



Ministry of  
**JUSTICE**

# **Restructuring the delivery of criminal defence services**

22 March 2010

© Crown copyright  
Produced by the Ministry of Justice

Alternative format versions of this report are available on request from the Criminal Legal Aid policy team ([Annette.Cowell@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Annette.Cowell@justice.gsi.gov.uk)).

## Contents

Ministerial foreword	2
Introduction	3
The case for restructuring the delivery model	3
Future structure of the market for criminal defence services	5
Scope of contracts	7
Tender design	8
Next steps	9
Principles underpinning a restructuring delivery	10
Firm level data	11

---

## Ministerial foreword

The Government spends around £1.2 billion every year on criminal legal aid. For many individuals, it is an essential service ensuring they receive fair access to justice. Through initiatives such as means testing in the magistrates' courts and Crown Court, we are ensuring that those who can genuinely afford to contribute towards the costs of their defence do so. We have also put in place a programme of fixed and standard fees across many areas of criminal legal aid and this has been successful in stabilising expenditure. However, in the current financial climate, these measures are unlikely to be sufficient. The Government has to make some tough decisions about public expenditure, and further savings, including from legal aid, will be needed. Even with the necessary savings and reforms, our system of legal aid – civil and criminal – will still be far and away the best funded in the world.

At the same time, we are very aware of what criminal legal aid providers have been telling us about the sustainability of the system. They have said that they are at or close to the point at which it is no longer profitable for them to carry on. While there are many dedicated firms up and down the country providing excellent services, I do not believe that we can continue with the current structure of provision, with services delivered by many hundreds of predominantly small firms. In my view, a significant restructuring of the market is likely to be the only sustainable solution.

The proposals outlined here would lead to a much more consolidated market, in which larger contracts were let to a smaller number of providers, enabling them to take advantage of economies of scale and the opportunity to deliver services more innovatively and efficiently. I recognise that providers need to drive down their own costs, and we will be looking very critically at the contractual requirements we place on them, with the aim of allowing them to choose how best to deliver good quality services to their clients. This approach will be a difficult process for many firms and practitioners. But I believe it will offer opportunities for those who are willing to join up with other providers to win larger contracts (which include the higher value Crown Court work), enabling them to build a sustainable and profitable business.

I am grateful for the constructive input we have received from the Law Society, the Legal Services Commission, and a number of practitioners. We have listened carefully to the views expressed, and this document reflects a number of the points raised. I recognise that there will be a range of views on these outline proposals that we have not yet heard. However, the *status quo* is not an option, and we believe that these proposals are the ones most likely to create a more secure long term base for that part of the legal profession dependent on public funds. Nevertheless, we are keen to consider any alternative options and will therefore be seeking views from all interested parties through a consultation later this year.

**The Rt Hon Jack Straw MP**  
**Lord Chancellor & Secretary of State for Justice**

## Introduction

1. On 17 December 2009, Justice Ministers announced that they had invited the Legal Services Commission (LSC) not to proceed with the planned pilots for Best Value Tendering which were due to begin in July 2010<sup>1</sup>. They were persuaded that the scheme proposed was unlikely to lead to the efficient, re-structured legal services market envisaged by Lord Carter in his 2006 review of legal aid procurement. However, Ministers remain fully committed to developing tendering processes with a more ambitious scope which would enable a reduction in the overall cost of criminal legal aid and at the same time enable suppliers to be profitable and sustainable by reducing their costs of delivery. The statement published in December concluded that the Ministry of Justice would work closely with the LSC, the Law Society and individual practitioners to develop in outline improved proposals by the end of March 2010.
2. Over the last three months, the Ministry of Justice has met the Law Society and a number of individual practitioners to discuss these outline proposals. We have also worked with the LSC to draw on their experience in developing a Best Value Tendering pilot model. This policy statement is the outcome of that work and is the first stage in a process heading towards the implementation of a revised structure for the delivery of criminal legal aid services.

### The case for restructuring the delivery model

3. The case for a restructured delivery model for criminal legal aid was made in 2006 in Lord Carter's report, *Legal Aid: a market-based approach to reform*<sup>2</sup>. Lord Carter argued for the restructuring of the delivery of criminal legal aid through tendering based on quality, capacity and price as the best means to secure greater value for money. Tendering based on these principles would enable greater efficiency in delivery and therefore control over rising costs through a restructuring of the market, without compromising quality or access to legal advice. It would also allow providers to receive a fair market price for their services and thus enable them to build sustainable businesses. As a part of this process Lord Carter also argued for expanded delivery areas, based on groupings of police station duty schemes, to enable firms to gain access to greater volumes of work. Restructuring of the market was likely to see an increase in the average size of firms through growth and mergers, rationalisation and harmonisation of the way separate services were delivered. Ultimately he envisaged a much smaller number of suppliers winning contracts within each expanded boundary area, but recognised there would need to be sufficient suppliers to ensure that conflicts of interest and issues regarding weak competition were managed. This approach was based on enabling firms to reduce their costs of delivery through economies of scale.

---

<sup>1</sup> See [www.justice.gov.uk/news/announcement171209a.htm](http://www.justice.gov.uk/news/announcement171209a.htm)

<sup>2</sup> See [www.legalaidprocurementreview.gov.uk/](http://www.legalaidprocurementreview.gov.uk/)

4. The continuation of the programme to introduce fixed and graduated fees across many areas of legal aid has been effective in reducing and controlling the cost of criminal legal aid in recent years. The Ministry of Justice is addressing some immediate financial pressures by reducing some police station fees and introducing a new fixed fee for committal hearings. We have also consulted on proposals to reduce advocates' fees. However, the Government still spends around £2.1bn per year on legal aid, of which around £1.2bn is on criminal legal aid. These measures are unlikely to be enough in the current financial circumstances. The Government will need to make significant savings across public expenditure in order to rebalance the public finances. We must therefore continue to ensure we maximise value for money from the legal aid budget, while recognising that we must now focus on enabling firms to reduce their own costs of delivery in order to remain profitable and sustainable.
5. At present, there continues to be full coverage of criminal defence services across England and Wales, indicating that providers have been able to adapt to the reforms we have implemented so far. It is possible there is scope to reduce fees further, beyond the measures we have consulted on, while avoiding any significant impact on supply. One option would therefore be to continue with the current system of administratively set fees, with work delivered in broadly the same way within the current supply structure involving a large number of predominantly smaller firms.
6. However, in our view it would not be sustainable to continue to reduce administratively set fees while maintaining the current supply structure. A number of providers have told us forcefully that we have already reached the point at which criminal legal aid work has become unprofitable for them, and it is no longer viable for them to continue to undertake it. At some point in the future we might therefore expect that suppliers would start to leave the market in significant numbers. We cannot predict how quickly this might happen, or the impact on the provision of services. We believe that, if we are to respond effectively to the financial imperatives and achieve greater value for money, while still ensuring we can continue to deliver fair access to justice and enabling providers to make a fair return, a significant restructuring of the criminal defence services market is needed. This is likely to be a difficult process for some providers, but we believe it may be the only sustainable answer to the pressures on legal aid expenditure.
7. This document describes the structure of the future provision of criminal defence services that we hope to achieve. We believe that the proposals that we outline here would lead to the kind of legal services market envisaged by Lord Carter in his report on legal aid procurement. We are setting out the broad direction of travel now so that providers can start to reflect on how this would affect them. More work is needed to develop the detailed model for tendering that would deliver this restructured market; and providers will have the opportunity to put forward their views through a future consultation. However, we believe the model we develop should be underpinned and guided by some basic principles, which are set out in Annex A of this document. We have also provided some analysis of the current make-up of the market by Criminal Justice System area in Annex B to provide context for the changes outlined in this paper.

## Future structure of the market for criminal defence services

8. Currently the criminal defence service is highly fragmented, with a large number of small suppliers and relatively few large suppliers. In addition, a number of providers are choosing to focus on Very High Cost Case (VHCC) and serious Crown Court work and not to deliver the high volume work in the police stations, magistrates' courts and Crown Court. This means that the availability of this relatively more profitable work is more restricted, and therefore less well able to support the delivery of the whole range of services that we wish to provide in the interests of the public. We believe that these market trends are not sustainable. Therefore we believe a future tendering process would **ensure a more consolidated market, with a smaller number of more efficient suppliers, required to undertake the full range of the services we need.** In addition we intend to remove many of the contractual requirements that constrain firms unnecessarily and drive up their underlying costs of delivery.
  
9. We believe these measures would provide a strong opportunity for firms to make a reasonable profit and therefore deliver a sustainable service over the long-term at a lower overall cost to the Government. We have been told that there is a clear potential for **economies of scale** and a more optimal use of resources and capacity in the delivery of legal aid services. We should therefore allow firms the scope to make these efficiencies, and ensure they have the incentives and means to invest in innovative approaches to delivering services and potentially increase their market share. This could, for example, mean sharing back-office functions, or changing staff structures so the work is handled differently. Accordingly, our view is we should seek to drive such economies of scale through the tendering process.
  
10. We envisage that providers would tender for **contracts across whole Criminal Justice System (CJS) areas, with multiple contracts** let in each CJS area. This would allow providers to grow and benefit from economies of scale, while still enabling individuals to choose from a range of suppliers and ensuring healthy competition in future tendering rounds. The precise number of contracts in any particular area would depend on the results of further detailed analysis and is likely to vary. We would consider factors such as the size and make-up of the area, available volumes of work, the existing supplier base, client choice and managing conflicts of interest. In determining the number of contracts, we would consider carefully how we maintain effective competition not just in the first but also in subsequent tendering rounds. However, we are clear that in future there are likely to be no more than **eight to ten contracts per CJS area.**
  
11. We would **take account of geographical differences**, such as between cities and urban parts of the country, and areas that are predominantly rural or have no large centres of population, as these may require different approaches to tendering. For example, given the high volume of work in London there may be a need to divide the CJS area into, say, four procurement areas as an exception to the general approach, or to retain the London CJS area as a single procurement area, but with, say, 30 to 40 contracts. While we believe that, in principle, the benefits of this restructuring can be applied to different geographies, in our view the greatest potential lies in more urban and densely populated areas. We will consider how restructuring can be applied effectively in areas where volumes of work are low and there are relatively few providers at present, and whether there is

a need to put in place different arrangements in the small number of very rural CJS areas.

12. In view of the pressures firms tell us they face in continuing to operate under the current fee system, we believe there are strong arguments for moving **quickly towards a consolidated market** that will enable firms to remain viable through access to greater volumes of work. However, there may be areas of the country where this cannot be achieved in a single step. In these areas, we may need initially to let a larger number of contracts and move to complete consolidation in a further stage. This will give firms an opportunity to expand and be in a position to take on a larger contract in subsequent rounds. Some firms may see this transition period as one in which they can adapt to a new market structure and manage their organisational arrangements or exit from the market in an orderly fashion. While we do not expect to offer firms financial compensation if they choose to exit the market, we will consider whether there is any advice or support that could be offered to help them manage the closure or transfer of their business.
13. Individuals would continue to have a **choice of legal representatives** from among the pool of providers who hold contracts. We believe this provides an important incentive to firms to maintain their reputation and retain clients through offering a good quality service. As is the case under the current contractual system, there is a trade-off between the degree of client choice and the degree of certainty contract holders would have about the volume of work they could expect. We will consider further how best to balance these two factors and whether, for example, clients should be restricted to providers who hold a contract within their CJS area (with provision for exceptional cases) or whether, as is our current view, contract holders will be able to represent clients from any area.
14. We will look for opportunities to enable providers to become more efficient through their own innovation in the way they deliver services. We want to **focus contractual requirements on the issues that really matter to their clients and the effective operation of the criminal justice system**. We will therefore examine the contractual obligations placed on providers under the current contracting arrangements with the objective of freeing suppliers to choose how best to deliver services for their clients. In this environment, there will be opportunities to take a different approach to assessing and managing quality. We believe that, in principle, responsibility for quality should rest with the professional regulators and will therefore look for opportunities to strip out the contractual requirements that are no longer necessary. However, we will want to be very clear about the service standards we expect suppliers to meet to deliver an effective service to clients, and to **have effective sanctions in place, which we are prepared to enforce**, if firms are not delivering on the contractual requirements to which they have signed up.
15. Greater freedom would also need to be balanced with continuing strong **audit controls over costs to ensure effective control on public funds**. A smaller number of contracts would allow more effective and targeted monitoring, where it is needed, and a more developed relationship between purchaser and provider. We believe that this should allow us to build a much clearer picture of the relative



profitability of firms, as recommended by the Public Accounts Committee in its recent report<sup>3</sup>. It is also consistent with our aim of reducing the cost of the administration of legal aid, through the planned new Executive Agency<sup>4</sup>, as this agency would have a more focused set of interactions with far fewer contracted providers.

### Scope of contracts

16. Providers would tender for work against a contract specification that requires delivery of a complete, **end-to-end service** to avoid any perverse incentives associated with taking on only the profitable parts of a single case or solely the more profitable types of case. This would ensure all cases are followed through to their conclusion, increase efficiency and ensure that relatively less profitable services remain available to the public in the longer term. Contracts would also ensure that where it became necessary for a client to change provider (for example because of a conflict of interest) they would be able to be represented by an alternative contracted provider.
17. Under our proposed model, we would therefore let contracts for **the full range of criminal defence work** from the police station through to the Crown Court, with cases followed through to their conclusion. All contracts would include **a share of police station and magistrates' court duty work**. Contract holders would therefore have greater access to the higher value, more profitable work.
18. We expect this is likely to mean **new ways of working** and business tie-ups between solicitors' firms, barristers and their chambers, and potentially other providers. We envisage that barristers' chambers who can put the appropriate structures in place in order to provide the full range of services specified in the contracts will be free to tender if they wish. We have said separately that we are likely to undertake a consultation exercise on a single fee for litigation and advocacy services. If that consultation takes place, and if we ultimately decide to introduce a single fee, then it is likely to lead to further market restructure. However at this time there are no worked up proposals for consulting on a single fee.
19. Our presumption is that these contracts would include the ability to undertake **Very High Cost Cases** (VHCCs). The LSC consulted<sup>5</sup> recently on various options for a future VHCC scheme. These included a possible extension to the Advocates Graduated Fee Scheme and Litigators Graduated Fee Scheme which, if implemented would mean fewer cases being contracted as VHCCs in the future. Regardless of the outcome of these consultations we believe that, if the market is

---

<sup>3</sup> *The procurement of legal aid in England and Wales by the Legal Services Commission*, Ninth Report of Session 2009-10, 2 February 2010, HC322. See [www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/cmpublicacc.htm](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/cmpublicacc.htm).

<sup>4</sup> Responding to Sir Ian Magee's review into the delivery of legal aid, the Government announced on 3 March 2010 that it had decided to move the Legal Services Commission to an Executive Agency of the Ministry of Justice. See <http://www.justice.gov.uk/news/newsrelease030310d.htm>

<sup>5</sup> See *Very High Cost (Crime) Cases 2010: A Consultation paper*, December 2009, within the consultation section of the LSC website at [www.legalservices.gov.uk](http://www.legalservices.gov.uk).

fully restructured, the firms that remain should be sufficiently large to manage the full range of VHCC cases. Outside of these contracts there would be no ability for providers to undertake VHCC cases or serious Crown Court cases alone.

## Tender design

20. The legal services market is complex in terms of the range of services that are delivered and the interactions between duty and 'own client' work. We will undertake further analysis of the market in order to determine the specification of services that will be tendered, including the obligations placed on providers (such as duty work and following cases through to their conclusion) and the opportunities available to them (such as retaining 'own clients').
21. However, we are clear that we wish to maintain some degree of client choice for the reasons set out above and therefore the concept of **'own client' work will continue**. A consequence of client choice is that contracts would not be able to specify fixed or guaranteed volumes of work. Rather they would enable firms to undertake the 'own client' work that they can attract through their quality and reputation, and would provide access to a proportion of the duty work available in the CJS area.
22. We will consider the most suitable tender mechanism in the light of the eventual design of any tender model. However, at this stage, for the first rounds of tendering required to achieve market consolidation, we envisage firms tendering, and being judged on their ability to deliver against the range of services set out in the contract specification and their capacity to deliver the volume of services required. This is likely to be against fixed published prices set at a discount to current rates.
23. Our aim is that a tender process should be as simple as is possible consistent with achieving a fair result that delivers the restructured market we are seeking.
24. There are a number of areas where we will need to undertake further work in order to develop a detailed design for a future tendering model. These include consideration of:
  - the length of contracts – we will need to balance the certainty provided by longer contracts against the flexibility offered by shorter contracts;
  - the phasing of contracts – we will consider how much of the market is let in the first tender round, and at any one time in subsequent tender rounds; and
  - given the current market structure in each CJS area, how quickly consolidation can be achieved and the number of tender rounds and the periods of time over which this is deliverable.

## Next steps

25. Having set out the direction of travel, we will undertake further analysis in order to develop options for a detailed model suitable for implementation. We expect that we would undertake a **consultation over summer 2010** and respond in the autumn. The consultation will include an impact assessment of the proposals, and consideration of the equalities impact on different types of provider. We will want to consider the views expressed by respondents, including on any alternative options that would ensure the sustainability of criminal legal aid at reduced overall expenditure, before making any final decisions. The timing will depend on the degree of market restructuring required. However, **the earliest date when we envisage new competitively tendered contracts starting in selected areas would be summer 2011**. This may mean that the 2010 crime contract will be terminated before 2013.

## Principles underpinning a restructuring of the delivery of criminal defence services

1. We believe that there are a number of principles that should underpin and guide the design of a model for the tendering of criminal defence services. Our objective is to create a system that:

*(i) can deliver continuing access to justice at the right quality*

A future system of tendering must be capable of delivering the range and volume of services we need now and in the future to those individuals who are eligible for publicly funded services. Those services must continue to be delivered to a standard that is consistent with the interests of justice and maintaining confidence in the justice system and ensure equal, fair access to all parts of society.

*(ii) maintains a sustainable and stable market*

We want a system that is sustainable and enables providers to make a fair return on their investment. We wish to avoid promoting short-term financial gains at the expense of a stable, efficient and competitive market over the long-term. This means ensuring there are enough suppliers to take part effectively in future rounds of tendering, and that new providers can enter the market.

*(iii) enables the Government and the taxpayer to secure greater value for money*

We want to design a system that offers providers incentives to innovate and improve their own efficiency so we create opportunities for them to continue to improve value for money.

*(iv) is as simple and consistent as possible*

The system should be simple to navigate and treat all those who wish to participate consistently and fairly. Providers should be clear about what they are expected to deliver and to what standard, and the risks they are expected to bear.

*(v) is flexible and continues to offer individuals a choice of legal representative*

We expect individuals to be able to choose a legal representative although, as now, that choice will not be unlimited. The system must also be flexible enough to respond to changing circumstances, such as variations in the volume of work or changes to the justice system.

## Annex B

### Firm level data

1. Data presented in this annex is all provided by the Legal Services Commission (LSC).
2. Table 1 presents estimates of individual firms' shares of total criminal legal aid receipts by the top 5, 10 and 20 firms within each CJS area.<sup>6</sup> The total value for each CJS area is given in the final column. The penultimate row presents the average market share of the top 5, 10 and 20 firms across all CJS areas, and the final row shows the market share of top 5, 10 and 20 firms nationally.
3. Tables 2–11 compile the largest 20 firms within the selected CJS areas ranked by total firm receipts from legal aid. These show the caseload volumes in police stations and representation orders of each firm for the period 2008-09. The tables illustrate the value of individual firms' receipts from crime lower, crime higher, and VHCC work within the CJS area, with rankings of each firm by receipts as a share of receipts within the area, as well as nationally.<sup>7</sup> Finally, the cumulative percentage share of firms' receipts out of total receipts within the CJS area for the top 20 firms, by crime lower, crime higher and VHCC, is presented.
4. These CJS areas have been selected to represent a well rounded sample of areas across England and Wales. An example of this is highlighted by examining Gloucestershire (Table 2) and London (Table 10). Gloucestershire has 13 firms, of which the top four firms receive 80 per cent of total Government criminal legal aid expenditure within the CJS area. Only one firm undertook VHCC work, reflecting high firm concentration for legal aid work. The top four firms all earn over £400,000, however the national rank varies significantly; from 146<sup>th</sup> for the first to 690<sup>th</sup> for the fourth.
5. Conversely, London has approximately 488 firms, of which the top 20 receive 23 per cent of Government legal aid expenditure in London, many firms have very similar shares of receipts, and all but two firms undertake VHCC cases, showing that London exhibits very low levels of legal aid receipts concentration. All top 20 firms in London receive over £1 million from legal aid and their national ranks are relatively high, making it to the national top 50 firms list. Splitting London into smaller regions, as in for example Table 11 for South East London, gives a more concentrated scenario, although not as concentrated as some rural areas.

---

<sup>6</sup> These are rounded to the nearest ten percentage points. Some CJS areas have less than 20 firms operating within the area as reflected in the Tables, these areas are; Gloucestershire, Northamptonshire, Warwickshire and Wiltshire.

<sup>7</sup> The national rank is related to the value of receipts by each firm for the specific CJS area. For firms operating in multiple areas, the national rank presented in Tables 2-11 does not capture receipts from other CJS areas. Source: LSC.

**Table 1 - Proportion of criminal legal aid market share by largest providers in each CJS area, 2008/09**

CJS Area	Top 5	Top 10	Top 20	Total Value
Gloucestershire	80%	100%	100%	£3,623,000
Bedfordshire	70%	90%	100%	£13,463,000
Northamptonshire	70%	100%	100%	£5,453,000
Nottinghamshire	70%	80%	100%	£18,308,000
Wiltshire	70%	100%	100%	£5,023,000
Warwickshire	60%	90%	100%	£2,242,000
Staffordshire	60%	80%	100%	£14,500,000
Suffolk	60%	80%	100%	£4,772,000
Cleveland	60%	90%	100%	£9,364,000
Lincolnshire	60%	80%	100%	£5,446,000
Durham	50%	80%	100%	£5,347,000
Norfolk	50%	80%	100%	£7,130,000
Surrey	50%	80%	100%	£8,607,000
Dorset	50%	80%	100%	£5,010,000
Cambridgeshire	50%	70%	100%	£6,429,000
Dyfed-Powys	50%	80%	100%	£4,275,000
Humberside	50%	70%	100%	£8,958,000
Gwent	50%	70%	100%	£6,125,000
North Yorkshire	50%	70%	90%	£5,501,000
Hertfordshire	50%	70%	90%	£9,828,000
North Wales	50%	80%	90%	£6,655,000
Derbyshire	40%	70%	90%	£11,481,000
Cumbria	40%	60%	90%	£4,735,000
Leicestershire	40%	60%	90%	£11,804,000
Cheshire	40%	60%	90%	£8,610,000
Essex	40%	60%	90%	£13,745,000
South Yorkshire	40%	60%	80%	£18,376,000
Lancashire	40%	60%	80%	£22,759,000
West Mercia	40%	60%	80%	£10,935,000
Avon and Somerset	40%	50%	80%	£15,669,000
Kent	40%	60%	80%	£16,760,000
Thames Valley	40%	50%	70%	£24,111,000
Sussex	30%	50%	80%	£18,690,000
Devon and Cornwall	30%	60%	80%	£14,244,000
Merseyside	30%	50%	70%	£31,649,000
Hampshire	30%	50%	70%	£21,624,000
Northumbria	20%	40%	70%	£19,828,000
South Wales	20%	40%	60%	£20,752,000
Greater Manchester	20%	30%	50%	£67,923,000
West Yorkshire	20%	30%	50%	£40,239,000
West Midlands	20%	30%	40%	£51,489,000
London	10%	10%	20%	£221,284,000
Average	45%	66%	85%	£19,590,000
National	3%	5%	8%	£822,770,000

Source: LSC

**Table 2<sup>8</sup> - Gloucestershire – largest 20 providers by total criminal legal aid receipts 2008/09**

Firm	Cases		Firm receipts (£)				Rank by total firm receipts		% of total CJS area firm receipts	Cumulative %			
	Police Attendance	Rep. Orders	Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL	CJS area	National		Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL
Gloucestershire Firm 1	1,600	1,056	810,000	0	295,000	1,105,000	1	146	30.5%	29.0%	0.0%	36.4%	30.5%
Gloucestershire Firm 2	1,599	735	639,000	16,000	220,000	875,000	2	236	24.1%	51.8%	100.0%	63.6%	54.6%
Gloucestershire Firm 3	985	606	486,000	0	9,000	495,000	4	555	13.7%	69.2%	100.0%	64.7%	68.3%
Gloucestershire Firm 4	637	313	301,000	0	101,000	402,000	3	690	11.1%	79.9%	100.0%	77.2%	79.4%
Gloucestershire Firm 5	220	133	132,000	0	17,000	148,000	6	1,286	4.1%	84.6%	100.0%	79.2%	83.5%
Gloucestershire Firm 6	135	99	105,000	0	31,000	136,000	7	1,338	3.7%	88.4%	100.0%	83.0%	87.2%
Gloucestershire Firm 7	145	104	88,000	0	27,000	115,000	8	1,416	3.2%	91.5%	100.0%	86.4%	90.4%
Gloucestershire Firm 8	148	23	44,000	0	59,000	103,000	9	1,470	2.8%	93.1%	100.0%	93.7%	93.3%
Gloucestershire Firm 9	120	67	64,000	0	24,000	88,000	10	1,539	2.4%	95.4%	100.0%	96.7%	95.7%
Gloucestershire Firm 10	104	70	70,000	0	0	70,000	11	1,626	1.9%	97.9%	100.0%	96.7%	97.6%
Gloucestershire Firm 11	136	24	53,000	0	12,000	64,000	12	1,662	1.8%	99.8%	100.0%	98.1%	99.4%
Gloucestershire Firm 12	0	0	0	0	15,000	15,000	13	1,990	0.4%	99.8%	100.0%	100.0%	99.8%
Gloucestershire Firm 13	6	13	6,000	0	0	6,000	14	2,102	0.2%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<b>Gloucestershire Total</b>	<b>5,835</b>	<b>3,243</b>	<b>£2,798,000</b>	<b>£16,000</b>	<b>£810,000</b>	<b>£3,622,000</b>							

Source: LSC

<sup>8</sup> Work is ascribed to provider location not case location, therefore a firm shown as having 5% of the work in Gloucestershire means that the legal aid was provided for by the Gloucestershire based firm, and does not necessarily reflect the case being based in Gloucestershire, nor that they provided 5% of the work arising from Gloucestershire Police Stations and Courts.

Restructuring the delivery of criminal defence services

**Table 3 - Northamptonshire – largest 20 providers by total criminal legal aid receipts 2008/09**

Firm	Cases		Firm receipts (£)				Rank by total firm receipts		% of total CJS area firm receipts	Cumulative %			
	Police Attendance	Rep. Orders	Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL	CJS area	National		Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL
Northamptonshire Firm 1	1,309	876	805,000	0	241,000	1,046,000	1	163	19.2%	18.5%	0.0%	21.8%	19.2%
Northamptonshire Firm 2	1,475	918	797,000	0	0	797,000	2	282	14.6%	36.9%	0.0%	21.8%	33.8%
Northamptonshire Firm 3	1,088	679	614,000	0	141,000	755,000	3	313	13.8%	51.0%	0.0%	34.5%	47.6%
Northamptonshire Firm 4	841	403	526,000	0	139,000	665,000	4	383	12.2%	63.2%	0.0%	47.0%	59.8%
Northamptonshire Firm 5	537	384	476,000	0	138,000	614,000	5	421	11.3%	74.1%	0.0%	59.5%	71.1%
Northamptonshire Firm 6	441	338	272,000	0	148,000	420,000	6	655	7.7%	80.4%	0.0%	72.8%	78.8%
Northamptonshire Firm 7	596	477	339,000	0	80,000	419,000	7	659	7.7%	88.2%	0.0%	80.1%	86.5%
Northamptonshire Firm 8	265	297	213,000	0	137,000	349,000	8	773	6.4%	93.1%	0.0%	92.4%	92.9%
Northamptonshire Firm 9	214	99	98,000	0	42,000	140,000	9	1,319	2.6%	95.4%	0.0%	96.2%	95.4%
Northamptonshire Firm 10	198	67	76,000	0	12,000	87,000	10	1,543	1.6%	97.1%	0.0%	97.2%	97.0%
Northamptonshire Firm 11	92	149	78,000	0	8,000	86,000	11	1,555	1.6%	98.9%	0.0%	98.0%	98.6%
Northamptonshire Firm 12	64	42	37,000	0	18,000	55,000	12	1,714	1.0%	99.8%	0.0%	99.6%	99.6%
Northamptonshire Firm 13	15	10	10,000	0	5,000	15,000	13	1,992	0.3%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	99.9%
Northamptonshire Firm 14	0	0	0	5,000	0	5,000	14	2,117	0.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<b>Northamptonshire Total</b>	<b>7,135</b>	<b>4,739</b>	<b>£4,341,000</b>	<b>£5,000</b>	<b>£1,109,000</b>	<b>£5,453,000</b>							

Source: LSC



**Table 4 - Lincolnshire – largest 20 providers by total criminal legal aid receipts 2008/09**

Firm	Cases		Firm receipts (£)				Rank by total firm receipts		% of total CJS area firm receipts	Cumulative %			
	Police Attendance	Rep. Orders	Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL	CJS area	National		Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL
Lincolnshire Firm 1	823	635	545,000	0	202,000	747,000	1	318	13.7%	13.6%	0.0%	14.0%	13.7%
Lincolnshire Firm 2	838	608	532,000	0	209,000	742,000	2	327	13.6%	26.9%	0.0%	28.6%	27.3%
Lincolnshire Firm 3	779	506	459,000	0	161,000	621,000	3	414	11.4%	38.4%	0.0%	39.8%	38.7%
Lincolnshire Firm 4	782	427	407,000	0	142,000	549,000	4	493	10.1%	48.5%	0.0%	49.7%	48.8%
Lincolnshire Firm 5	669	548	351,000	0	117,000	467,000	5	588	8.6%	57.3%	0.0%	57.8%	57.4%
Lincolnshire Firm 6	513	360	258,000	0	133,000	392,000	6	714	7.2%	63.7%	0.0%	67.1%	64.6%
Lincolnshire Firm 7	432	296	242,000	0	78,000	320,000	7	829	5.9%	69.8%	0.0%	72.5%	70.5%
Lincolnshire Firm 8	492	198	228,000	0	26,000	254,000	8	977	4.7%	75.5%	0.0%	74.3%	75.2%
Lincolnshire Firm 9	352	273	179,000	0	63,000	242,000	9	1,017	4.4%	79.9%	0.0%	78.7%	79.6%
Lincolnshire Firm 10	248	136	126,000	0	91,000	217,000	10	1,087	4.0%	83.1%	0.0%	85.0%	83.6%
Lincolnshire Firm 11	274	163	158,000	0	52,000	210,000	11	1,101	3.9%	87.0%	0.0%	88.6%	87.4%
Lincolnshire Firm 12	182	85	105,000	0	47,000	152,000	12	1,269	2.8%	89.6%	0.0%	91.9%	90.2%
Lincolnshire Firm 13	208	123	110,000	0	12,000	123,000	13	1,382	2.3%	92.4%	0.0%	92.7%	92.5%
Lincolnshire Firm 14	126	58	56,000	0	29,000	85,000	14	1,558	1.6%	93.8%	0.0%	94.8%	94.0%
Lincolnshire Firm 15	102	52	43,000	0	40,000	83,000	15	1,567	1.5%	94.9%	0.0%	97.5%	95.6%
Lincolnshire Firm 16	96	71	53,000	0	11,000	64,000	16	1,665	1.2%	96.2%	0.0%	98.3%	96.7%
Lincolnshire Firm 17	103	52	55,000	0	0	55,000	17	1,717	1.0%	97.6%	0.0%	98.3%	97.7%
Lincolnshire Firm 18	108	24	41,000	0	7,000	48,000	18	1,761	0.9%	98.6%	0.0%	98.8%	98.6%
Lincolnshire Firm 19	70	56	43,000	0	0	43,000	19	1,803	0.8%	99.6%	0.0%	98.8%	99.4%
Lincolnshire Firm 20	0	0	0	0	17,000	17,000	20	1,979	0.3%	99.6%	0.0%	100.0%	99.7%
Total - Top 20:	7,197	4,671	3,991,000	0	1,437,000	5,431,000							
<b>Lincolnshire Total</b>	<b>7,222</b>	<b>4,677</b>	<b>£4,007,000</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£1,439,000</b>	<b>£5,446,000</b>							

Source: LSC

Restructuring the delivery of criminal defence services

**Table 5 - Dorset – largest 20 providers by total criminal legal aid receipts 2008/09**

Firm	Cases		Firm receipts (£)				Rank by total firm receipts		% of total CJS area firm receipts	Cumulative %			
	Police Attendance	Rep. Orders	Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL	CJS area	National		Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL
Dorset Firm 1	859	683	594,000	0	181,000	775,000	1	301	15.5%	17.2%	0.0%	11.5%	15.5%
Dorset Firm 2	455	518	338,000	0	200,000	538,000	2	502	10.7%	27.1%	0.0%	24.3%	26.2%
Dorset Firm 3	630	327	340,000	0	150,000	490,000	3	560	9.8%	37.0%	0.0%	33.8%	36.0%
Dorset Firm 4	498	308	250,000	0	141,000	391,000	4	716	7.8%	44.2%	0.0%	42.8%	43.8%
Dorset Firm 5	670	291	336,000	0	51,000	387,000	5	717	7.7%	54.0%	0.0%	46.0%	51.5%
Dorset Firm 6	135	347	192,000	0	157,000	349,000	6	774	7.0%	59.6%	0.0%	56.0%	58.5%
Dorset Firm 7	190	292	196,000	0	153,000	348,000	7	778	6.9%	65.3%	0.0%	65.7%	65.4%
Dorset Firm 8	363	454	241,000	0	28,000	269,000	8	944	5.4%	72.3%	0.0%	67.5%	70.8%
Dorset Firm 9	257	164	159,000	0	73,000	232,000	9	1,042	4.6%	76.9%	0.0%	72.2%	75.4%
Dorset Firm 10	140	112	126,000	0	58,000	184,000	10	1,179	3.7%	80.6%	0.0%	75.9%	79.1%
Dorset Firm 11	282	143	139,000	0	36,000	175,000	11	1,204	3.5%	84.6%	0.0%	78.3%	82.6%
Dorset Firm 12	0	0	0	0	152,000	152,000	12	1,266	3.0%	84.6%	0.0%	88.0%	85.6%
Dorset Firm 13	195	100	103,000	0	21,000	124,000	13	1,376	2.5%	87.6%	0.0%	89.3%	88.1%
Dorset Firm 14	74	120	75,000	0	43,000	118,000	14	1,394	2.4%	89.8%	0.0%	92.1%	90.5%
Dorset Firm 15	111	69	60,000	0	8,000	68,000	15	1,642	1.4%	91.5%	0.0%	92.6%	91.8%
Dorset Firm 16	140	66	56,000	0	11,000	67,000	16	1,645	1.3%	93.1%	0.0%	93.3%	93.2%
Dorset Firm 17	62	101	64,000	0	1,000	64,000	17	1,660	1.3%	95.0%	0.0%	93.3%	94.4%
Dorset Firm 18	79	92	55,000	0	3,000	58,000	18	1,701	1.2%	96.6%	0.0%	93.5%	95.6%
Dorset Firm 19	76	39	54,000	0	2,000	55,000	19	1,713	1.1%	98.1%	0.0%	93.6%	96.7%
Dorset Firm 20	53	58	41,000	0	11,000	52,000	20	1,737	1.0%	99.3%	0.0%	94.3%	97.7%
Total - Top 20:	5,269	4,284	3,419,000	0	1,480,000	4,896,000							
<b>Dorset Total</b>	<b>5,276</b>	<b>4,308</b>	<b>£3,441,000</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£1,569,000</b>	<b>£5,010,000</b>							

Source: LSC

**Table 6 - North Wales – largest 20 providers by total criminal legal aid receipts 2008/09**

Firm	Cases		Firm receipts (£)				Rank by total firm receipts		% of total CJS area firm receipts	Cumulative %			
	Police Attendance	Rep. Orders	Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL	CJS area	National		Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL
North Wales Firm 1	1,423	1,112	856,000	0	215,000	1,071,000	1	154	16.1%	16.6%	0.0%	14.4%	16.1%
North Wales Firm 2	828	838	684,000	0	138,000	822,000	2	268	12.3%	29.8%	0.0%	23.7%	28.4%
North Wales Firm 3	713	554	465,000	0	189,000	653,000	3	391	9.8%	38.8%	0.0%	36.3%	38.3%
North Wales Firm 4	620	523	403,000	0	120,000	523,000	4	525	7.9%	46.6%	0.0%	44.4%	46.1%
North Wales Firm 5	439	408	294,000	0	155,000	449,000	5	611	6.7%	52.3%	0.0%	54.8%	52.9%
North Wales Firm 6	403	456	339,000	0	67,000	406,000	6	684	6.1%	58.9%	0.0%	59.3%	59.0%
North Wales Firm 7	412	351	228,000	0	99,000	326,000	7	819	4.9%	63.3%	0.0%	65.9%	63.9%
North Wales Firm 8	256	401	265,000	0	58,000	323,000	8	825	4.9%	68.4%	0.0%	69.8%	68.7%
North Wales Firm 9	438	362	269,000	0	46,000	315,000	9	844	4.7%	73.6%	0.0%	72.8%	73.5%
North Wales Firm 10	252	207	182,000	0	36,000	218,000	10	1,083	3.3%	77.2%	0.0%	75.2%	76.7%
North Wales Firm 11	137	88	84,000	0	108,000	192,000	11	1,155	2.9%	78.8%	0.0%	82.5%	79.6%
North Wales Firm 12	227	179	132,000	0	53,000	185,000	12	1,173	2.8%	81.3%	0.0%	86.0%	82.4%
North Wales Firm 13	183	149	110,000	0	41,000	151,000	13	1,271	2.3%	83.5%	0.0%	88.8%	84.7%
North Wales Firm 14	123	107	87,000	0	20,000	107,000	14	1,449	1.6%	85.2%	0.0%	90.1%	86.3%
North Wales Firm 15	144	91	82,000	0	24,000	106,000	15	1,453	1.6%	86.7%	0.0%	91.7%	87.9%
North Wales Firm 16	162	117	95,000	0	10,000	105,000	16	1,459	1.6%	88.6%	0.0%	92.4%	89.4%
North Wales Firm 17	145	124	91,000	0	13,000	103,000	17	1,468	1.6%	90.3%	0.0%	93.3%	91.0%
North Wales Firm 18	81	83	66,000	0	22,000	87,000	18	1,544	1.3%	91.6%	0.0%	94.7%	92.3%
North Wales Firm 19	157	83	66,000	0	8,000	75,000	19	1,604	1.1%	92.9%	0.0%	95.3%	93.4%
North Wales Firm 20	101	90	62,000	0	8,000	70,000	20	1,632	1.0%	94.1%	0.0%	95.8%	94.5%
Total - Top 20:	7,244	6,323	4,860,000	0	1,430,000	6,287,000							
<b>North Wales Total</b>	<b>7,656</b>	<b>6,667</b>	<b>£5,165,000</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£1,490,000</b>	<b>£6,655,000</b>							

Source: LSC

**Table 7 - Cumbria – largest 20 providers by total criminal legal aid receipts 2008/09**

Firm	Cases		Firm receipts (£)				Rank by total firm receipts		% of total CJS area firm receipts	Cumulative %			
	Police Attendance	Rep. Orders	Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL	CJS area	National		Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL
Cumbria Firm 1	544	531	323,000	0	269,000	592,000	1	445	12.5%	10.2%	0.0%	17.1%	12.5%
Cumbria Firm 2	427	457	292,000	0	69,000	361,000	2	757	7.6%	19.5%	0.0%	21.5%	20.1%
Cumbria Firm 3	258	385	194,000	0	136,000	330,000	3	812	7.0%	25.6%	0.0%	30.2%	27.1%
Cumbria Firm 4	328	214	264,000	0	37,000	301,000	4	872	6.3%	33.9%	0.0%	32.5%	33.4%
Cumbria Firm 5	361	438	249,000	0	38,000	287,000	5	902	6.1%	41.8%	0.0%	34.9%	39.5%
Cumbria Firm 6	167	232	112,000	0	140,000	252,000	6	981	5.3%	45.4%	0.0%	43.9%	44.8%
Cumbria Firm 7	136	128	101,000	0	131,000	232,000	7	1,043	4.9%	48.6%	0.0%	52.2%	49.7%
Cumbria Firm 8	7	455	168,000	0	50,000	218,000	8	1,084	4.6%	53.9%	0.0%	55.4%	54.3%
Cumbria Firm 9	208	176	113,000	0	82,000	196,000	9	1,140	4.1%	57.4%	0.0%	60.7%	58.5%
Cumbria Firm 10	174	41	90,000	0	87,000	177,000	10	1,197	3.7%	60.3%	0.0%	66.2%	62.2%
Cumbria Firm 11	172	189	111,000	0	52,000	163,000	11	1,234	3.4%	63.8%	0.0%	69.5%	65.6%
Cumbria Firm 12	256	216	145,000	4,000	1,000	151,000	12	1,274	3.2%	68.4%	100.0%	69.6%	68.8%
Cumbria Firm 13	75	108	81,000	0	66,000	147,000	13	1,293	3.1%	71.0%	100.0%	73.8%	71.9%
Cumbria Firm 14	186	121	89,000	0	55,000	144,000	14	1,300	3.0%	73.8%	100.0%	77.3%	75.0%
Cumbria Firm 15	154	101	92,000	0	48,000	141,000	15	1,317	3.0%	76.7%	100.0%	80.4%	77.9%
Cumbria Firm 16	223	86	108,000	0	27,000	135,000	16	1,342	2.9%	80.1%	100.0%	82.2%	80.8%
Cumbria Firm 17	34	252	86,000	0	23,000	109,000	17	1,438	2.3%	82.8%	100.0%	83.6%	83.1%
Cumbria Firm 18	113	74	70,000	0	28,000	98,000	18	1,490	2.1%	85.0%	100.0%	85.4%	85.2%
Cumbria Firm 19	91	88	68,000	0	30,000	98,000	19	1,493	2.1%	87.2%	100.0%	87.3%	87.2%
Cumbria Firm 20	48	110	52,000	0	41,000	92,000	20	1,513	1.9%	88.8%	100.0%	89.9%	89.2%
Total - Top 20:	3,962	4,402	2,808,000	4,000	1,410,000	4,224,000							
<b>Cumbria Total</b>	<b>4,434</b>	<b>4,867</b>	<b>£3,163,000</b>	<b>£4,330</b>	<b>£1,568,000</b>	<b>£4,735,000</b>							

Source: LSC

**Table 8 - Kent – largest 20 providers by total criminal legal aid receipts 2008/09**

Firm	Cases		Firm receipts (£)				Rank by total firm receipts		% of total CJS area firm receipts	Cumulative %			
	Police Attendance	Rep. Orders	Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL	CJS area	National		Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL
Kent Firm 1	1,283	666	827,000	4,000	802,000	1,633,000	1	58	9.7%	7.0%	1.3%	17.3%	9.7%
Kent Firm 2	795	423	697,000	0	438,000	1,135,000	2	132	6.8%	12.8%	1.3%	26.8%	16.5%
Kent Firm 3	616	279	552,000	103,000	433,000	1,087,000	3	150	6.5%	17.5%	40.2%	36.1%	23.0%
Kent Firm 4	1,266	865	799,000	0	236,000	1,035,000	4	169	6.2%	24.2%	40.2%	41.2%	29.2%
Kent Firm 5	1,107	705	804,000	0	201,000	1,006,000	5	177	6.0%	31.0%	40.2%	45.5%	35.2%
Kent Firm 6	1,237	444	696,000	0	236,000	932,000	6	207	5.6%	36.9%	40.2%	50.6%	40.7%
Kent Firm 7	1,012	878	673,000	0	208,000	881,000	7	232	5.3%	42.6%	40.2%	55.1%	46.0%
Kent Firm 8	644	378	454,000	92,000	204,000	750,000	8	315	4.5%	46.4%	74.9%	59.5%	50.5%
Kent Firm 9	895	591	532,000	0	211,000	744,000	9	325	4.4%	50.9%	74.9%	64.0%	54.9%
Kent Firm 10	752	721	565,000	0	106,000	671,000	10	379	4.0%	55.7%	74.9%	66.3%	58.9%
Kent Firm 11	616	417	416,000	0	215,000	631,000	11	406	3.8%	59.2%	74.9%	71.0%	62.7%
Kent Firm 12	1,059	519	577,000	0	50,000	628,000	12	409	3.7%	64.0%	74.9%	72.0%	66.4%
Kent Firm 13	608	359	388,000	0	87,000	475,000	13	573	2.8%	67.3%	74.9%	73.9%	69.3%
Kent Firm 14	567	144	331,000	0	129,000	460,000	14	596	2.7%	70.1%	74.9%	76.7%	72.0%
Kent Firm 15	595	270	303,000	0	73,000	376,000	15	736	2.2%	72.6%	74.9%	78.3%	74.2%
Kent Firm 16	297	206	217,000	0	157,000	374,000	16	739	2.2%	74.5%	74.9%	81.7%	76.5%
Kent Firm 17	225	549	278,000	0	71,000	349,000	17	776	2.1%	76.8%	74.9%	83.2%	78.6%
Kent Firm 18	354	181	254,000	0	85,000	339,000	18	797	2.0%	79.0%	74.9%	85.1%	80.6%
Kent Firm 19	428	256	240,000	0	99,000	339,000	19	798	2.0%	81.0%	74.9%	87.2%	82.6%
Kent Firm 20	291	273	261,000	0	41,000	303,000	20	871	1.8%	83.2%	74.9%	88.1%	84.4%
Total - Top 20:	14,647	9,124	9,864,000	199,000	4,082,000	14,148,000							
<b>Kent Total</b>	<b>17,677</b>	<b>10,716</b>	<b>£11,859,000</b>	<b>£264,000</b>	<b>£4,637,000</b>	<b>£16,760,000</b>							

Source: LSC

Restructuring the delivery of criminal defence services

**Table 9 - Greater Manchester – largest 20 providers by total criminal legal aid receipts 2008/09**

Firm	Cases		Firm receipts (£)				Rank by total firm receipts		% of total CJS area firm receipts	Cumulative %			
	Police Attendance	Rep. Orders	Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL	CJS area	National		Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL
Greater Manchester Firm 1	1,743	1,568	1,524,000	448,000	2,547,000	4,519,000	1	4	6.7%	5.3%	4.8%	8.5%	6.7%
Greater Manchester Firm 2	1,124	1,076	851,000	422,000	1,572,000	2,845,000	2	12	4.2%	8.2%	9.4%	13.8%	10.8%
Greater Manchester Firm 3	1,723	2,133	1,416,000	128,000	1,158,000	2,702,000	3	16	4.0%	13.2%	10.7%	17.7%	14.8%
Greater Manchester Firm 4	0	0	0	1,006,000	1,446,000	2,453,000	4	23	3.6%	13.2%	21.5%	22.5%	18.4%
Greater Manchester Firm 5	8	3	50,000	1,876,000	380,000	2,306,000	5	27	3.4%	13.3%	41.7%	23.8%	21.8%
Greater Manchester Firm 6	1,439	1,383	1,663,000	32,000	503,000	2,198,000	6	28	3.2%	19.1%	42.0%	25.5%	25.1%
Greater Manchester Firm 7	1,088	1,007	839,000	281,000	839,000	1,959,000	7	38	2.9%	22.0%	45.0%	28.3%	27.9%
Greater Manchester Firm 8	546	955	686,000	424,000	549,000	1,659,000	8	56	2.4%	24.4%	49.6%	30.2%	30.4%
Greater Manchester Firm 9	612	552	988,000	0	464,000	1,452,000	9	75	2.1%	27.8%	49.6%	31.7%	32.5%
Greater Manchester Firm 10	1,149	1,511	889,000	0	525,000	1,415,000	10	82	2.1%	30.9%	49.6%	33.5%	34.6%
Greater Manchester Firm 11	1,074	1,255	728,000	0	670,000	1,398,000	11	85	2.1%	33.5%	49.6%	35.7%	36.7%
Greater Manchester Firm 12	1,550	1,303	971,000	0	395,000	1,366,000	12	87	2.0%	36.8%	49.6%	37.1%	38.7%
Greater Manchester Firm 13	164	95	95,000	591,000	653,000	1,339,000	13	91	2.0%	37.2%	55.9%	39.3%	40.7%
Greater Manchester Firm 14	929	842	734,000	44,000	481,000	1,260,000	14	104	1.9%	39.7%	56.4%	40.9%	42.5%
Greater Manchester Firm 15	30	15	148,000	114,000	904,000	1,165,000	15	121	1.7%	40.2%	57.6%	43.9%	44.2%
Greater Manchester Firm 16	42	12	33,000	936,000	139,000	1,109,000	16	144	1.6%	40.3%	67.7%	44.4%	45.9%
Greater Manchester Firm 17	387	199	263,000	202,000	633,000	1,099,000	17	147	1.6%	41.2%	69.9%	46.5%	47.5%
Greater Manchester Firm 18	547	595	415,000	259,000	390,000	1,064,000	18	157	1.6%	42.7%	72.6%	47.8%	49.0%
Greater Manchester Firm 19	716	736	473,000	29,000	490,000	992,000	19	185	1.5%	44.3%	73.0%	49.4%	50.5%
Greater Manchester Firm 20	1,031	1,124	704,000	0	262,000	966,000	20	191	1.4%	46.8%	73.0%	50.3%	51.9%
Total - Top 20:	15,902	16,364	13,470,000	6,792,000	15,000,000	35,266,000							
<b>Greater Manchester Total</b>	<b>37,227</b>	<b>36,591</b>	<b>£28,799,000</b>	<b>£9,311,000</b>	<b>£29,814,000</b>	<b>£67,923,000</b>							

Source: LSC

Table 10 - London – largest 20 providers by total criminal legal aid receipts 2008/09

Firm	Cases		Firm receipts (£)				Rank by total firm receipts		% of total CJS area firm receipts	Cumulative %			
	Police Attendance	Rep. Orders	Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL	CJS area	National		Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL
London Firm 1	3,257	1,441	2,550,000	814,000	2,176,000	5,539,000	1	1	2.5%	2.4%	3.2%	2.4%	2.5%
London Firm 2	1,041	907	931,000	1,749,000	812,000	3,492,000	2	6	1.6%	3.3%	10.0%	3.3%	4.1%
London Firm 3	2,414	1,758	1,995,000	172,000	1,069,000	3,236,000	3	8	1.5%	5.2%	10.7%	4.5%	5.5%
London Firm 4	1,916	1,889	1,808,000	248,000	848,000	2,904,000	4	10	1.3%	6.9%	11.7%	5.5%	6.9%
London Firm 5	1,735	885	1,259,000	210,000	1,303,000	2,772,000	5	14	1.3%	8.1%	12.5%	6.9%	8.1%
London Firm 6	2,485	1,078	1,709,000	342,000	707,000	2,758,000	6	15	1.2%	9.7%	13.8%	7.7%	9.4%
London Firm 7	1,704	532	962,000	974,000	750,000	2,685,000	7	18	1.2%	10.6%	17.6%	8.5%	10.6%
London Firm 8	1,666	782	1,131,000	429,000	1,081,000	2,640,000	8	19	1.2%	11.7%	19.3%	9.7%	11.8%
London Firm 9	2,379	1,075	1,569,000	5,000	963,000	2,537,000	9	21	1.1%	13.1%	19.3%	10.8%	12.9%
London Firm 10	380	155	628,000	100,000	1,683,000	2,412,000	10	24	1.1%	13.7%	19.7%	12.7%	14.0%
London Firm 11	1,601	846	1,247,000	57,000	809,000	2,113,000	11	31	1.0%	14.9%	19.9%	13.6%	15.0%
London Firm 12	1,675	614	1,016,000	231,000	863,000	2,110,000	12	32	1.0%	15.9%	20.9%	14.5%	15.9%
London Firm 13	1,941	772	1,129,000	184,000	784,000	2,097,000	13	33	0.9%	16.9%	21.6%	15.4%	16.9%
London Firm 14	992	528	743,000	140,000	1,162,000	2,045,000	14	36	0.9%	17.6%	22.1%	16.7%	17.8%
London Firm 15	1,781	1,113	1,296,000	81,000	611,000	1,988,000	15	37	0.9%	18.9%	22.4%	17.4%	18.7%
London Firm 16	240	140	185,000	1,026,000	721,000	1,932,000	16	40	0.9%	19.0%	26.4%	18.2%	19.5%
London Firm 17	1,422	788	1,064,000	135,000	733,000	1,932,000	17	41	0.9%	20.0%	27.0%	19.0%	20.4%
London Firm 18	1,285	966	1,099,000	0	820,000	1,919,000	18	42	0.9%	21.1%	27.0%	19.9%	21.3%
London Firm 19	1,853	1,210	1,424,000	0	448,000	1,872,000	19	43	0.8%	22.4%	27.0%	20.4%	22.1%
London Firm 20	1,393	710	937,000	409,000	507,000	1,853,000	20	47	0.8%	23.3%	28.6%	21.0%	23.0%
Total - Top 20:	33,160	18,189	24,682,000	7,306,000	18,850,000	50,836,000							
<b>London Total</b>	<b>135,967</b>	<b>73,353</b>	<b>£105,864,000</b>	<b>£25,568,000</b>	<b>£89,851,000</b>	<b>£221,284,000</b>							

Source: LSC

**Table 11 - London South East<sup>9</sup> – largest 20 providers by total criminal legal aid receipts 2008/09**

Firm	Cases		Firm receipts (£)				Rank by total firm receipts		% of total CJS area firm receipts	Cumulative %			
	Police Attendance	Rep. Orders	Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL	CJS area	National		Crime Lower	VHCC	Crown Court	TOTAL
London SE Firm 1	2,485	1,078	1,709,000	342,000	707,000	2,758,000	1	15	7.2%	8.1%	20.8%	4.6%	7.2%
London SE Firm 2	2,379	1,075	1,569,000	5,000	963,000	2,537,000	2	21	6.6%	15.5%	21.1%	4.9%	13.9%
London SE Firm 3	1,941	772	1,129,000	184,000	784,000	2,097,000	3	33	5.5%	20.8%	32.3%	16.1%	19.4%
London SE Firm 4	1,285	966	1,099,000	0	820,000	1,919,000	4	42	5.0%	26.0%	32.3%	16.1%	24.4%
London SE Firm 5	1,501	666	1,500,000	0	247,000	1,746,000	5	52	4.6%	33.1%	32.3%	16.1%	28.9%
London SE Firm 6	913	641	661,000	246,000	725,000	1,632,000	6	59	4.3%	36.2%	47.3%	31.1%	33.2%
London SE Firm 7	936	465	601,000	3,000	725,000	1,330,000	7	92	3.5%	39.0%	47.5%	31.3%	36.7%
London SE Firm 8	701	405	507,000	0	758,000	1,265,000	8	102	3.3%	41.4%	47.5%	31.3%	40.0%
London SE Firm 9	1,053	483	693,000	33,000	432,000	1,158,000	9	125	3.0%	44.7%	49.5%	33.3%	43.0%
London SE Firm 10	16	2	25,000	411,000	713,000	1,150,000	10	128	3.0%	44.8%	74.5%	58.3%	46.1%
London SE Firm 11	1,072	581	829,000	9,000	224,000	1,062,000	11	159	2.8%	48.7%	75.0%	58.8%	48.8%
London SE Firm 12	1,012	453	730,000	0	308,000	1,038,000	12	166	2.7%	52.2%	75.0%	58.8%	51.6%
London SE Firm 13	690	359	433,000	76,000	438,000	946,000	13	202	2.5%	54.2%	79.7%	63.5%	54.0%
London SE Firm 14	590	325	434,000	0	481,000	915,000	14	215	2.4%	56.3%	79.7%	63.5%	56.4%
London SE Firm 15	998	587	657,000	0	211,000	869,000	15	240	2.3%	59.4%	79.7%	63.5%	58.7%
London SE Firm 16	756	484	588,000	44,000	169,000	800,000	16	279	2.1%	62.1%	82.3%	66.1%	60.8%
London SE Firm 17	557	423	412,000	0	368,000	780,000	17	295	2.0%	64.1%	82.3%	66.1%	62.8%
London SE Firm 18	470	306	514,000	0	180,000	693,000	18	359	1.8%	66.5%	82.3%	66.1%	64.7%
London SE Firm 19	764	461	511,000	0	164,000	674,000	19	373	1.8%	68.9%	82.3%	66.1%	66.4%
London SE Firm 20	685	426	474,000	0	197,000	671,000	20	377	1.8%	71.1%	82.3%	66.1%	68.2%
Total - Top 20:	20,804	10,958	15,074,000	1,353,000	9,614,000	26,041,000							
<b>SE Area in Total</b>	<b>28,209</b>	<b>14,793</b>	<b>£21,188,000</b>	<b>£1,643,000</b>	<b>£15,363,000</b>	<b>£38,194,000</b>							

Source: LSC

<sup>9</sup> London has been identified as a very large area, and for illustration purposes only, this has been split on the basis of a constituency areas of South East London. Looking at this gives figures very similar to Table 8. South East comprises of the following areas: Bexley, Bromley, Greenwich, Lambeth, Lewisham, and Southwark. This is for illustrative purposes only.