

Providing your response

If you have chosen to provide a separate written response, then please complete the first page of this Respondent Information Form and attach it to your response.

If you wish to include your responses within this Respondent Information Form, please insert your responses to each consultation question in the (expandable) boxes below:

Proposal 1 - Consolidation

Question 1 – Do you agree that the 2 existing sets of regulations from 2002 should be replaced with 1 new consolidated instrument? If not why not?

Yes they should be replaced – the table as it stands is out of date and requires modernisation

Proposal 2 – Adopting unit based charging:

Question 2 – Do you agree that a change to “unit based charging” can provide improved transparency on the level of fee being charged? If not why not?

Yes it will for all concerned – provides a simple process for all users to calculate what level of fee is applicable for a specific service. The current table provides no clear and obvious method.

Question 3 – Do you agree that the baseline “monetary value” should start at £5.40 and that 1 unit of time should be fixed at 6 minutes? If not why not?

Yes as this matches other bodies whose fees/costs are governed by the committee and keeps us on the same baseline moving forward. Subject to the increase indicated in point 18 of the consultation guidance document.

Dividing into 6 minutes units of time provides enough flexibility with fee calculation to allow for the vagaries of Sheriff Officer services.

Question 4 – Do you agree that the proposed changes to the general regulations will support the adoption of unit based charging?

Yes – as referenced above this provides a degree of clarity for how fees are calculated which will encourage use.

Question 5 – With regard to annex 4, do you have a view on whether any of the current 60 line items shown are no longer required, or whether any of the baseline unit of work should be amended? If so why?

My understanding is that the discount applied to Column A is a result of Government policy to improve access to justice. As we receive no funding from the Government I am unclear why we should bear this cost despite the work in question requiring exactly the same resources, time and qualifications as Column B. 0

It seems fair that we remove column A and any discount which would ensure members are remunerated fairly for their work.

Question 6 – Do you have a view on any unintended consequences that might arise from implementing a change to unit based charging?

None that I am aware of at this time

Proposal 3 - Adjusting for inflation in advance:

Question 7 – Do you have a view on the proposed change to the Council progressing inflation adjustments in advance?

I believe this provides a degree of clarity moving forward for all concerned in terms of expected costs.

Question 8 – Do you have a view on which indices (*CPI, CPIH* or a combination of both) should be use when forecasting inflation?

Makes sense to us a blend of PI and CPIH indices should be used when forecasting any increase in inflation costs which are core to our business.

Other

Question 9 – Are you aware of any other opportunities to modernise how these regulated fees are set by the courts and charged to end users?

Our professional Society would be keen to engage on an ongoing basis to ensure the table of fees remains relevant and reacts faster to changes in legislation and policies from Government that impact our role.