

No response.

4.5 What issues should the government consider in the development of the future programme of training public service commissioners?

At present there is a lack of formal training courses, materials and qualifications in commissioning, whilst procurement is well catered for by CIPS and specific training within government. Commissioning is not a core module for those being trained by the Civil Service Fast Stream for central government, yet it impinges more on policy development than procurement. Further, there is no formal professional qualification in commissioning.

The LSC is one of the sponsors of the Academy for Justice Commissioning. The Academy is a group of individuals involved in commissioning across MoJ, NOMS and LSC. The Academy is bringing together available training materials onto its website, and running talks by those in commissioning.

The LSC proposes that there would be real benefit in creating specific training materials, course and qualifications, particularly for those in central government. The EGD within the Cabinet Office would be a good candidate to sponsor for such training and qualification.

There are commissioners in central and local government both working with NfPs. The LSC also recommends staff exchanges between government bodies and providers, and between central and local government.

4.6 What can civil society organisations contribute to the roll out of community budgets? What barriers exist to realising this contribution? How can these barriers be removed?

No response.

4.7 What can civil society organisations contribute to the roll out of Local Integrated Services? What barriers exist to realising this contribution? How can these barriers be removed?

No response.

4.8 What can civil society organisations contribute to the development of Free Schools? What should Government consider in order to realise this contribution?

No response.

4.9 What contributions could civil society organisations make to the extension of personal budgets across a range of service areas? What changes do both commissioners and civil society organisations need to make to adapt to an environment where citizens are commissioning their own services?

No response.

Other Comments

If you would like to discuss any aspect of the LSC's response in more detail, please contact

Yours sincerely

Hugh Barrett
Executive Director, Commissioning

Annex A – Reference Publications:

1. Lord Chancellors Objective set out in Green Paper “**Legal Aid – Targeting Need**” May 2004. (see LAB annual report 1994/05).
2. Policy Studies Institute report: “**Extending Legal Aid Franchising to non-Solicitor Agencies: Standards for Supervisors.**” (Circa 1993-94)
3. Policy Studies Institute report: “**Legal Aid Franchising for non-Solicitor Agencies: Interim Report**” Sept 1995.
4. **Paths to Justice (England, Genn 1999) Civil and Social Justice Survey** (Pleasance et al, 2004, Pleasance et al 2006)
5. Fox, C., Moorhead, R., Sefton, M. and Wong, K. (2010): Community Legal Advice Centres and Networks: A Process Evaluation, London: Legal Services Research Centre
6. Buck, A., Smith, M., Sidaway, J., and Scanlan, L. (2010): Piecing It Together: Exploring One-Stop Shop Legal Service Delivery in Community Legal Advice Centres, London: Legal Services Commission
7. Buck, A., Smith, M., Sidaway, J. and Balmer, N.J. (2010) Community Legal Advice Centres: A Survey of Clients in Reception Areas, London: Legal Services Commission
8. Smith, M. and Patel, A. (2010) Using Monitoring Data: Examining Community Legal Advice Centre Delivery, London: Legal Services Commission.

