		Barristers Legal Execut				<u>Licensed</u> <u>Conveyancers</u>		<u>NA</u>		Patent Attorneys		Solicitors		Unregulated Entity		<u>Unregulated</u> <u>Individual</u>			
Complaint Type	Method of funding	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%	Num	%
Lack of price transparency	Contingency / conditional fee agreement (no win no fee) via claims management company		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	4	0.09%		0.00%		0.00%	4	0.09%
	Contingency/ conditional fee agreement (no win no fee)	2	0.05%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	50	1.16%		0.00%		0.00%	52	1.21%
	Damage Based Agreements (DBA)		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.02%		0.00%		0.00%	1	0.02%
	Insurance		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	13	0.30%		0.00%		0.00%	13	0.30%
	Part publicly funded		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	13	0.30%		0.00%		0.00%	13	0.30%
	Private payment	32	0.74%		0.00%	20	0.46%		0.00%		0.00%	665	15.44%	6	0.14%		0.00%	723	16.79%
	Publicly funded	2	0.05%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	32	0.74%		0.00%		0.00%	34	0.79%
	Blank	16	0.37%		0.00%	3	0.07%		0.00%	1	0.02%	237	5.50%		0.00%		0.00%	257	5.97%
Lack of price transparency Total		52	1.21%		0.00%	23	0.53%		0.00%	1	0.02%	1015	23.57%	6	0.14%		0.00%	1097	25.47%
Non – transparency related	Contingency/ conditional fee agreement (no win no fee) via claims management company	1	0.02%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	24	0.56%		0.00%		0.00%	25	0.58%
	Contingency/ conditional fee agreement (no win no fee)	3	0.07%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	207	4.81%	1	0.02%		0.00%	211	4.90%
	Damage Based Agreements (DBA)		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	5	0.12%		0.00%		0.00%	5	0.12%
	Insurance	5	0.12%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	145	3.37%	1	0.02%		0.00%	151	3.51%
	Part Publicly funded		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	15	0.35%	1	0.02%		0.00%	16	0.37%
	Private payment	59	1.37%	1	0.02%	78	1.81%		0.00%	1	0.02%	1435	33.32%	8	0.19%	4	0.09%	1586	36.82%
	Pro-bono	2	0.05%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	5	0.12%		0.00%		0.00%	7	0.16%
	Publicly funded	26	0.60%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	189	4.39%		0.00%		0.00%	215	4.99%
	(blank)	64	1.49%		0.00%	25	0.58%	2	0.05%		0.00%	896	20.80%	7	0.16%		0.00%	994	23.08%

	Table 1: co	omplainants about a pe	erceived	l lack of	price t	ranspare	ency or	ganised k	y met	hod of f	unding	and reg	julator	types.							
	related total		160	3.71%	1	0.02%	103	2.39%	2	0.05%	1	0.02%	2921	67.82%	18	0.42%	4	0.09%	3210	74.53%	
Ī	Grand total		212	4.92%	1	0.02%	126	2.93%	2	0.05%	2	0.05%	3936	91.39%	24	0.56%	4	0.09%	4307	100.00%	

Table 2: Perceived lack of price transparency by method of funding

Method of Funding	<u>Total</u>
	4
Contingency / Conditional fee agreement (no win no fee) via claims management company	
Contingency / Conditional fee agreement (no win no fee)	52
Containguing / Containental locagiosment (no will no loc)	1
Damage Based Agreements (DBA)	•
	13
Insurance	
	13
Part publicly funded	
	723
Private payment	
	34
Publicly funded	0.5-7
//- la . \	257
(blank)	4007
Grand Total	1097
Granu Total	

Table 3: Perceived lack of price transparency by complainant type

Complainant Type	<u>Total</u>
Club or Association or Society	2
Club of Association of Society	23
Executor	23
	973
Member of Public	
	33
Micro Enterprise	
	6
Personal Representative of an Estate	
	1
Representative With Power of Attorney	
	55
Residuary Beneficiaries of an Estate	
	4
Trustee	
	1097
Grand Total	

Table 4: Perceived lack of price transparency by legal service provider

Legal Service Provider Type	<u>Total</u>
	52
Barristers	
	23
Licensed Conveyancers	
	1
Patent Attorneys	
	1015
Solicitors	
	6
Unregulated Entity	
	1097
Grand Total	

Table 5: Perceived lack of price transparency by area of law

<u>Area Of Law</u>	<u>Total</u>					
Family Law	257					
Wills and Probate	156					
Litigation	152					
Residential Conveyancing	141					
Personal Injury	64					
Immigration and Asylum	60					
Employment Law	56					
Crime	53					
Property	47					
Other	37					
Social Welfare	28					
Commercial Conveyancing	24					
Finances	11					
Commercial law	10					
Consumer Law	1					

Grand Total	1097