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Nevertheless, judges today must consider procurement in light of the related public law regime, by building in a number of procedural requirements, in order to ensure that the public procurement regime is not undermined by an excessive number of claims.

Both the Lord Justice Board (LJ B) and the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) had recognized that there was no single best mechanism for addressing procurement judicial review claims and that instead the key issue was to develop a system in which claims were managed appropriately. The LJ B therefore introduced a series of policy changes in 2010 and 2012 that were designed to increase the promptness and fairness of challenge in public procurement judicial review. These included a number of procedural changes, such as: the introduction of a standard decision time limit of 28 days for claims; the provision of an early indication of whether a case was acceptable; and the requirement to provide a preliminary indication of the outcome of a case within 14 days.

The main aim of these changes was to improve the ability of the Administrative Court to manage the growing number of claims, and to make the proceedings more efficient and fair for all parties involved.

In addition to these procedural changes, the MoJ also introduced a number of changes to the rules governing the conduct of public procurement judicial review claims. These changes included: the introduction of a new rule applying to claims arising from contract awards; the introduction of a new rule applying to claims arising from contract modifications; and the introduction of a new rule applying to claims arising from contract terminations.

The MoJ also introduced a new rule applying to claims arising from contract awards, which requires claimants to provide early notice of their intention to bring a claim and to specify the grounds on which the challenge is based. This new rule is designed to improve the efficiency of the claims management process and to ensure that claims are brought promptly.

The MoJ also introduced a new rule applying to claims arising from contract modifications, which requires claimants to provide early notice of their intention to bring a claim and to specify the grounds on which the challenge is based. This new rule is designed to improve the efficiency of the claims management process and to ensure that claims are brought promptly.

The MoJ also introduced a new rule applying to claims arising from contract terminations, which requires claimants to provide early notice of their intention to bring a claim and to specify the grounds on which the challenge is based. This new rule is designed to improve the efficiency of the claims management process and to ensure that claims are brought promptly.

The MoJ also introduced a new rule applying to claims arising from contract awards, modifications, and terminations, which requires claimants to provide early notice of their intention to bring a claim and to specify the grounds on which the challenge is based. This new rule is designed to improve the efficiency of the claims management process and to ensure that claims are brought promptly.

The MoJ also introduced a new rule applying to claims arising from contract awards, modifications, and terminations, which requires claimants to provide early notice of their intention to bring a claim and to specify the grounds on which the challenge is based. This new rule is designed to improve the efficiency of the claims management process and to ensure that claims are brought promptly.

The MoJ also introduced a new rule applying to claims arising from contract awards, modifications, and terminations, which requires claimants to provide early notice of their intention to bring a claim and to specify the grounds on which the challenge is based. This new rule is designed to improve the efficiency of the claims management process and to ensure that claims are brought promptly.

The MoJ also introduced a new rule applying to claims arising from contract awards, modifications, and terminations, which requires claimants to provide early notice of their intention to bring a claim and to specify the grounds on which the challenge is based. This new rule is designed to improve the efficiency of the claims management process and to ensure that claims are brought promptly.

The MoJ also introduced a new rule applying to claims arising from contract awards, modifications, and terminations, which requires claimants to provide early notice of their intention to bring a claim and to specify the grounds on which the challenge is based. This new rule is designed to improve the efficiency of the claims management process and to ensure that claims are brought promptly.