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Terms of reference

I, David Bradbury, Assistant Treasurer, pursuant to Parts 2 and 3 of the Productivity Commission Act 1998, hereby request that the Productivity Commission undertake an inquiry into Australia's system of civil dispute resolution, with a focus on constraining costs and promoting access to justice and equality before the law.

### Background

The cost of accessing justice services and securing legal representation can prevent many Australians from gaining effective access to the justice system. For a well-functioning justice system, access to the system should not be dependent on capacity to pay and vulnerable litigants should not be disadvantaged.

A well-functioning justice system should provide timely and affordable justice. This means delivering fair and equitable outcomes as efficiently as possible and resolving disputes early, expeditiously and at the most appropriate level. A justice system which effectively excludes a sizable portion of society from adequate redress risks considerable economic and social costs.

### Scope of the Inquiry

The Commission is requested to examine the current costs of accessing justice services and securing legal representation, and the impact of these costs on access to, and quality of justice. It will make recommendations on the best way to improve access to the justice system and equity of representation including, but not limited to, the funding of legal assistance services.

In particular, the Commission should have regard to:

1. an assessment of the real costs of legal representation and trends over time
2. an assessment of the level of demand for legal services, including analysis of:
   1. the number of persons who cannot afford to secure legal services but who do not qualify for legal assistance services, and
   2. the number of pro bono hours provided by legal professionals
3. the factors that contribute to the cost of legal representation in Australia, including analysis of:
   1. the supply of law graduates and barriers to entering the legal services market
   2. information asymmetry
   3. other issues of market failure
   4. the structure of the legal profession in State and Territory jurisdictions
   5. legal professional rules and practices
   6. court practices and procedures
   7. models of billing practices
   8. the application of taxation laws to legal services expenditure, and
   9. other features of the legal services market which drive costs
4. whether the costs charged for accessing justice services and for legal representation are generally proportionate to the issues in dispute
5. the impact of the costs of accessing justice services, and securing legal representation, on the effectiveness of these services, including analysis of:
   1. the ability of disadvantaged parties, including persons for whom English is a second language, to effectively self-represent, and
   2. the extent to which considerable resource disparity impacts on the effectiveness of the adversarial system and court processes
6. the economic and social impact of the costs of accessing justice services, and securing legal representation
7. the impact of the structures and processes of legal institutions on the costs of accessing and utilising these institutions, including analysis of discovery and case management processes
8. alternative mechanisms to improve equity and access to justice and achieve lower cost civil dispute resolution, in both metropolitan areas and regional and remote communities, and the costs and benefits of these, including analysis of the extent to which the following could contribute to addressing cost pressures:
   1. early intervention measures
   2. models of alternative dispute resolution
   3. litigation funding
   4. different models of legal aid assistance
   5. specialist courts or alternative processes, such as community conferencing
   6. use of technology, and
   7. expedited procedures
9. reforms in Australian jurisdictions and overseas which have been effective at lowering the costs of accessing justice services, securing legal representation and promoting equality in the justice system, and
10. data collection across the justice system that would enable better measurement and evaluation of cost drivers and the effectiveness of measures to contain these.

The Commission will report within fifteen months of receipt of this reference and will consult publicly for the purpose of this inquiry. The Commission is to provide both a draft and final report, and the reports will be published.

David Bradbury  
Assistant Treasurer

[Received 21 June 2013]
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AAT Administrative Appeals Tribunal
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ACCC Australian Competition and Consumer Commission

ACG Allen Consulting Group
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ACT Australian Capital Territory
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CFDR coordinated family dispute resolution
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COAG Council of Australian Governments
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DHS Department of Human Services
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FCLC Federation of Community Legal Centres (Victoria)

FCWA Family Court of Western Australia
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FMC Federal Magistrates Court of Australia
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FTE full time equivalent

FVPLS family violence prevention legal services
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HRSCATSIA House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs

ILNP Indigenous Legal Needs Project

IT information technology

LACs legal aid commissions
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LANSW Legal Aid New South Wales

LAQ Legal Aid Queensland

LAW Survey Legal Australia-Wide Survey

LCA Law Council of Australia

LECS legal expenses contribution scheme

LEI legal expenses insurance

LIV Law Institute of Victoria

LSC Legal Services Commission

MRT Migration Review Tribunal

MYEFO Mid Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook

NAAFVLS North Australian Aboriginal Family Violence Legal Service

NAAJA North Australian Aboriginal Justice Agency

NAATI National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters

NACLC National Association of Community Legal Centres

NADRAC National Alternative Dispute Resolution Advisory Council

NATSILS National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services

NCAT New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal

NCYLC National Children’s and Youth and Law Centre

NDIS National Disability Insurance Scheme

NFP not for profit organisation

NLA National Legal Aid

NPA National Partnership Agreement

NPBRC National Pro Bono Resource Centre

NSW New South Wales

NSWADT New South Wales Administrative Decisions Tribunal

NSWLRC New South Wales Law Reform Commission

NT Northern Territory

NTLAC Northern Territory Legal Aid Commission

NZ New Zealand

OECD Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

OLSC Office of Legal Services Coordination

OPC Office of Parliamentary Counsel

ORIC Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations

PBS Portfolio Budget Statements

PC Productivity Commission

PCLC Peninsula Community Legal Centre

PCO protective costs order

PIAC Public Interest Advocacy Centre

PILCH Public Interest Law Clearing House

PLEAS Public Legal Education and Support

PM&C (Department of) Prime Minister and Cabinet

PPF Public Purpose Fund

PTO Public Transport Ombudsman

PwC Pricewaterhouse Coopers

QAILS Queensland Association of Independent Legal Services

QC Queen’s Council

QCAT Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal

Qld Queensland

QPILCH Queensland Public Interest Law Clearing House

RLC Redfern Legal Centre

RMIT Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology

RRT Refugee Review Tribunal

SA South Australia

SACAT South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

SAT State Administrative Tribunal

SBDC Small Business Development Corporation

SEIFA Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas

SRL self-represented litigant

SRS Self Representation Service

SSAT Social Security Appeals Tribunal

Tas Tasmania

TIO Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman

UK United Kingdom

UNSW University of New South Wales

UQ University of Queensland

US United States

VALS Victorian Aboriginal Legal Service

VCAT Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

VCOSS Victorian Council of Social Services

Vic Victoria

VLA Victoria Legal Aid

VLRC Victorian Law Reform Commission
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**Explanations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Billion | The convention used for a billion is a thousand million (109). |
| Meaning of ‘civil law’ | In this report, the term ‘civil law’ is used broadly and includes family law matters. It excludes criminal law matters. |