

Horizon Compensation Programme Board Note

Chair: Carl Creswell (CC) **Date:** 21/08/2024

Attendees (DBT)

Rob Brightwell (RB), Helen Thomas (HT), Joel Miah (JM), Eleri Wones (EW1), Ellen Wasden (EW2), Shay Abedin (SA), Fidelma Griffin (FG), Elena Michael (EM), Beth White (BW), Ross Fielding (RF), Grace Cockerill (GC), Ethan Corkhill (EC), Helena Raraty (HR)

External Attendees

Simon Recaldin (SR) [POL], Milo Kershaw (MK) [HMT], Bruno Williams (BW) [UKGI]

Comparison of Legal representation, Decision-Making Process and Appeals Mechanisms Across Schemes

- EM introduced the paper, sharing that this paper was for information and no decisions would be required at the meeting.
- On legal representation, the position of OC, GLO and HCRS was known, that reasonable costs were paid, GLO and HCRS had legal tariffs, OC was done on a case by case basis, and the HSS was determined at the offer stage.
- On decision making, the GLO and HCRS were set up so that DBT reviews first offers, in contract with OC where POL reviewed first offers. EM noted that principles had been aligned across schemes, namely on CAGs and principles.
- On appeals. All schemes had an independent panel in place, OC, GLO and HCRS utilise an independent reviewer.
- CC thanked EM for providing an overview of differences and commonalities between the schemes.
- CC commented on the legal side, acknowledging that HSS was quite different and that some sort of explanation may need to be provided to the inquiry on this matter.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- RF introduced the item alongside a slide deck
- RF provided an outline of the update on this area. The team was feeling an increased pressure from the internal DBT evaluation team to produce evaluation data on the redress schemes.
- RF highlighted that there were no immediate evaluation plans for non-horizon related schemes due to limited resource and order of priority.
- RB asked if there was a requirement to evaluate schemes run by POL. RF responded (from his perspective) that it does lay with DBT, as funding for POL was provided by DBT. CC acknowledged this, reflecting that this would require closely working with POL.
- Capture was flagged, uncertain as of the date of the board if there would be a scheme for this, though in the event a scheme was stood up then evaluation would also be needed for this area.
- RF spoke through the slide deck and the various evaluation plans for the schemes, outlining that GLO had its evaluators appointed.
- On HCRS, lessons learned from previous criticism on speed of standing up M&E activity has led them to ensure that a plan was in place from the stand up of the scheme.
- On HSS, added complexity that it could become a multi delivery approach, POL led HSS and DBT led HSS appeals.

- With OC, the plan for this was simpler and smaller in comparison to the other schemes given its smaller claimant pool, and that a lighter approach could be taken for this scheme.
- RB asked about a programme level M&E exercise and if there was a plan in place for this, proposing if a unified singular approach would be simpler than carrying out multiple M&E exercises.
- RF responded that the scheme by scheme approach provided a more comprehensive and nuanced M&E exercise. That a programme level review would limit the number of suppliers that could perform such a large single evaluation exercise, risking a loss of detail and depth in the data that could be attained.
- RF also shared that an "FYI" sub would be shared with the minister. Additionally, he asked if there was an post office colleague that he could collaborate with on schemes led by them
- In relation to a question by the board on if evaluation exercises would strain vulnerable claimants, the response was that the companies being used to engage in evaluation specialise with dealing with vulnerable individuals, confident in suppliers capability in approaching claimants.
- CC recommended to the analyst team to consider the governance behind carrying out the M&E work.
- SR offered himself as the POL contact and was forthcoming in his offer to collaborate on the M&E exercise. He also offered select areas of POL's resources that could be used to aid in the data collation process.

Finance

- HR mentioned on the GLO, it had reprofiled into next FY based on current run rate, OC costs had been reduced due to passing of HCRS bill. Those were the main points flagged for notice to the board.
- BW added spending review return was to be done in coming days. Questioned whether similar numbers would be needed for SRR or PPR, Helena responded that those numbers should indeed be looked at.

Comms

- EM highlighted that the main thing to mention is that first round of case manager reports had been published.
- SR also noted for the board's information that there would be an interview with a capture victim, and that a capture angle should be added to the comms tracker

Programme Dashboard

- CC provided a high-level overview of the dashboard with the information as presented
- RB asked to consider the relative ratings of the projects in relation to one another, given that GLO was rated Amber, and the HCRS rating was amber/green. Though given the challenging and risky nature of the HCRS project could this rating be higher. CC recommended that this rating be reviewed at the respective project board.