

## Report: Courts and Tribunals Observers' Network workshop

### Table of Contents

<b>Context</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>The structure of the 2025 workshop</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>A disparity between the public and the press</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Court listings</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Understanding proceedings</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Audibility</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Access to documents</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Contempt of court</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Applications to vary reporting restrictions</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Role of open justice champions</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Future role and development of the network</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Appendix A: Participants</b> .....	<b>13</b>

### Context

The Courts and Tribunals Observers' Network was established at a workshop in Oxford in 2023, as part of an initiative funded by the Sheila Kitzinger Programme.<sup>1</sup> Our aim was to share and learn from a range of court observers, especially those working for / with NGOs and academic institutions. A report published after the event sets out the focus of discussion: court lists, physical and remote access to hearings, the impact of technological changes, the practicalities of “doing” court observation, and systemic injustices such as racism.<sup>2</sup>

Since the Network first met, there have been a series of noteworthy developments relating to open justice. These developments include:

- In September 2023, various members of the Network made submissions to the Ministry of Justice's consultation on open justice, which have been compiled on the Network's website.<sup>3</sup> In January 2025, the Ministry of Justice reported a summary of consultation responses.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gtc.ox.ac.uk/academic/health-care/sheila-kitzinger-programme/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://courtoobservers.org/2023/08/25/report-courts-and-tribunals-access-and-observation-workshop/>

<sup>3</sup> <https://courtoobservers.org/submissions-to-moj-consultation-open-justice-the-way-forward/>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/open-justice-the-way-forward>

- In April 2024, the Lady Chief Justice established a Transparency and Open Justice Board,<sup>5</sup> which is chaired by Mr Justice Nicklin. Its purpose is to “lead and coordinate the promotion of transparency and open justice across the courts and tribunals of England & Wales”. Alongside the panel, a stakeholder committee has been established. The Board sought views on its proposed key objectives,<sup>6</sup> to which Network members responded.<sup>7</sup>
- In late 2024, the Parole Board Rules were amended so as to provide a clear framework for how members of the public ought to request to observe a hearing. This was supplemented in February 2025 by the publication of guidance for members of the public.<sup>8</sup>
- In January 2025, the Family Court’s Reporting Pilot became a permanent change.<sup>9</sup> This is intended to make it easier for legal bloggers and journalists to report from the family courts.

Additionally, independent courts observation projects have continued to grow.

- The **Transparency Project** has continued to report on hearings in the family courts, including publishing and updating transparency related guidance for judges and lawyers.<sup>10</sup>
- In 2024, the **Open Justice Court of Protection Project** began to run webinars<sup>11</sup> on the topic of how to observe remote hearings in the Court of Protection. They also established an observers’ WhatsApp group.
- The **Transform Justice** charity launched **CourtWatch London**: a mass observation of magistrates’ courts.<sup>12</sup> They have published reports that detail the experience of observers, as well as a guide for anybody who wants to start their own courtwatching project.<sup>13</sup>
- Four academics have published an open access book - *Inside asylum appeals: Access, Participation and Procedure in Europe*- based on their experience of observing Asylum Appeals in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and the United Kingdom.<sup>14</sup>
- Finally, in May 2025 a new section was added to the Court and Tribunal Observers’ Network website.<sup>15</sup> This contains information on court observation

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.judiciary.uk/transparency-and-open-justice-board/>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Transparency-and-Open-Justice-Board-Key-Objectives-proposals-1.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> <https://courtoobservers.org/2025/03/04/responses-to-the-judiciarys-transparency-open-justice-board-proposed-objectives/>

<sup>8</sup> <https://courtoobservers.org/resources/parole-board/>

<sup>9</sup> <https://courtoobservers.org/2025/01/31/transparency-updates-from-the-family-court/>

<sup>10</sup> <https://transparencyproject.org.uk/updated-guidance-what-to-do-if-a-reporter-attends-or-wants-to-attend-your-hearing-pilot-and-non-pilot-court-versions/>

<sup>11</sup> <https://openjusticecourtprotection.org/forthcoming-events/>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.transformjustice.org.uk/focus-areas/courtwatch-london/>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.transformjustice.org.uk/publication/courtwatching-a-learning-guide/>

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/oa-mono/10.4324/9781003295365/inside-asylum-appeals-nick-gill-nicole-hoellerer-jessica-hambly-daniel-fisher>

<sup>15</sup> <https://courtoobservers.org/resources/>

across different court and tribunal types. It is intended to be helpful both for those who are new to court observation and those who have prior knowledge.

Despite these various developments, court observers continue to raise issues of concern. There is a disparity of access between the public and members of the press; listing information is not always accurate and up to date; the ability to follow proceedings is frustrated by issues with audibility and a lack of consistent access to documents; the comparative knowledge of judges affects applications in relation to open justice. Many of these issues are not new. One attendee at the workshop commented that court observers are having the same arguments again and again. Another commented that a lack of action in relation to making hearings accessible meant that they are “losing patience with the judiciary”.

## The structure of the 2025 workshop

The most recent workshop took place at Green Templeton College, University of Oxford, on Wednesday 4 June 2025. The day was split into three parts. In the morning session, court observers (members of the public, NGOs, academics, and journalists) shared their experiences, views, and needs. The type of questions being considered were:

- What successes have you experienced?
- What challenges have you experienced?
- What can be done to draw attention to the experiences of marginalised individuals and groups within the court system?
- What is needed to improve the realisation of open justice within the contexts you are working/observing?
- What support can the Courts and Tribunals Observers' Network offer and how should we develop it?

In the afternoon session, court observers came together with policy and law makers to consider possible responses. The types of questions being considered were:

- What (if any) practical changes are needed?
- What (if any) policy changes are needed?
- What (if any) legislative changes are needed?
- How can the reporting of cases involving marginalised individuals and groups be improved?
- What role can the Courts and Tribunals Observers' Network play?

Finally, Mr Justice Nicklin, the Chair of the Transparency and Open Justice Board, delivered a public lecture<sup>16</sup> followed by a Q&A.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> <https://courtoobservers.org/2025/06/05/speech-by-mr-justice-nicklin-open-justice-fit-for-purpose/>

<sup>17</sup> See accompanying transcript published at: <https://courtoobservers.org/>

The workshop was not recorded but all participants gave consent for their contributions to be summarised in this report. For a full list of participants, see Appendix A.

## A disparity between the public and the press

Throughout the day, concerns were raised about the disparity between the treatment of the public and press. In some jurisdictions, such as the Family Court, an individual needs a particular type of accreditation to observe proceedings. Practice Direction 12R<sup>18</sup> defines reporter, for the purposes of observing Family Court hearings, as such:

### 2.1

“Reporter” means-

- (a) a duly accredited representative of news gathering and reporting organisations, within the meaning in rule 27.11 FPR and Practice Direction 27B;
- (b) a duly authorised lawyer attending for journalistic, research or public legal education purposes, within the meaning in rule 27.11 FPR and Practice Direction 27B; or
- (c) a media representative who is unable to demonstrate accreditation so as to be able to attend a hearing by virtue of rule 27.11(2)(f) but who the court has permitted to attend a hearing under rule 27.11(2)(g) (paragraph 4.3 of Practice Direction 27B refers);

Here, “reporter” refers to a media representative and legal bloggers (a duly accredited lawyer). In the afternoon session, it was remarked that this was a trade-off in order to allow greater transparency in family courts.

This connected to wider concerns that a member of the public, including people from an NGO or academic background, often must explain themselves to the court. This includes justifying their right to be there, and sometimes being asked why they are there (a common theme across jurisdictions). This contrasts with the experience of journalists, who are usually not asked such questions.

A shared experience was that these questions often came from security and admin staff. The reason for this may be more complicated than it appears. While some attendees found this questioning to be perturbing, others felt that it “comes across from a place of being helpful or [of] general curiosity”. For others, these questions are asked because “there is a hierarchy of issues, and open justice is quite far down [...] it’s like they were trained in open justice principles twenty years ago and nobody has mentioned it since. The judiciary set the tone and the judiciary have been quite silent”.

This questioning may also be done to protect the integrity of the administration of justice, particularly in the Crown Court. As one attendee put it, “if the judge and court staff don’t

---

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.justice.gov.uk/practice-direction-12r-the-court-giving-permission-to-communicate-information-from-proceedings-to-which-part-12-fpr-applies>

know who you are, they can't make sure they're [notes] not being passed on" to other witnesses.

One observer commented that HMCTS had published guidelines for its staff on how to support media access: "there was little about how to support non-media access". This spoke to concerns that there is a privilege of access depending on one's background. As one public observer put it, there is an "inequality between journalists and accredited press, and everybody else". Another observer highlighted that there are two different types of court list: the "bare bones" lists are made publicly available, and the "fuller" court lists that are sent to accredited journalists.

This difference between the public and press is repeated in case law with the oft-repeated judicial comment that the media are "the eyes and ears" of the public.<sup>19</sup> However, an attendee in the afternoon session commented that these older authorities refer to the media "because they were the only game in town back then". Needless to say, things have changed. The law doesn't draw this distinction, and there is no special category of observer except in the Family Courts and the Youth Court. Beyond that, "it's very difficult to draw a principled line".

In the view of one observer, this distinction between the media and the public doesn't stand up to scrutiny under Freedom of Information regulations. If a disclosure had been made under the Freedom of Information Act, it is done on the basis that there will be onward disclosure. If the disclosure may cause real harm, it would not be disclosed to the journalist (because there is an expectation that the journalist will, or at least could, make it public).

Despite this, many attendees were frustrated that His Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service (HMCTS) has drawn a line with the creation of a new listing system – Court and Tribunal Hearings (CaTH).<sup>20</sup> While this is a publicly accessible website, it has a separate functionality whereby individuals can register for an account. Registered users will receive alerts when a new cause list is uploaded, as well as information that is not available on the public lists. However, only "professional users", meaning members of the press and legal professionals, are able to register.

---

<sup>19</sup> For an example, see §16 of *Khuja (formerly PNM) v Times Newspapers Limited* [2017] UKSC 49

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.court-tribunal-hearings.service.gov.uk>

## Court listings

The topic of listings was frequently returned to. While attendees agreed there had been some improvement in this area, there continue to be serious issues.

A cross-jurisdictional Practice Direction<sup>21</sup> states that committal applications (for those alleged to be in contempt of court) such be listed as such:

FOR HEARING IN OPEN COURT  
Application by *(full name of applicant)* for  
the Committal to prison of  
*(full name of the person alleged to be in contempt)*

One public observer commented that committal proceedings in the Court of Protection are not always listed in this way, and sometimes there is no way of knowing that a hearing concerns a committal application. This is a derogation from the principle of open justice and also has implications for the ECHR Article 6 rights<sup>22</sup> of the alleged contemnor. The problem is further exacerbated by the fact that committal judgments from the Court of Protection are not always published, even when the contemnor has been sent to prison. There was a feeling that this could be an issue across jurisdictions.

Another public observer commented that closed hearings (where a party and their legal representative are excluded, either with or without their knowledge) are also not being adequately listed in the Court of Protection. In contradiction to the guidance<sup>23</sup> issued by the then Vice-President of the Court of Protection, these hearings are not always being listed appropriately: they are either being listed for hearing in open court (when they are not) or, in the case of without notice applications, are not being publicly listed at all (the guidance states they should be listed without a case number).

There were also concerns raised about the fact that hearing times are changed but this is not reflected in the lists. One observer shared an experience of the first hearing of a case being listed for 11am when, in fact, it was heard at 2pm. The observer commented that the "only way to navigate this is as an insider". This again speaks to the discrepancy of access between journalists and members of the public.

Another observer commented that the listing information "isn't designed for members of the public". For example, they contain a lack of sufficient detail about what a case concerns. If a member of the public wanted to observe a case about a particular issue (for example, sexual offences) they would be unable to find this information from looking at the lists.

---

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/practice-direction-committals-for-contempt.pdf>

<sup>22</sup> <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/human-rights/human-rights-act/article-6-right-fair-trial>

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.judiciary.uk/guidance-and-resources/guidance-for-the-court-of-protection-closed-hearings-and-closed-material/>

Even when lists are accurate, their late publication poses some problems for both journalists and members of the public. More often than not, court lists will be published late the afternoon of the day before the hearing. This is a problem in the Family Court, where observers must submit their credentials to the court. Quite often, they will receive no response to this, and will have to arrive at court hoping somebody had seen these documents.

## Understanding proceedings

### *Audibility*

All observers raised concerns about the audibility of proceedings. One observer shared that, in France, asylum hearings are in public by default and the doors to tribunal hearing rooms are kept open in order to symbolise that the proceedings are open to the public. (Doors are only closed when a hearing is made formally 'huis clos', or behind closed doors which does occur sometimes.) However, for public hearings, the "degree of publicness was affected by noise", meaning that a lot of background noise in the corridors outside the courtroom affected what observers could actually observe.

A similar problem was experienced in magistrates' courts in England. While the doors are closed there, multiple members of the public have reported being unable to hear proceedings. This is not unique to members of the public – defendants have also struggled to hear proceedings. While this has been raised with senior members of the judiciary, one public observer had the impression that "it's not being taken seriously as an issue. I think the feeling is that there are more important things."

### *Access to documents*

Access to documents was another significant challenge. It was universally acknowledged that, at the very least, having access to skeleton arguments and position statements was fundamental for the realisation of open justice. There was a general consensus that there was a right to access these documents. In general barristers were reported as being open to disclosing their skeleton arguments. However, some public observers are being told to make formal applications for access to these documents, which costs £313.<sup>24</sup>

In the afternoon session, it was discussed whether greater proactivity in the automatic disclosure of skeleton arguments may ease up pressures on the system and also help to achieve open justice. An attendee commented that "it's for the court to take custody of the

---

<sup>24</sup> <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2008/1053/schedule/1>;  
<https://www.bevanbrittan.com/insights/articles/2025/court-of-protection-family-and-civil-proceedings-fee-changes/>

documents, not the individual parties". Whilst some clients may not want skeleton arguments being released, they should only be withheld if they contain genuinely confidential information that will not be discussed in open court.

It was also suggested that part of the problem is in the digitisation of the court system. With much of court business now online, issues that were traditionally aired in court are now inaccessible. This makes the public provision of documents all the more important.

Even when the public can access documents, it is not altogether clear what they can do with them. An observer drew attention to the fact that there is little case law on whether court documents (including the bundle and transcripts) can be published. One notable exception is *Serious Fraud Office, R (on the application of) v Jeffrey Cook & Anor*,<sup>25</sup> in which Mr Justice Picken granted Spotlight on Corruption's application to be able to publish trial transcripts and the jury bundle.

This does not, however, make it easy. Some attendees shared the difficulties in accessing transcripts, which can be costly, and access to which can be vetoed by a trial judge. There is some policy work in this area to try and embed a consistent approach.

### *Contempt of court*

In the Q&A following his lecture, Mr Justice Nicklin commented on the public's limited knowledge of contempt of court law, which is reflected in the MOJ's summary of consultation responses report in 2025.<sup>26</sup> This was also discussed in the afternoon session, where attendees commented that a consultation paper on contempt of court is due to be published later this year. In particular, there is work being done on the question of whether the strict liability rule<sup>27</sup> (where somebody can be guilty of contempt even if they do not intend to interfere with the administration of justice) should apply in cases of general public interest.

### **Applications to vary reporting restrictions**

Most of the observers present had the experience of applying to vary reporting restrictions. This is not an easy process, and an effective challenge requires some insider knowledge – something that seasoned observers and journalists will know about but not necessarily members of the public who are new to observing.

For example, one observer commented that, "you could ask for things informally but for that you need to be in the know. If you have to make a formal application, it costs money, it poses a formal barrier, and you enter onto a procedural treadmill".

---

<sup>25</sup> <https://caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ewcr/2024/8>

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/open-justice-the-way-forward>

<sup>27</sup> <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/49/crossheading/strict-liability>

However, even when in the know, it is not always the case that court observers will be notified of reporting restrictions. In July 2025, it was announced<sup>28</sup> that courts will be required to notify journalists when “discretionary reporting restrictions are being considered”. While clearly a positive step toward greater transparency, there is the risk that this will further embed the discrepancy of access between journalists and members of the public.

The attendees heard that sometimes a challenge to reporting restrictions is complicated by the fact that nobody can locate the actual order, usually because the point at which they are being challenged is many months down the line from them first being issued. A possible solution is a centralised repository where orders such as these can be found.

A similar problem is in applications for a private case to be heard in public, when the only apparent justification of a private hearing is because somebody convinced a magistrate to order it at some point early in the proceedings. One observer pointed out that this is common when there are “well-resourced defendants”. The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) often takes a neutral stance, leaving it up to members of the public and/or journalists to have the argument.

Some of the problems arise from a lack of judicial knowledge of media law. A couple of observers shared their experience of difficulties with magistrates who appeared to not know the law or applied it improperly. On the back of this, another observer commented that judges of the High Court and above are usually comfortable with challenges to reporting restrictions, but judges of a lower tier (such as District Judges and Circuit Judges) appear to be less confident in dealing with these applications.

## **Role of open justice champions**

In his public lecture, Mr Justice Nicklin shared the development of a new role within HMCTS: open justice champions. He said, “[t]hey will be regionally based, and it is intended that they will provide a single point of contact to assist in resolving open justice issues.”

This had also been discussed in the afternoon session, where it was explained that the precise role of the open justice champions is currently being considered. The aim is that they will understand more about open justice than the average person and will be a point of contact for journalists and members of the public who have concerns about open justice. The role will be undertaken by mid-level civil servants with strategic oversight.

How this will be useful for court observers was discussed during the workshop. One attendee shared their difficulty in obtaining a judgment from a court: nobody was at the court desk, and they were told to ring somebody. As emails often go unanswered for many days, it was suggested the open justice champion would be able to be contacted about the issue.

---

<sup>28</sup> <https://pressgazette.co.uk/news/courts-to-notify-journalists-of-reporting-restrictions-so-they-can-be-challenged/>

There was some scepticism of how efficient this role will be, and in particular there were concerns about what training – and delivered by whom – the open justice champions will receive.

Following the event, the legal commentator Joshua Rozenberg invited members of the network to offer their responses to the proposal, which he published in his Substack newsletter.<sup>29</sup> These included:

**Judith Townend**, reader in digital society and justice at the University of Sussex and chair of the [courts and tribunals observers' network](#):

Mr Justice Nicklin's engagement with the practical issues on the ground, as well as his recognition of a broader range of court observers than the traditional media, is to be welcomed. The creation of a stakeholder committee accompanying the transparency and open justice board was a good first step and these new roles within HM Courts and Tribunals Service could be useful in terms of removing obstacles that court observers regularly encounter. But those initiatives won't fix the problems — or resolve some of the current tensions — alone.

**Daniel Cloake**, who blogs as [Mouse in the Court](#):

Whilst the idea of open justice champions might sound good, the notion that they are needed at all signifies a cultural problem at HM Courts and Tribunals Service that should, in my opinion, be corrected first. Most open justice issues, especially ones which it's anticipated can be dealt with over the phone, should be solved by having an easy-to-read document clearly setting out the rights of the public that can be accessed by all. Having been told last week by the team leader at Clerkenwell and Shoreditch County Court the entirely false proposition that "As you are not a party to the claim. The court cannot provide documents or discuss any aspect of the claim in question" the suggestion that this isn't a problem with culture and training, but one which can only be fixed by having a helpline, is wrong.

**Penelope Gibbs**, director of [Transform Justice](#):

Without eyes on the court, miscarriages of justice happen more easily. Our CourtWatch project, which recruits volunteers to observe magistrates' court, has shown that people are keen to observe justice in action. But the courts are not always welcoming or accessible. Open justice champions could be the advocates that court watchers need.

**Helen Taylor**, deputy director of [Spotlight on Corruption](#):

Open justice champions could play a valuable role helping courts across the country embed transparency in their operations and resolve the daily challenges that thwart effective access for public observers. But this initiative will only deliver meaningful results if there are system-wide reforms that harness technology to ensure open

---

<sup>29</sup> <https://rozenberg.substack.com/p/open-justice-champions>

justice is a practical reality — including sufficiently detailed listing information, better access to remote and live-streamed hearings and a centralised database for free public access to core court documents.

**Celia Kitzinger**, co-director of the [Open Justice Court of Protection Project](#):

I worry that open justice champions will be placed in an impossible situation. I'm also concerned that they won't have any clear understanding of the barriers and obstructions impeding those of us who want to observe and report on the courts; nor, I fear, will they have the practical skills to fix them.

After observing more than 600 Court of Protection hearings myself, I am now spending a lot of time trouble-shooting for other members of the public who can't find a case in the (woefully inadequate) public lists; or aren't sent a link in time for a hearing (or the link doesn't work); or there's a "private" notice on the court door; or the reporting restrictions are incomprehensible and unjustifiably draconian; or the judge is unwelcoming. At the very least, the new open justice champions need proper support and training (as do all HM Courts and Tribunals Service staff, lawyers and the judiciary) covering the law and practice of transparency. Members of the courts and tribunals observers' network would be happy to offer this.

Charlie Moloney, a journalist, submitted a Freedom of Information request to the Ministry of Justice. He asked<sup>30</sup> the Ministry of Justice to "reveal how many [open justice] champions would be appointed, which HMCTS staff had been given the role, as well as any HMCTS documents about the appointment process". The Ministry of Justice responded that they do not hold this information "due to the ongoing development of the Open Justice Champions Scheme".

The Ministry of Justice was also asked about the funding for the open justice champions scheme. The response was that "[t]here is no new funding for these roles. The skill of understanding open justice and enacting open justice is already an expectation of employees in the MoJ."

## Future role and development of the network

After the workshop, we asked Network members to share any ideas they have for the future role, and development of, the Network. The suggestions included:

- Formalising the group to include a legal structure, with a leadership committee and sub-committees. The practicalities of this will need to be discussed at a later meeting.
- Expanding the group membership further. A possible route for this is beginning to establish the Network's presence on social media.

---

<sup>30</sup> <https://www.lawgazette.co.uk/news/no-new-money-for-open-justice-champions/5123887.article>

- Expanding the blog coverage, for example by reposting publications from elsewhere, doing roundups of relevant commentary from elsewhere, and producing some original commentary. Some of this is now in the works.
- Exploring funding opportunities, with a view to acquiring more research support.

Readers of this report can share further ideas for improving the public's ability to observe the courts via this link: <https://courtoobservers.org/contact>.

More generally, Mr Justice Nicklin will continue to hold his stakeholder sessions that accompany the work of the Transparency and Open Justice Board. The committee can be contacted via: [pmo@judiciary.uk](mailto:pmo@judiciary.uk).

*Suggested citation:* Clark, Daniel T. and Townend, Judith (2025) Report: Courts and Tribunals Observers' Network workshop Oxford: Sheila Kitzinger Programme, Green Templeton College, University of Oxford, pp1-13

## Appendix A: Participants

### Morning workshop (in alphabetical order)

- David Banisar, Senior Visiting Fellow, London School of Economics
- Daniel Clark, PhD student, University of Sheffield (Workshop research assistant)
- Paul Foster, Senior Lecturer in Journalism, University of Portsmouth
- Lauren Fox, DPhil candidate in Criminology, University of Oxford
- Maurice Frankel, Director, Campaign for Freedom of Information
- Jess Hambly, Senior Lecturer in Law, Australian National University & ASYFAIR Project
- Paul Magrath, Head of Product Development and Online Content, ICLR / Trustee, The Transparency Project
- Celia Kitzinger, Co-director and court observer, Open Justice Court of Protection Project
- Jenny Kitzinger, Professor Emerita, Cardiff University
- Charlie Moloney, Freelance court reporter
- Fionnuala Ratcliffe, Deputy director, Transform Justice
- Stephen Shute, Professor of Criminal Law and Criminal Justice, University of Sussex
- Helen Taylor, Senior Legal Researcher, Spotlight on Corruption
- Judith Townend, Reader in Digital Society and Justice, University of Sussex (Workshop lead & co-convenor Courts and Tribunals Observers' Network)

### Afternoon workshop (in alphabetical order)

All those attending morning session, plus:

- Enehuwa Adagu, Policy Analyst, Bar Council of England and Wales
- Phoebe Clapham, Head of Domestic Abuse and Family Courts Policy, Ministry of Justice
- Rhiannon Du Cann, Senior Communications Officer, Bar Council of England and Wales
- Yasmin Ilhan, Legal Assistant, Law Commission of England and Wales
- Robert Kaye, Lawyer, Law Commission of England and Wales
- Natalie Kyneswood, Wellcome Trust Early-Career Fellow, Centre for Socio-Legal Studies, University of Oxford
- Ruth Lamont, Parliamentary Thematic Research Lead for Crime and Justice, House of Commons / University of Manchester
- Gemma McNeil-Walsh, Barrister, 5RB
- Matthew Nicklin, Justice of the High Court and Chair of the Transparency and Open Justice Board, Royal Courts of Justice
- Nicola Reynolds, Deputy Director and Service Owner for Future Hearings, HMCTS
- Jacob Rowbottom, Professor of Law, University of Oxford
- Henry Screatton, Legal Assistant, Law Commission of England and Wales