Litigation futures: strong & stable despite the Brexit effect

While Brexit created unhelpful uncertainty for litigators & their clients, statistics suggest that international cases in London are on the rise & that London remains a primary global legal centre. But what about the future & wellbeing of the next generation of litigators & what should law firms be doing to ensure their teams are both diverse & inclusive? Grania Langdon-Down reports

For litigators, 2020 is going to be a year where their focus is both on external issues, including any fallout from Brexit and procedural changes, and internally on how best to ensure teams are not just diverse and inclusive but properly supported amid increasing concern about mental health and wellbeing.

For the first time, the *NLJ*'s annual online survey of litigators, conducted with the support of the London Solicitors Litigation Association (LSLA), asked whether the legal community needs to do more to promote diversity and inclusion and what areas could be improved. Eight out of ten of the 120-plus respondents said yes, with 18% (21) saying no. Their additional comments show not only how far some firms still have to go—with one respondent admitting their firm was 'embarrassingly behind the curve'—but also some individual scepticism, with one respondent maintaining 'there is a deeply and legitimately-felt belief that we are already doing far too much'.

But the message increasingly being heard across the profession is that focusing on diversity alone is not enough and that the emphasis must be on being inclusive, as well as being open to discussions around mental health and wellbeing. There are plans underway for a conference later this year to look at ways of working more sensitively, with the recognition that the aggressively competitive culture that can build up around litigation can be very damaging.

The Brexit effect

In the meantime, the focus will be on the new government. And for litigators, that raises the question that has been haunting the legal sector since the referendum—will Brexit lead to a flight of litigation to other jurisdictions?

Philippe Sands QC, a barrister at Matrix chambers and professor of law at University College London, painted a very gloomy picture at the annual Bar Conference in November. He argued that the UK's legal status on the global stage is under threat, citing Brexit, the prorogation of Parliament and the dwindling count of UK judges serving on the benches of international judges.

But the CityUK legal services report 2019 published in December showed that total earnings for the legal profession across all jurisdictions in the UK rose by six per cent last year, to £35bn. CityUK, a lobbying group that promotes business in the Square Mile, maintained that the UK was holding its position as the largest legal services market in Europe and, globally, was second only to the US.

'London's courts have faced competition for a long time,' says Julian Acratopulo, LSLA president and partner at Clifford Chance. 'But they have continued to maintain their global pre-eminence. This is a reflection of our system and global litigants are showing no signs of taking their cases elsewhere. Indeed, statistics suggest that international cases in London are on the rise.

'While Brexit has created unhelpful uncertainty, I think that the concerns around jurisdiction and recognition and enforcement will ultimately be resolved. In practice, clients are not showing any real appetite to change their choice of jurisdiction or law in the face of the Brexit risk.'

Ed Crosse, past president of the LSLA and a partner at Simmons & Simmons, has also seen the early 'high level' of uncertainty settle down. 'Clients generally favour English law in most commercial contracts and they will be very slow to abandon that.'

He also believes clients would be slow to move to the new English language courts being set up in the EU because the judiciary here is so highly respected.

Judicial retention & engagement

Where he sees the 'biggest threat' is over the retention of senior judges, with highly regarded figures leaving the bench and going into arbitration, including the former appeal judge Dame Elizabeth Gloster QC, the first woman to be appointed a judge in the commercial court and then the first woman to lead it. She resigned last year after being turned down for a post on the Supreme Court because she didn't have enough years left to serve before she had to retire.

Instead she has returned to her former chambers at One Essex Court where she has been appointed chairwoman and co-chairwoman in a wide range of international arbitrations.

However, Crosse says there has also been a strong push from the judiciary in London to build closer engagement with senior judges from commercial courts across the world.

Last summer, the Standing International Forum of Commercial Courts (SIFoCC), which was established in 2017, launched the first edition of its Multilateral Memorandum on Enforcement of Commercial Judgments for Money. The memorandum sets out an account of the procedures for the enforcement of judgments of one jurisdiction in the courts of another. Contributed to by 32 of the SIFoCC member jurisdictions, the aim is for it to be a 'useful tool' in global enforcement.

The SIFoCC membership will reconvene in Singapore in March and consider further common interests that impact on the courts and their users.

Crosse says: 'This all plays into questions of judicial comity respecting decisions made in other jurisdictions, even if they don't fall within the Brussels regulations.'

The litigation market

The view of eight out of ten litigators responding to the survey is that the litigation market has remained unchanged, or has grown, despite the upheavals of the last two/three years, with only 14% reporting a

decline (see Box out, '2019: a record year for international litigation').

Nearly seven out of ten expect a spike in litigation affecting businesses operating cross-borders post Brexit with just under a quarter disagreeing.

'It will be a nightmare,' says one.

Asked if they foresaw a 'material flight of litigation work' to other jurisdictions, responders were more cautious. Only just over half (56%) said no while more than a quarter (28%) said yes.

As one responder pointed out, 'the reason for choosing London as a litigation forum lies more in the quality and impartiality/political independence of the judiciary. London has never been the cheapest venue; but availability of other centres such as Dublin or Paris and the prospect of lower costs have not prompted moves to date'.

But another warned: 'In the long run, if other financial and commercial centres take business from London, the disputes work will follow.'

'The uncertainty of the outcome has been the most damaging aspect of Brexit,' says David Greene, vice president of the Law Society and senior partner of Edwin Coe.

'That uncertainty still exists because it remains to be seen what can be achieved in a very short transition period. Absent a deal, we are back to the precipice of no deal. It's a pretty standard question from foreign clients

Disclosure: a work in progress

"Interim findings show that parties are now moving away from standard disclosure as a default and are selecting the more focused request-based approach"
Ed Crosse, immediate past President LSLA

Disclosure is an issue which can send the blood pressure of litigators, parties and judges off the scale with the Disclosure Pilot Scheme (DPS) winning both praise and criticism.

The survey asked if clients had commented on the cost impact of any procedural reforms that were being piloted. Of the 40% who said yes, none saw any benefits. Disclosure is a 'mess' and the pilot 'increases work and costs and makes the whole process longer,' give a flavour of the responses. While a third said the pilot hadn't brought about a more proportionate approach by litigators, just over half said it was too early to tell. One commented that the new system is making it easier for defendants to 'game the system', skewing the field against claimants so they face an uphill struggle to get relevant disclosure. Another added it has resulted in additional costs and makes the process more contentious so that time is spent on matters which previously would not have arisen.

It was also early days to know if it will result in more robust case management by judges around the permitted scope of disclosure.

'On at least one major case it was clear that the judge hadn't fully grasped what it involved,' one said. Another argued the pilot was not appropriate in large scale litigation as the court had to step in to resolve issues which have arisen purely as a result of the scheme. Parties try to limit their own disclosure obligations while widening those of their opponents which leads to inevitable disagreement and increased costs with the court eventually having to step in.

A combined approach

Crosse says the DPS was a direct response to demands from clients to make disclosure more focused and less expensive. Procedural reform may help but the real impact will be from the use of technology.

'Interim findings show that parties are now moving away from standard disclosure as a default and are selecting the more focused request-based approach,' he says.

'Is it starting to influence the type of orders being made? Absolutely, there is very clear evidence of that. Does the pilot scheme require refinement? Absolutely. We are getting great feedback from the profession on areas that are causing issues.'

He highlights two areas parties are finding challenging as they work through the lifecycle of disclosure. 'The first is the obligation to serve a preservation notice on former employees, which for most corporates can be sensitive,' he says.

'You are effectively having to contact someone who no longer works for you and tell them about a dispute that has arisen. The obligation has always been there but is now in black and white. What people are asking is if it can be a requirement to take reasonable and proportionate steps to contact the person rather than an absolute obligation.'

The other challenge is agreeing issues for disclosure. He says there has been very little take-up of the option of a disclosure guidance hearing—an informal 30-minute appearance before a judge to get through an impasse.

'These hearings were intended to avoid large case management conferences with counsel,' he explains, 'and to encourage more junior lawyers to pitch up at court and discuss with the other side and the judge how to get through particular points.'

Crosse says it may be parties feel 30 minutes is too short and there is still a lack of trust in what is traditionally a highly adversarial process. He says the hearings could be extended if they are considered too short and parties should be taking up the option throughout the disclosure process and not just pre-CMC. While there has also been a tendency to overcomplicate the orders parties are seeking, this should ease as parties become more familiar with the process.

David Greene, *NLJ* consultant editor, says: 'Reining in disclosure in the digital age is undoubtedly necessary but claimants will always be nervous that they are missing something in the search for the - usually non-existent - smoking gun. I have to say, however, that I have yet to see any civil justice reform that doesn't increase costs.'

LSLA Vice President Chris Bushell says it is too early to say whether the DPS will achieve its aims. 'The spotlight it has shone on the issue of excessive disclosure may, in itself, go some way in steering the parties, and the court, toward a more restrained approach,' he says.

'But it's fair to say that it introduces new layers of complexity into the process, which brings increased costs, and the question is whether those costs will be outweighed by savings down the line.'

So, unless the courts move away from the basic premise in English litigation that the 'cards need to be on the table' to do the case justice—a key attraction for international parties—he says disclosure will remain an important part of major cases.

Cultural change

The DPS is intended to be a 'living pilot' which leads to cultural change. Professor Rachael Mulheron, from Queen Mary University of London, has been producing interim reports and analysing the responses to a recent questionnaire. She stresses the importance of feedback from litigators—positive and critical.

as to whether Brexit might affect enforcement of any judgment. The government has committed to contracting to the Lugano Convention to ensure the easiest enforcement in Europe. Now we are out of the EU we can apply to join, but the EU still holds the whip hand because its consent will be needed. It remains to be seen whether they see that consent as a bargaining chip in the wider negotiation.'

Greene's firm had been looking at opening a Dublin office, but it is now opening one in Malta. 'We decided it was more cost efficient and swifter to open in Malta,' he says. 'It is important for us to have a European office because, without one, we would face hurdles in maintaining major parts of our IP practice.'

In the meantime, he says there is already competition between the UK and the Netherlands to produce the most flexible procedures for bringing collective claims.

'The two have been leapfrogging each other,' he notes. 'I would say the Netherlands is on top at the moment because it has a cheaper and easier process than us. It is becoming the choice within the EU to bring a collective action.'

But, overall, Greene says London remains as a primary global legal centre because the law is predictable but with the common law flexibility. 'It is also outstanding when it comes to cases that need disclosure and advocacy which are limited under the civil law system,' he adds. 'Although the adversarial process is expensive, it produces cost efficient, effective and predictable results.'

For Chris Bushell, LSLA vice president, the continuing uncertainty around the impact of Brexit is 'obviously unhelpful', but it shouldn't have a significant impact on the attractiveness of English law and the English courts.

English contract law appeals because it has a large body of case law to back it up, but remains flexible enough to adapt to new business practices, he says, adding: 'It generally gives effect to the bargain that commercial parties have reached, with limited scope for implied terms or the influence of public policy.'

Where some clients have concerns is about enforcement, if a counterparty's assets are all in the EU27, says Bushell, a dispute resolution partner with Herbert Smiths Freehills. 'But, in most cases, English judgments should still be enforceable, particularly where the dispute stems from a contract with an exclusive English jurisdiction clause.'

In those circumstances, he says, the Hague Convention on Choice of Court Agreements 2005 should allow enforcement across the EU27 and some other countries. 'And even where a contract falls outside Hague, most EU27 countries have procedures for the enforcement of foreign judgments, even without a specific treaty or convention, though the process may be slower, more costly and more uncertain,' he explains.

Longer term, other arrangements such as the Lugano Convention can be put in place.

'It's worth remembering,' he notes, 'that there are many features of English law and the English courts that international parties find attractive, including the combination of stability and flexibility that comes with English law, the quality and independence of the judiciary, and the ability of the English courts to do justice with the 'cards on the table'. Brexit doesn't affect these at all.'

Cost matters

Alongside Brexit, the cost of litigating in the UK is a constant refrain. But for nearly 60% of those responding to the survey, cost wasn't a significant factor in whether clients pursued litigation in London. They chose it because the court system is seen as 'trustworthy and not corrupt' and it is still 'cheaper than other jurisdictions'.

'Costs are always a relevant factor in the decision whether or not to pursue litigation,' says Acratopulo. 'Costs are not, however, the principal reason why litigants internationally chose to fight their cases in London. Typically, the quality of our bench and the inherent fairness and rigour of our process are the key drivers. Litigants are more likely to shy away from London for reasons of recognition and enforcement than cost.'

Bushell says the increased availability of alternative fee arrangements for commercial parties is proving significant. 'Where clients are costs conscious, they may like the thought that they can pay less if they don't achieve the desired result and be happy to pay more on success as a quid pro quo,' he says.

'We're talking to clients a lot more than we used to about success-based arrangements, and so it's good to see that efforts to reform the regime for damages-based agreements are currently gaining momentum. If implemented, that could allow greater flexibility to develop fee arrangements that work for both the law firm and for commercial clients.'

The court estate

An area causing practitioners concern centres around the lack of resources in terms of the court estate and administration staff.

Elizabeth Mason, an associate in the global commercial disputes team at Reed Smith, is a committee member of the Junior LSLA. She highlights lengthy security queues at the Royal Courts of Justice and the Rolls Building causing hearings to be delayed; unanswered calls to the court registry due to insufficient staffing; and slow responses to CE filing matters, suggesting court administration staff can't keep pace with the significant workload.

Acrapoluto agrees: 'The courts are the shop window for London litigation and we cannot afford to give international litigants the wrong first impression by failing to maintain that infrastructure.'

The Corporation of London is working on plans for a new court to deal with commercial claims. It completed the purchase of 68-71 Fleet Street in November 2018, with the aim, subject to finalising funding and planning permission, of completing the court by 2025.

'That shows two things,' says Greene. 'That the corporation has faith in London remaining a global legal centre, and it sees a need for a new courthouse, which practitioners will welcome.'

Digitalisation & legal tech

The digitalisation of the courts is also an important development. Acrapotulo says: 'The fact that the court files are now online and applications are issued electronically has created greater flexibility and efficiency. It is a very positive step along the right path.'

However, Mason says the introduction of the CE filing system (a new electronic filing and case management system) has not been smooth and there are still significant issues with the system, including the acknowledged receipt of CE filing taking a long time; documents being incorrectly dated; court orders not reflecting what the parties agreed and missing information, such as the judge's name.

Other issues, she says, include the limits on the number of attachments to any filing being too low; the limits on the size of electronic files being too low; features on CE files, such as dropdown menus, not working; rejection of filings for no apparent reason; and a guide to the system that is insufficiently detailed and lacks transparency for users.

Looking at legaltech more broadly, Bushell says technology is playing a significant role not only in how litigation is conducted—with electronic filing of documents, predictive coding software for more efficient disclosure document review and analysis, and electronic trial bundles—but also in how practitioners advise clients.

His firm is working with Solomonic, a start-up which provides a software platform to give a wide range of analytics on commercial court and chancery decisions, including win rates for various types of case. 'The aim is not to replace the lawyer's judgment and experience,' he says, 'but to identify a 'base rate' for past cases that can help inform the lawyer's assessment of risk.

'We have also used technology to build decision tree models which allow for a more scientific assessment of legal risk and probable outcomes, based on key points of uncertainty in a dispute.'

Mason says Reed Smith has introduced new remote access software, with a more

Diversity & inclusion: the future

"Apart from being quite clearly the right thing to do, diversity and inclusion is very firmly a business issue. Clients are demanding that the legal community partners with them in promoting greater diversity and inclusion in the workplace. Anecdotally, clients are unwilling to work with a legal team that is not sufficiently diverse."

Julian Acrapotulo, LSLA President

"Diversity matters because London needs a legal community which reflects and understands the dynamic international market that it serves."

Natalie Osafo, Chair of the Junior LSLA

user-friendly interface, to enable staff to work remotely and pick up exactly where they have left off in the office, with the firm's new agile working policy.

For Crosse, Skype for Business has helped staff work flexibly. 'It means you can do a video conference from your bedroom at home, even on your mobile phone, right across the globe.'

However, while technology is having an impact across the legal sector, particularly around more routine tasks, practitioners don't believe it will put them out of a job because human talent and experience remain critical.

'Forms of AI technology and predictive machine learning models will always require parts of the process to be checked by people,' says Mason.

'While machine learning can accelerate the privilege review process, human eyes will generally need to verify claims of privilege. At Reed Smith, we also apply forms of AI in the organisation, analysis and lifecycle management of deals and contracts. But there are certain parts of the process that will always require human experience and legal expertise.'

Predictive coding and other artificial intelligence-based technology are rapidly becoming the norm for the disclosure process, says Natalie Osafo, Junior LSLA chair and a senior associate at Stewarts Law.

'The question now is how best to deploy it in the litigation process,' she says. She points out that the Disclosure Pilot Scheme (DPS) for the Business and Property Courts (BPC) encourages litigants to consider using technology assisted review (TAR) for cases involving in excess of 50,000 documents. If they choose not to, they will have to explain their decision to the court.

'We have not reached a stage where AI is able to make substantive decisions or complex judgment calls in litigation without human input,' she says, 'and the outputs still need to be checked by lawyers. But the role of technology is not to make decisions for humans, but rather to make it easier for the decisions to be made by humans in cases involving gargantuan volumes of data.'

And she says new eDisclosure platforms are also emerging which go beyond predictive coding and purport to leverage machine learning to identify relevant/irrelevant or privileged/not privileged documents much faster.

Witness evidence

Another area under review is witness evidence. A working group was established last year to examine potential reform following concerns expressed by business clients that witness statements had become 'overlawyered' and expensive to produce.

Recommendations put forward by the Witness Statement Working Group have recently been endorsed by the senior judiciary. The group, chaired by Mr Justice Baker, will be looking at the detailed substance, form and timing of any change over the coming months.

The survey asked whether there should be a requirement for parties to introduce a pre-trial statement of facts, in addition to witness statements which would be confined to evidence which could properly be given at trial. Responses ranged from 'this sounds like a must' to fears that it will only increase costs and cause delay.

Bushell is part of the working group. He says: 'Prior to skeleton arguments, which are only served shortly before trial and ought to be in summary form, there isn't really an opportunity for the parties to set out their factual case in detail, drawing together documentary and witness evidence. So parties often try to capture their full factual case through witness statements.

'I don't think that a pre-trial statement of facts should be mandatory, but for certain cases such a document should be considered at the CMC stage and may allow the parties to advance their case on the facts—which may be helpful for settlement and better case management—while encouraging witness statements to be confined to their appropriate content. There are, however, a number of countervailing arguments, including introducing another layer of process and potential issues around the scope of cross-examination at trial.'

Alongside so many external challenges are pressures for law firms to ensure their teams are both diverse and inclusive.

The majority of survey respondents

2019: a record year for international litigation

Despite all the political uncertainties, the London courts have had a record year and are still attracting international litigants.

The Portland 2019 report on the commercial courts found that:

- from March 2018 to March 2019, the courts heard 258 cases, a 63% increase from 2017–18.
- Seventy-eight countries were represented, up from 69 previously, with non-UK litigants accounting for 60% of users.

The report concluded: 'It will be important to follow the development and growth of these international courts in comparison to foreign litigant use of the London courts over time. However, it seems likely that, while more countries try to take a slice of the pie, the pie will continue to grow.'

Ed Crosse, immediate past President of the LSLA, says a large proportion of cases involve parties from the Ukraine, Russia and Kazakhstan. 'Three things might drive that, none of them affected by Brexit,' he says. 'From an enforcement perspective, parties will have contractually agreed to this jurisdiction; they will have substantial assets in this jurisdiction; while the expansive powers of the courts here to grant interim relief, in particular by worldwide freezing orders, have real teeth.'

In relation to EU parties, the future enforcement of judgments continues to be a problem. 'But I think it is a problem that applies as much for parties from the EU 27 member states seeking to enforce judgments here as it is the other way,' Crosse says.

embraced the need for more to be done. One pointed out that lawyers from black and other ethnic minority backgrounds are severely under-represented at all the top levels of the legal profession, despite an 'abundance of talent at lower and middle levels'.

'Apart from being quite clearly the right thing to do, diversity and inclusion is very firmly a business issue,' says Acrapotulo. 'Clients are demanding that the legal community partners with them in promoting greater diversity and inclusion in the workplace. Anecdotally, clients are unwilling to work with a legal team that is not sufficiently diverse.'

Social mobility

One of the real challenges the profession needs to focus on further is social mobility, he says. 'The pool of talent entering the profession needs to be more diverse and that is a broader issue for society to grapple with as a whole.'

Ensuring a diverse and inclusive workplace is a key priority, agrees Bushell.

His firm set targets in 2014 to increase the proportion and number of women. Five years on, the number of women in the firm has increased by more than 50%. The current target is to ensure women make up 35% of partners and partner leadership roles by May 2023.

'We now make use of contextual data at the recruitment stage,' he says, 'which flag up socially mobile candidates, and work with organisations such as Rare, Prime and Aspiring Solicitors to ensure that students from all socio-economic backgrounds are aware of opportunities in law and supported in applying for them.'

Yet there is always more that can be done, he acknowledges. In 2018 HSF launched its global commitment to health and wellbeing to reinforce a 'supportive, respectful and inclusive culture'.

The legal community has vastly improved in providing support and promoting diversity and inclusion, says Mason.

Her firm, for instance, has modified the interview process from competence to strength-based questions and actively recruits from non-Russell group universities. It is also working with more schools in disadvantaged areas of Greater London to improve access to the profession. It has also introduced shared parental leave and an agile working policy to enable more flexible working

Diversity is discussed and demanded in the legal sector more than in previous years, says Osafo. Clients are now asking about the diversity of legal teams in their law firm tender processes.

'Diversity matters because London needs a legal community which reflects and understands the dynamic international market that it serves,' she says, pointing to the increasingly global profile of litigation.

Progress has been made, she says. 'Diversity has, to some degree, got its foot in the door, but it is stuck in the middle of the legal profession. Solicitors Regulation Authority statistics show that only 24% of partners working in the litigation/ADR sector are from non-white backgrounds versus 76% white partners and 31% were female versus 69% of male partners.

'The critical questions for the legal sector are: how do we retain diverse talent? And how do we elevate it to where it will have the greatest impact and add value?'

Significant steps are being taken, she says, including removing structural barriers and biases by introducing working from home and other agile working policies, enhanced paternity rights and shared parental leave.

Reducing the scope for biases in key decision-making processes such as recruitment, work-allocation and partnership promotions, is also critical, she adds. Some firms are allocating work to associates through 'blind allocation' based solely on an associate's capacity, or by engaging external experts/specialists in the process.

Crosse says the work that the recent initiative around 100 years of women in law has been 'fantastic and we are seeing a step change in how people think about diversity and inclusion without being prompted'.

However, he says there is still a perception within arbitration that, at the tribunal level, it is a 'very male dominated club' and it would be good to see a lot more women arbitrators.

He is also driving plans for a conference later in the year involving judges, in-house counsel, barristers and solicitors to discuss the whole process of litigation from cradle to grave to find ways to make it 'more savvy and sensitive'.

'This could include the judge not insisting on written submissions by the following morning or the law firm not giving its counsel team an unreasonable demand just because they always deliver,' explains Crosse. 'Similarly, in engagement between in house counsel and the law firm, why say "can I have it by close of business on Monday?", if that means the entire team has to work over the weekend?'

There is a growing momentum around this issue, he says, because litigation, by its very nature, is adversarial and hard-nosed which puts massive stress on all sides.

'It used to be badge of honour to send a stinker of a letter on Friday evening,' he says. 'But do you really need to do that when you know the impact it will have on the way the other side finishes their week with some of the more junior associates having to work over weekend. Is that really serving both parties' interests? This isnt about being soft but about being savvy and recognising the pressures that apply within the profession.'

The next generation

And what about the next generation of litigators? Mason says the recruitment market is very active and training contracts remain competitive. Salaries for NQs have continued to increase at magic circle and large international firms. But there are concerns around promotion opportunities, with a lengthier timeline for progression to partnership, she says.

'This has led to a shift in people's mind-sets whether partnership is the right path for them or whether in-house is a better opportunity. For some, in-house roles with a regulator or a client are seen as an interim step to partnership while others see it as an alternative career path altogether.'

Other concerns for the Junior LSLA include working conditions, increasing billable hours targets and the wellbeing of junior lawyers.

The latter is a systemic issue for the profession, she says, adding that: 'If law firms are to engage with the concern for wellbeing, they also need buy-in from their clients and their clients' in-house teams. I know of one team that is trying to change the culture in law firms by providing modified deadlines for tasks that recognise and accommodate their legal advisors' outside commitments.'

It is clear, she stresses, that change is occurring in response to the concern for wellbeing. 'But there is more that must still be done, and the profession needs to continue the conversation on this topic from the top down to make this a priority.' **NLJ**

Grania Langdon-Down is a freelance legal journalist.

The London Solicitors Litigation Association (LSLA) represents the interests of a wide range of civil litigators in London. Its members represent the major litigation practices, ranging from the sole practitioner to large international firms. It provides a strong and effective voice for litigators in law-defining consultations and debate. LSLA also runs a popular high-profile series of Spring and Autumn lectures featuring leading figures. Website: *www.lsla.co.uk*.

Survey details: 126 lawyers completed the LSLA/*NLJ* survey, which was distributed to LSLA & Junior LSLA members in Autumn 2019. Many thanks to all who took the time to take part and to Grania for researching and writing it up.