

Appendix 1

C&CS Trading Account SWOT

Strengths

1. Transparency of costs of legal advice and distribution of demand across CoLC departments.
2. Greater incentive for fee-earners to meet chargeable hours targets.
3. Improved BI on legal work undertaken and costs.
4. Has brought greater rigour to the instruction process.
5. Has not created significant organisational turbulence.

Weaknesses

1. Has not reduced demand for legal advice and which was one of the key drivers for introducing a trading account.
2. Lack of client knowledge of trading account processes.
3. Increased transactional work
 - Fee-earners finding cost codes
 - Client struggle with cost codes
 - Generation of bi-monthly reports and distribution to depts
 - Client time checking and correcting reports
 - Dealing with queries, incorrect codes and adjustments – time consuming
 - Instruction process – client form filling, checking and correcting cost centres and adding these to the DPS case management system
 - Charge processing – Chamberlains and subsequent accountancy queries
4. Current arrangement is not a true trading account as it's not possible to flex the budget too increase fixed-term resource when LRB budget is fixed.

Opportunities

1. Revise trading account budget arrangement to enable C&CS to expand and contract in-house lawyer resource flexibly to enable service agility to undertake work in-house at a lower cost rather than outsourcing.
2. Revise and simplify the recharge process to build on the robust embedded systems already in place e.g. less frequent charge

Threats

1. The Key threat identified at the outset and raised by several clients during the consultation process was the perceived risk that to reduce spend on legal support clients may not instruct C&CS for legal advice when necessary, resulting in the risk of financial and or reputational damage due to poor decisions taken without legal guidance.