



**CCMS – LAPG Member Feedback (August 2016)**

1. Are urgent applications a problem? (If no, that's all I need to know)							
Solicitor private practice Yes	Solicitor private practice Yes	Solicitor NfP Yes	Solicitor NfP Yes	Solicitor private practice Yes	Solicitor private practice Yes	Solicitor private practice Yes	Solicitor private practice Yes

2. If a problem, can you list in what ways? Can you set out CCMS issues i.e. the way CCMS is designed causes the problem?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These are a huge problem. We've been told that the case worker doesn't agree with us it's urgent, so it will be 28 days before its considered (Even in cases of HBV and even more ridiculous – Hague abduction cases where we have to comply with the 6 weeks time limit for start of case to finish.)</li> <li>• In addition, the CCMS system can only deal with one application to amend at a time – in very urgent, fast moving cases – this is hopeless and causes massive delay. I have raised issues about children being left in situations of significant harm due to the system being not fit for purpose.</li> <li>• The system is designed so that if we chase up something urgent and it's not be dealt with, our enquiry is treated as an 'action' so the decision will be put back a further 28 days.</li> <li>• The system is still constantly crashing and takes for ever to complete the application – which we do not get paid for – which makes our margins even tighter.</li> <li>• Documents sent by us and acknowledged by CCMS, do not appear on the system – so there is delay as we are asked for them repeatedly – even when we have had a receipt for them.</li> <li>• The situation is particularly critical with wardship for Non Hague child abductions and for Hague child abductions – we cannot delegate for either – even when it is hugely urgent due to the impact on the child.</li> </ul>
<p>It is difficult to monitor unlike with the old paper applications with incoming DX but clearly increasingly the most difficult part of the case is dealing with the LAA on CCMS and not the opponent in the litigation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When making an urgent application, it is not possible to make it and then let nature take its course. Whether CCMS or paper, we have to ring the LAA to chase up to find out if the app was received and when it will be dealt with. When we do this, the LAA often cannot trace the app as their 'screen' isn't the same as ours. This is also a problem when there are queries with making apps generally on CCMS. The LAA's caseworkers cannot see what we are doing which makes it very difficult to obtain a solution.</li> <li>• When the LAA does something with an app, they do their thing on the system but we are not instantly notified that an action has been taken. We have to wait for a notification which seems to only be generated overnight, meaning that the email which tells us there is something to do or view on CCMS only ever comes the next day. That is totally ridiculous for an online system and means there is no real difference from the paper process where letters were generated and dispatched the next day. The only way to avoid the above is to have CCMS open on a browser constantly and to keep checking it every 30 mins or so. That is a waste of time and it is silly to have to do when they have built an online system.</li> <li>• We also query whether this same delay (receiving notifications) applies on the other side i.e. if we submit something, does the LAA only get notified the next day?</li> </ul>

- You can't upload docs when making the urgent app itself. We obviously know what we think the LAA will need so it is crazy that we can't upload this at the time of making the app. Instead we have to wait for the LAA to send a notification to us to request docs. That just builds in unnecessary delay. An example: S did an application on Thursday morning; Friday morning got notification to upload docs; LAA didn't specify which docs they wanted; S guessed which ones they wanted and uploaded them that day. It is now Monday afternoon and she has still not heard from the LAA. This was an urgent app.
- Often notifications say 'upload docs' but the LAA don't specify what docs they wish to see. Then we have to call (if we can ever get through) and ask the LAA what docs they want. That involves more problems as it may not be obvious to the person answering the phone what docs were being originally asked for.
- Typing a statement of case box – still can't use certain characters like apostrophes. This is a real problem for solicitors who generally like to write properly. So it means we have to waste time being extra careful or proof read everything to take out offending characters.
- Most of these relate to the way in which they have constructed and designed CCMS. It just is not fit for purpose.

I'm assuming here that when you refer to "urgent" applications you are including applications where delegated functions have already been used to grant the emergency certificate, rather than applications where we are asking the LAA to deal with an application on an urgent basis because we are not able to use delegated functions (e.g. for a Judicial Review case). The terminology is a bit confusing. If you don't mean to include delegated functions applications then please ignore the rest of this email

The most obvious CCMS-caused problem is that it is only possible to have one amendment open at any one time. We have generally been using the Single Stage Emergency Application process. This means that we submit an application via CCMS for an emergency certificate and then within 7 days we have to apply to amend the certificate to a substantive certificate. The problem is that in practice, it takes the LAA several weeks to process an application for a substantive amendment and frequently requests are made for further information etc which drags the whole process out even further. This means that it is quite likely that you will have to amend the emergency certificate because e.g. a hearing has been listed since delegated functions were used and so the scope needs to be amended. CCMS is only able to deal with one application for amendment at a time. This means that the LAA has to reject the application for a substantive amendment and you then need to put in an application to amend the emergency certificate and have that approved. You are then asked to resubmit the substantive amendment application. This is obviously a duplication of time and effort and drags the whole process out so it takes even longer. The only possible way around it seems to be where you call the LAA before you amend the emergency certificate and get them to deal with the substantive amendment urgently. But this will only work if a) you have to have enough notice of the impending change before you have to undertake the urgent work that requires a scope change and b) you aren't still in the process of tracking down whatever obscure and random piece of information or document that the Means Assessment team have decided they need to examine before funding can be granted. In practice you are faced with the choice of either deal with this frustrating bureaucratic duplication of effort or do the work pro bono.

Further to your recent update we are always experiencing issues of one sort or another.

The other day when trying to do urgent work the new portal wasn't working so we had to go via the old one that we of course no longer have access to. My colleague had to wait for an email to be sent with a link to access the old portal to then get on that way but the email took forever to come which meant

more calls to the LAA and more delay, frustration and general despair!

In the pre-CCMS days we could deal with an urgent amendment relatively easily by sending an App8 marked urgent – we knew this would be considered swiftly and could therefore advise the client that within 48 hours or less we would have an answer re funding and therefore able to put a together a plan as to what to do next with case. There is no such facility now. You put in the amendment and they seem to take ages to process it and there is no way of knowing when you are likely to receive a response. We have been advised over the phone when complaining about this that we should make a fresh application altogether – using delegated functions as the matter was urgent – so we could get into court immediately and then do a substantive application once the document request was sent out to us.

This then however results in requiring all new up to date financial information. Even with a client who is on benefits this is now a big task. The client in question lives a good 7 miles from our office and a good 3 miles from her support worker's office. She has two children (off school because it is summer) and a brand new baby born by C section, living on her own two floors up in a flat. No money, a violent, controlling husband (with home rights in the property). When I went to visit to get her to approve and sign a statement the day before the C section her washing machine flooded the kitchen. She is from Africa and her English is ok but she doesn't understand as much as she may first seem to so explaining what I need (again) and why is not easy. And of course I need it promptly and she is stuck in a two bed flat with no washing machine with three small children recovering from surgery!!

CCMS more than anything else in this taxing job makes me question why I do this!

- Pre-CCMS one had precedent application forms with certain generic information already inserted. There is no means to upload into CCMS an application form that we can use and re-use in the same way. This adds significant time to any application. Time is even more precious with urgent applications.
- The above is especially relevant where one has a number of linked clients with significant overlapping information/common data. However, it has to be entered separately, repeating the same data for each client. Again this adds even more time to such applications.
- Where delegated functions cannot be exercised (e.g. in Judicial Review claims) the two stage procedure has to be adopted. For emergency applications it is not possible to upload attachments until they are requested by the LAA in an emailed notification (unless you happen to spot the notification in CCMS before receiving the email). This itself causes significant delay. An application lodged on Thursday will result in an email notification from the LAA requesting supporting documents; the email is sent by the LAA overnight Friday/Saturday – usually received on Saturday – and not seen until Monday. That wastes 3 days before one can even provide the information that could have been provided at the start. Then the LAA has to act on the submitted documents and then advise, usually by email that arrives 2 days later which in the above example is 5 days since submission of the emergency application. Such times are 'at best'. Any hiccup in the information or in time of processing means even longer delays. This causes huge prejudice to the client, and stress to both client and lawyers. It is not unknown for people to be evicted before the emergency funding has been granted.
- Pre-CCMS one could email the APP6, with all supporting documentation, and get a confirmation of grant within the same day or by the next day (usually at latest).
- The actual time it takes to complete information in CCMS is a problem, especially with urgent applications.

- There is unnecessary repetition of information required in CCMS.
- Case Enquiries are a thoroughly inefficient way of communicating. Frequently the response comes long after the problem has been resolved (whilst the problem itself doesn't get resolved speedily). There is no effective substitute in CCMS for pre-CCMS communications by email and by telephone to the caseworker when it is necessary to alert the LAA to information regarding the case that needs to be taken into account urgently.
- Due to the fact that a non-emergency application takes ages to be processed, regardless of any indication of urgency, one is driven to making an emergency application in circumstances where it is not desperately urgent but it is sufficiently urgent that one cannot be waiting the time for a substantive application to be processed.

The time lag between them dealing with it from submission can be a problem.

- When you make an emergency application for Non-Molestation Order and Children Act proceedings there is only one box available on CCMS for the delegated functions date. However, the delegated functions date for Children is almost always after the Non-Molestation Order (as this is a gateway for legal aid funding). Applications have been refused by the Legal Aid Agency for being 'ultra vires' despite there only being one box available to enter the delegated functions date.
- On the substantive amendment you have to go through questions already asked during the emergency application. Although there is a fast forward button it is very slow and usually crashes. You then have no other option but to click next and go through all the questions you have already answered.
- Substantive amendments have to be done with 7 days but it can then take up to 21 days for such to be granted. If in the meantime you have to delegate for Children Act proceedings and you need to amend the scope of the certificate you then have to withdraw your substantive amendment/the LAA will reject it back to you and then you have to put in an amendment for Children Act proceedings. Therefore, the time you have spent making the substantive amendment is wasted.
- You are unable to use the emergency function and 'urgent' for the same application. For example, if you have an emergency application for an ex-parte Non-Molestation and you reach your costs limit you cannot make an urgent application to increase costs.
- The upgraded version of CCMS now asks for housing/rent costs even when the client is on a passporting benefit. When the client receives passporting benefits they also normally receive housing benefit and their rent is automatically paid for them. Therefore, most clients are unaware of their rent costs and we have to enter a random figure to move forward with the application and then we have to raise this point in a case query.

### 3. Can you list issues which arise because of how the LAA deal with the situation?

- The staff are clearly not trained and have no idea what is urgent and what isn't.
- Staff make judicial decisions on merit on CCMS – e.g. refuse an application for FMPO/FGMPO because the Respondents are out of the Jurisdiction – when we have already been to court as we have delegated.

My feel is for it to work – no matter how good the software which let's face it is still not fit for purpose - it would need to be staffed by LAA individuals with a grounding in housing law and JR and procedure and the merits criteria etc. whereas all or the bulk of them are not. There is a shocking mismatch between supplier and the LAA and multiple errors being made by the LAA which the practitioner then has to correct.

- When we call, we are pushed around to different departments within the LAA. No one seems to want to take responsibility and so each pushes the

<p>query to a different department.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The immigration department is constantly engaged and it is almost impossible to get through to speak to someone.</li> <li>• When we do call LAA caseworkers will tell us that they cannot look up our case reference as they are working on CCMS on something else. They have said the system doesn't allow this and they have told us to send an email to the urgent apps email address with our query (!)</li> </ul>
<p>The main problems we have identified are a) conflicting advice from caseworkers and customer service advisers at the LAA and b) having to continually phone up to chase progress because no notification is sent out on CCMS and/or you're told that someone will call you within 24 hours to tell you what step to take next but they don't. In a recent case it took so long trying to sort out getting the substantive application rejected and then getting the right team to authorise the emergency amendment that by the time it was all in place the emergency certificate was about to expire. On three separate occasions during this process I was told I would be contacted within 24 hours and wasn't with the result that I had to call again myself and even more time elapsed. I was then told that I should submit an application to extend the time limit of the emergency certificate before resubmitting the substantive amendment. When I did so the application to extend was rejected because it wasn't urgent enough (apparently) so it was just another waste of my time. This is just one example and I'm sure we could all give many others.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-CCMS one could also email the APP6 etc. to a LAA caseworker who had expertise and long standing knowledge of the nature of the work and the lawyer, and could understand the work and have the benefit of knowing the provider, and who could very speedily raise any queries and have them answered directly.</li> <li>• Post-CCMS the last two points have gone. People processing the work at the LAA do not necessarily have the knowledge and expertise to properly and speedily understand the matter, with decisions being made that are more random or based on misunderstanding etc.</li> </ul>
<p>An application for extension of costs limitation as trial imminent (in 10 days) . They say 12 days later that they cannot increase costs as retrospective. A the moment that is a major problem and there will be more of those.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When you call the LAA helpline in relation to a CCMS issue you have to explain your issue on every occasion to the LAA. It would be helpful if you were given a reference number for each issue so that you do not have to continually repeat your issue and explain the advice that you were given previously.</li> <li>• When you call the LAA in relation to an urgent amendment to the certificate e.g. increase in costs/scope, they will inform you that they cannot assist you or mark your matter as urgent until 48 hours before the court hearing. Therefore, in the interim we cannot carry out work on the file e.g. prepare bundles and statements for the hearing, as we may not receive the increase in costs/change to scope. However, there have been occasions when we have called the LAA 48 hours before the court hearing and the LAA have advised us that we were already covered. It appears that we are receiving conflicting advice as a result of the LAA not reviewing our matter merely on the basis that it does not fall within the 48 hours.</li> </ul>

Some further points from LAPG members after we had summarised the above. NB see LAA response to list of issues from LAPG members to follow the numbering:-

- a. Feedback today 6.9.16 – tried to complete urgent case at the end of last week. Confirmed merits sections as complete but at the end when reach application summary page, it said complete for everything except merits section. Spent 45 minutes trying to sort out (late at night so helpline not



working). Next day 40 mins on phone to helpful person on helpline – some characters not accepted. But more importantly, the person on phone said that error messages were not coming up and that a lot of people were having problems in the last two weeks. The short term solution was to use the earlier version.

- b. Feedback today 6.9.16 No 23 in the list is a real problem for emergency certificates because when you do a single application (emergency & substantive combined) it treats the issue of the substantive as an amendment to the emergency. It is just not good enough to say that all amendments should be uploaded at the same time, this is simply not possible in the single application process. Further, we are required to limit the emergency to the steps needed to be done immediately. It is often the case that further urgent work becomes necessary but we cannot amend the certificate until the substantive has been issued. We have been told not to worry as the amendment will have retrospective effect. I have raised this with our relationship manager and asked for confirmation that our amendments will be retrospectively applied as we have granted them, without second guessing. This confirmation has not been forthcoming. They are therefore requiring us to undertake urgent work at risk in circumstances where I don't know that they have the right to do so. Perhaps they should consider revising the guidance so that we can limit the emergency to all the steps likely to be necessary in the time until the substantive is issued?

No doubt C has told you about the problems in relation to the drop down options for where the client lives. Caravan/boat/tent not there.

- c. None of our applications through CCMS are being processed accurately, let alone the fact you cannot upload docs before being invited to do so, and even when you do upload the system says you haven't. So we are doing it 3 or 4 times, and even then the LAA don't respond to our messages pleading for the applications to be processed quickly. So we ring up. It is taking far far longer than paper applications, and taking away from client time.
- d. Thank you for your very helpful document with the CCMS responses to questions, many of which resonate with ourselves. I would like to make it known that it is all very well for them to keep saying they have introduced a document upload facility – see no. 7, 11, 26 – but this facility has NEVER worked. When you click on the document upload link nothing happens!

I found no.34 interesting as a similar thing happened here – we were asked for a more detailed narrative for a bill that had been submitted. So the narrative was typed into the response section. Clearly, no documents were required just to write a narrative, so the drop down 'documents not sent' was selected. When we heard nothing more for several weeks and chased this up, we were told this matter was sitting in a queue as we had not sent any documents! The next time there was a query on the same matter, I selected 'documents sent' even though there were no documents to send, and it was dealt with in a reasonable time frame!



- e. Feedback 2.9.16 Our biggest problem is the system crashing. We have spent hours on the phone to technical support – and “downgraded”; and used different browsers with emptied caches etc. Frustratingly it sometimes works then crashes – often losing work in process. I am currently urgently trying to increase a financial limit in a Court of Protection case. This has now taken me 3-4 hours with still no submission possible. For the first time we are as a firm seriously looking at taking on major private work. In part we are driven to this by the wasted costs/time of CCMS!
- f. Feedback 1.9.16 I think the most urgent one to challenge is the inability to amend while another amendment is in process. That’s is totally bonkers and does not allow us to deal with urgent court hearings that are set by judges without warning etc. Followed by the “invalid characters” nonsense.
- g. Feedback in last ten minutes (not confined to urgent cases but very worrying): On one of my cases, I was in the middle of completing a means assessment, and had to obtain more information so went back to it later. I was surprised to see that the last time the means assessment had been saved was not by me, but by someone else outside the firm. I searched that solicitor and called her. She said she had been on CCMS at that time but on one of her cases (not mine). How could her name come up in my system?

Compiled by Carol Storer , LAPG

6.9.16

## CCMS – points raised by LAPG members and LAA response 4.7.16

	LAPG member point/question	LAA response
1	Frustration with ‘unrecognised characters’; (feedback <b>today</b> : “Invalid characters have become an issue for me when inserting large amounts of text into the CCMS boxes (such as reasons for amendment or statement of case). It doesn’t allow you to use an apostrophe or other types of punctuation. It becomes time consuming as you have to go back through the text and take out all punctuation! It sometimes let you have it and sometimes does not, it is not consistent.”	It is not on our list of planned changes to the system but I have included the <a href="#">Training link</a> in this area.
2	A solicitor used a code for defending possession proceedings that was correct in law but he was told that he had to use a different code. He could not see codes on CCMS but to amend the code he had to go through the means and merits application again – so it took an hour to amend something that was actually correct in the first place	All our guidance reflects that there are no specific codes for proceedings in CCMS.  If however the proceedings are not in the drop down box we will investigate. We need more details of scenario or a case reference.
3	Even with the enhanced version, the number of screens is still an irritation (better than before but still not good enough);	Only vital information is asked for during the application process. The LAA has made every effort to reduce the number of questions and screens and no further screens can be removed due to legal policy reasons.
4	Having to choose an option from a drop down list where the information to be inserted does not fit any of the options;	The framework is designed to cover all areas. If, however something significant is missing we can look to add to the reference data. We would require specifics from the user as to the scenario(s).
5	One firm has been told ‘If you have any difficulties attempting to submit an application via CCMS, try using the original version of the CCMS portal rather than the upgraded version.	There have been occasions where it has been necessary to advise users to revert to the original version of the system to complete a task. This advice should have only been applicable to individual applications and the scenario presented.

		The system has now been designed so that all users are directed to the Upgraded version.
6	Delays in decision-making	If we have feedback on individual cases we can investigate and see if there have been any unwarranted delays. Please click <a href="#">here</a> for a link to the published turnaround times for the LAA.
7	<p>One member summarised her firm's views as follows:-</p> <p>"My staff are actually pleased I made them start it ages ago as they are much more used to it. It is working much better, just if you can't log on you know you will have a long wait. The automatic benefits checker with DWP is really useful. Still the same irritation that you have to wait to be asked to upload documents, we know what we need to upload and have to wait sometimes weeks to be asked to do it. For example to discharge you have to load outcomes then wait to be asked to upload the supporting court order, or when a certificate is revoked you cannot record outcomes or enter a bill for three months in case the client suddenly pays The means forms are not identical to the online version. We do not have the client sitting with us while we fill in the online version. We would not have time to do this and would not be paid.</p>	Document upload functionality was released some time ago for applications and was released into production at the end of June for Outcomes.
8	With regard to HCC's, when the Legal Aid Agency send you a notification that your Case Plan has been agreed and a Contract Price confirmed the Solicitor then has to make an application on CCMS to extend the costs limitation of the certificate to the amount the Legal Aid Agency have told you that they have agreed. A totally pointless waste of time. Why can't the HC caseworker amend the certificate limitation in the same way they would have done for a CIS certificate?	<p>Currently the costs limits cannot be amended by caseworkers.</p> <p>The full area of HCC has been under review by our specialist teams. We will issue guidance to all stakeholders as soon as this is available.</p>

9	Completing Outcome Codes for multiple scope certificates. The particular irritation relates to s31 applications which are always listed as applications for Care or Supervision Orders. On CCMS this creates two scope items - application for a Care Order and application for a Supervision Order. When you come to do outcomes you have to enter outcome codes for both scope items even though they will be exactly the same	The area you have highlighted is not currently included in our CCMS enhancement plans. However these are reviewed on a regular basis.
10	Nil bills for Multiple Client certificates. No problem that the Legal Aid Agency nominate one certificate to be the lead certificate for multiple party representation with the costs limitation being attached to it. However, when the case ends, the Solicitor makes a final claim for costs against the lead certificate but then has to go through a process of submitting 'nil' bills for each of the linked certificates. Again, a pointless waste of time. If CCMS knows they are linked why can't CCMS close the linked certificate when the lead certificate claim is processed?	Currently there is no alternative to this but we will ensure that this issue is raised for consideration for future enhancements
11	The inability to attach documents to an emergency application causes undue delay and in effect results in a certificate not being confirmed for possibly 4 days, as the request for docs can come through on the second day, and then further delay whilst it is processed and confirmed (and I have been asked for documents on two consecutive days even where they were sent the previous day, presumably not acted upon that day hence triggering another request as if I hadn't sent them	In July 2016, we implemented a change in CCMS that moved all providers to the upgraded version of the system, where the document upload functionality is available for Applications and Outcomes.
12	I copied and pasted a chunk of pre-action letter to provide the explanation of what the case was about and this worked fine in the emergency application. However, when I did exactly the same in the amendment to substantive, CCMS rejected it and I had to go through it all dealing with all the punctuation which is so, so stupid	Please can you provide further on the information text you entered into CCMS. This will allow us to investigate what happened. Also I have included the <a href="#">Training link</a> on how to deal with unrecognised characters.
13	There is an urgency facility but this is managed by case management. We will pass on I thought that one could apply for a substantive instead of an emergency and ask for	In these situations the provider submits an application and then rings Customer Service Team and explain what the urgency is. They can then send an email to the 24hr urgent team who will

	<p>it to be dealt with urgently, but it appears no indication of urgency is taken any notice of. This means one can't act sensibly with an application that isn't a dire emergency but IS urgent. The result is significant delay and therefore practitioners will opt for emergency application when that shouldn't be necessary. There should be an ability to seek processing within, say, 5 days, to bridge this gap.</p>	<p>deal with it within 24hrs from the point the email was sent</p> <p>We are currently processing applications within 7 days of submission</p>
14	<p>Severe hassle: where one is making an application for multiple clients in the same or linked matter, doing the apps on paper would have meant entering it once into forms software and then just amending the personal details for each one (not just APP1 but also MEANS). On CCMS you have to enter up each one completely separately which vastly increases the time it takes so much of the entering is the same. This should be sorted. Not only does it mean a waste of time and costs but where it is emergency apps it can mean one can't even complete them within even a whole day</p>	<p>One application is needed for each client, however there is a <a href="#">training guide</a> that will show how elements of the application can be copied over.</p>
15	<p>Where a client has passed as passported on income the further questions should be solely about capital. I had a problem very recently where it went on to ask the question whether the client received any state benefits. The correct answer was yes, but that triggered a whole host of irrelevant questions (i.e. MEANS 1 questions rather than MEANS 2). I had to phone up and find out what to do and was told to answer no and no to everything that followed, regardless! This shouldn't happen</p>	<p>This is a known issue that is currently under investigation by the LAA.</p>
16	<p>Another issue I came across last week was the inability to amend a date of birth. I spoke to the online technical support and they confirmed there was no way that either I or the LAA could amend it. This meant I had to input the whole application in again (with all 8 bank accounts, 6 children, 3 maintenance payment, 2 cars...!!!)</p>	<p>We wouldn't want to be able to change a DOB as it is the client's data.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to check the info before submitting the client details to the database.</p>
17	<p>Online support is poor– they only advise – log out then log on. 1 case not been able to do any work since December as issues and not resolved</p>	<p>If we have the case reference we can look at exactly what the difficulty is on this application.</p> <p>When contacting Online Support please provide the case</p>

		specific reference and screen shots where appropriate.
18	LAA taking too long to process applications - this is a <b>SERIOUS PROBLEM</b> - made one app – in plenty of time for hearing – they did not process then had to resubmit as emergency – creates extra work for us	Please can you provide the information on the application in questions so we can investigate if there were any unwarranted delays? Please click <a href="#">here</a> for a link to the published turnaround times for the LAA.
19	When print summaries – not enough information is shown	This should be the same as the information that has been entered - if there is an example where it is not we can look into this.
20	1) question is, does client have any extra benefits – but no place to insert details so it looks as if the client has negative income!	If the benefit is not listed the user should be clicking yes to ‘other benefits?’ and provide the details.  If it is a disregarded benefit that causes the negative disposable income, it is advised that the user should type ‘shortfall covered by benefits not included by the LAA as income’ in the text box.
21	Real problem is that only fee earner can respond to queries. We have para legals imputing application but if there is then a problem LAA send email to fee earner who may be out of office and not to person who put app on in first place	On CCMS it is possible to set the para legal as the <a href="#">case contact</a> . This will direct all case queries to that individual. Also any individual with the office manager role can look at all cases and check for any outstanding queries.
22	The only issue I have is logging on to more than one account in one day, if I try to log onto someone else’s account after I have checked my own it does not like this and I have to use someone else’s computer	The login details and passwords are there to protect information/data protection. If you really needed to login with somebody else’s security information then you would need to clear their cache (see <a href="#">training docs</a> ). Alternately, if you have the office manager role you can check all cases.
23	When you make an amendment on a case, e.g prior authority, you are then unable to make any further amendments before your first amendment has been dealt with. As amendments take 8-10 working days to be considered, this is not practicable. There are often further amendments that need to be made and may be urgent, e.g. a cost extension, a change of scope or a further prior authority application. As we are governed by the court timetable this delay often means we have to apologise to the court for the delay in decisions being made	It is not possible to make further amendments while one is pending -If a provider is aware of all the amendments they can be all loaded at one time.  We are not looking at changing this in the short term.

24	When you submit a POA it would be beneficial if you are able to upload the invoice that the POA relates to at the same time, rather than receiving a notification a few hours later asking for the invoice to be uploaded. As the CCMS system is so slow to have to log back into the system and upload the document wastes a considerable amount of time	At the moment there is no plan in the short term to introduce the document upload facility to POA's. However options to offer benefits in this area could be considered due to the potential provider benefits.
25	It is terribly slow but I don't think there is anything we can do about that	The Team are continually looking at ways to improve both the stability and speed of the system, however the number of platforms on which the system is built means that there will always be a limit as to how far we can progress with this. In addition we cannot allow for the speed of the internet at the provider's end in particular if that office is based in a city centre where there is a huge demand for the bandwidth in that area.
26	The main bugbear must be having to be asked to upload documents, it just is completely farcical and shows what an inadequate system it is that it does not have the capability to allow this immediately. Contrast with the Land Registry (another Government Department, well at the moment unless privatised) where we can upload all the documents at the same time we lodge an application, just have a drop down list of options to identify the document	The document upload functionality has been implemented and available on the upgraded version of the system. On the 3 <sup>rd</sup> July we moved all user to the upgraded version, this should improve the application process.
27	I have tried to allocate costs to counsel, which we need to do or they won't get paid. The system did not recognise the name of chambers and indeed I tried a selection of chambers we use regularly and none of them came up	Alternatively the provider can search under the account number which will give a more accurate search result.
28	Searching by counsel's name also did not work as she has a middle initial – unknown to me, and because CCMS is not intuitive I could not locate her without this middle initial.	Data for counsel has been taken from CWA so will appear as they are registered. Alternatively the provider can search under the account number which will give a more accurate search result.
29	It would assist greatly if the individual LAA reference number could be included on all fee notes, it is included on the CF1A which counsel submits at the end of the case and which replaces the need for a fee note, but this form is not used until the end of the case.	We have included this issue for consideration for future enhancements

	<p>Would it be possible for the LAPG to raise this with chambers undertaking legal aid work? Or indeed the LAA, who could alter CCMS to ensure its database was up to date and acted more intuitively, I doubt that will ever be possible though!"</p>	
<p>30</p>	<p>2. From 18.4.16 I have sought to use the interactive guides in CCMS training but they do not work (just comes up with a blank page). I have followed the instructions they have on the CCMS training website i.e. my internet explorer is newer than version 9 and I have gone through the clearing my cache (whatever that meant). I have also downloaded the document and still when I then bring it up it still appears as a blank page. I don't know if other people have the same problem, but it would be helpful to know if this has been experienced by others</p>	<p>Please can you provide the name of the training documents that will not load and where they are located on the training website? If possible can you also provide screen shots and confirm your internet browser.</p>
<p>31</p>	<p>3. From 19.4.16 <u>Law costs draftsman trying to get cert discharged in order to lodge final bill</u> Email To LAA: I have tried to discharge this certificate so many times. I've reported everything and this is just getting silly now. Can you please just discharge the certificate so I can submit my final bill. LAA Reply: We have raised with our supplier support team. Unfortunately we are unable to confirm once this might be resolved. If this relates to an urgent billing matter, our case management team should authorise and allow you to undertake one of the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Submit hard copy claim</li> <li>2. Submit you final bill as 'solicitor Interim' and include all POAs that need to be recouped, in the document request make it clear that you have submitted your final claim as solicitor interim owing to technical issue on the case.</li> </ol>	<p>In order to discharge a certificate you would require the role of case manager supervisor, it is unlikely that this role has been given to the costs draftsman and so outcome and discharge would sit with the provider.</p>

	Please included contingency cover sheet with your supporting documents to ensure claim is assessed.	
32	<p>4. From 19.4.16 Housing lawyer</p> <p>Yesterday I was trying to do a CCMS application all morning but kept being knocked back when the DWP check did not work. I could not tick the box saying we had a letter from dwp dated within 14 days because we didn't... Really frustrating because it is a warrant case and we needed emergency legal aid. But when tried again at 3pm, it worked. I asked client to come back in the afternoon to sign etc.</p> <p>But aside from that it has been working reasonably ok, and the new version is significantly better than the original.</p>	<p>All providers have been moved to the upgraded version of CCMS, this should alleviate the issues.</p> <p>Any issues with the DWP link need to be reported to Online Support Team as they occur.</p>
33	<p>5. From 19.4.16</p> <p>I agree. Same problems still there and new problems occurring. I got a show cause because I hadn't applied to amend an emergency certificate to substantive. The show cause however prevented me from making the necessary application. That took about an hour of ineffective efforts and phone calls.</p>	<p>Please provide the certificate reference number so that we can investigate further.</p>
34	<p>6. From 19.4.16</p> <p>They haven't got VHCC matters sorted, especially CCFs, admitting they weren't part of the original build.</p> <p>I am at 4 weeks for a poa! The goalposts keep moving as to what they want to process it, staff there aren't trained on how to process them.</p> <p>I've now been told never choose 'documents not sent' as that means effectively you go in a queue for queries, so press 'documents sent' whether you have or haven't to ensure your notification gets processed!</p>	<p>All POAs including those for High Cost Cases are dealt with within target. Please click <a href="#">here</a> for a link to the published turnaround times for the LAA.</p> <p>It would appear that there may have been difficulty in uploading evidence and would therefore suggest referring to our <a href="#">Quick Guide</a> on how to upload documents.</p>
35	7. From 18 May 2016	This is not an issue with CCMS but with a process. We are

	<p>I had used delegated functions on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2015 to grant an emergency certificate on a Court of Protection welfare matter with a non-standard costs limit of £7500 because of the extent of urgent work involved and scope up to final hearing because there was a hearing on 23 December which was potentially final (as there had already been several hearings before I was instructed by the Official Solicitor). Important issues about extreme deprivation of the client's liberty including use of a padded room. I applied on 27 December 2015 to amend the certificate to substantive with the same costs and scope limits as on the emergency. The LAA took until 16<sup>th</sup> January 2016 to issue an emergency certificate. It had costs of only £1350 and scope only up to initial hearing.</p> <p>I appealed on 4<sup>th</sup> February. I also mentioned another problem that the system would not allow me to assign counsel because an amendment request was pending. I think this system has now changed so you can allocate costs to counsel more straightforwardly.</p> <p>I then received the substantive certificate on 11<sup>th</sup> February, which still had the scope only up to an initial hearing. The notification said that the costs were £7500 but on the CCMS overview they were still £1350 and it was said that there was still an amendment request pending.</p> <p>I raised the issues by a case enquiry the same day. On 7<sup>th</sup> April I received notifications that the appeal (of 4<sup>th</sup> Feb) and the case enquiry (of 11<sup>th</sup> Feb) had been 'assigned'. However they hadn't been processed.</p> <p>Today I have finally received the amended certificate with the correct costs and scope that I granted under delegated powers over 5 months ago. The covering letter is dated 8 April 2016</p>	<p>unable to comment on individual cases without having the full case details including the CCMS case reference number.</p>
36	8. And is universal credit now on the correct drop down list?	Universal Credit is currently not available on the drop down list, and is on the future enhancement list. In the meantime please select the Guarantee Pension Credit and enter the



		applicant/benefits claimant's details.
37	9. Recent advice to a member If you have any difficulties attempting to submit an application via CCMS, try using the original version of the CCMS portal rather than the upgraded version.	<p>The system has now been designed so that all users are directed to the Upgraded version.</p> <p>The Upgraded version gives providers a better user experience. By concerting our efforts on that system we can give better stability and put our efforts into enhancing that system. The Original version will be available for some time should we need it, but we are not anticipating this to be the case.</p>
38	10. And a reminder that we have received no response to this email.	Zara Topping has replied to this e-mail.