

## **Horizon Compensation Programme Board Note**

**Chair:** Carl Creswell (CC) **Date:** 27/06/2024

### **Attendees (DBT)**

Chris Hurne (CH), Eleri Wones (EW1), Cara Jenkins (CJ), Ellen Wasden (EW2), Rob Emmett (RE), Helen Thomas (HT), Joel Miah (JM), Michael Carling (MC), Helena Raraty (HR), Rob Brightwell (RB), Charlotte Heyes (CH), Samantha Parker (SP), Shay Abedin (SA), Sereine Bara (SB)

### **External Attendees**

Simon Recaldin (SR) [POL], Milo Kershaw (MK) [HMT], Caroline Lawless (CL2) [HO]

### **Previous Actions**

- JM spoke to the actions, covering that one of the key actions on finance would be covered at this board.

### **Finance Update Across Schemes**

- CC asked HR to speak on the slide. HR covered that this slide essentially present the period 2 figures that have been attained from the Post Office for schemes on which they are leading, additionally inclusive of the HCRS and GLO teams.
- HR added that this was a first go at presenting this data, and there were some gaps in the data, such as the lifetime operational costs of the schemes.
- HR finished, by mentioning that given this was the inaugural finance slide presented at the programme board, that feedback was welcomed by the board. HR also expressed that working with the analytical team would boost the value of such slides, and enhance the value of the data presented.
- CC invited the board to provide feedback on the slides.
- RB spoke to this and said that he would provide commentary to HR offline, reflecting that the GLO numbers were higher than expected.
- MK added that it would be helpful for the purpose of presenting the data from low, central and high points, noting that it would enhance the readability of the data and what can be expected in each scenario.
- MK additionally mentioned that it would be beneficial to also be able to have an idea of the forecast.

### **HCRS Update**

- CH was introduced to the Board by CC.
- CH spoke to the current (as of 27/06/24) progress of the HCRS (Horizon Convictions Redress Scheme) scheme and the timeline that would be followed in the run up to scheme launch, with the addition of a plan on a page document being presented to the group to supplement the verbal update.
- CH covered that the project's delivery confidence had improved across several of the project's workstreams.
- CH pointed out there had been some issues with legal resource, but that the team was liaising with legal colleagues to secure more resource at pace.
- The other legal issue, around the development of the legal power of the scheme, the costs were being drafted, and once received claimants reps would be consulted.
- CH added that the scheme was still working toward the projected July Launch.

- Internal DBT case assessment team had been successfully recruited, and that training materials for the case workers was being prepped.
- CH overall capped off the update that there were a number of wins and positive progress on delivering to the timeframes that the team had set out to deliver the scheme by.
- The grants directorate is also working with the HCRS project, with that element of the project also progressing well.
- CC opened the board to express any concerns or risks regarding HCRS.
- RB recommended on the scheme principles, the more the team is able to get exposure to the claimants lawyers, this will be highly beneficial as the feedback could be built in early on.
- RB also reflected on the appointment of AG (Addleshaw Goddard) and their bandwidth will need to be tested, given this supplier is working on the GLO.
- HCRS have also got another appointed firm, and CH reflected on AG's errors on the GLO, that a contingency is necessary if AG's performance as a supplier is inadequate.
- RB also shared lessons from the GLO regarding GDPR clearances among other.
- MC also shared that IRAP had been invited to HCRS meetings. And that other parts of assurance and regulatory checks are being done for the project. With RB responding that much of the work that is being done for the HCRS had already been done for the GLO, so that work could be used as a template for the ease of HCRS.
- EW2 commented on the planner document that CH presented, noting the absence of analytical milestones. EW2 went on to discuss and update the board on the work the analytical team had done in collaboration with the HCRS team, with updates on the financial model, planning work on evaluation.
- CH responded to EW2's commentary, reflecting on the milestones and that they would be a helpful addition to the HCRS planning document.
- **ACTION:** EW2 to provide MC with analytical milestones for HCRS POAP.
- EW1 shared her feedback regarding the HCRS Plan, reflection on the "MoJ Letters sent" Line, reflecting that its not part of the departments deliverables. But that it was a milestone that likely wouldn't meet the July Deadline, that not all letters would go out by that timeframe. EW1 expanded on this point, asking CH if the team would do anything to address the interface between DBT and MoJ.
- CH responded regarding the letters, that the team was expectant of the limitation that all claimants may not receive a letter by the required deadline, and that not all claimants had been identified, with the expectation that there would be some claimants who are self-identified. CH touched on the that a discussion would take place at a ministerial level, and an approach would be agreed on how best to distribute these letters.

#### Approach To Interim Payments Across the Schemes

- SB spoke to the paper, reflecting that it covered the different categories of interim payments across the three schemes.
- That the paper compares the initial payment, fixed sum offers and interim payments on receipt of a full claim across the different schemes.
- SB also highlighted that the paper justifies the differences between the schemes and how it handles these payments.
- SB set out the that the outcomes to be achieved from this item, was alignment between schemes on interim payments on receipt of a challenge/first offer. E.g. was the 100% on HSS incentivising potential claimants to delay a claim?

- SB added that another area of alignment to be sought out from the board was on hardship payments, reflecting that this was the area that used the majority of time regarding interim payments.
- SB covered that the paper recommended alignment specifically on hardship payments as each scheme, as of the board, took individual approaches to the positions on these payments.
- CC thanked SB for the overview, going on to reflect that he had met with James Hartley from Freeths, discussing interim payments including and beyond just hardship payments. CC reflected that the conversation discussed the complexity of interim payments in hardship and non-hardship scenarios. But that overall, James had indicated it would be beneficial for those payments to continue, despite having an impact on the overall speed of redress delivery.
- CC asked SR for the POL perspective, highlighting the 100% point on HSS and its impact on delayed settlements. SR shared some lessons learned, that a clear decision was made on post-offer, that these monies were solely for the post-master. The otherside of this, that when claimants are legally represented, that there was evidence that when a 100% offer was made created a lack of jeopardy, and this was the cause of the delays.
- CC questioned whether, at that point in the HSS' Lifecycle, if a change of course was at all possible?
- SR reflected that with another 1800 claimants in the pipeline, that it would be ideal to reconsider the percentage of the offer, but that equally, it would be a delicate balance of ensuring consistency between how new claimants were treated relative to the past cohorts.

#### **Plan on a Page**

- JM reflected on changes to the POAP document, reflecting that a number of dates had moved to the right quite due to the general election, JM then invited the board for commentary on the plan.
- CC reflected on HSS payments, that in conversations it was understood that this milestone was continuing to slip to the right
- SR reflected that mini pilot would be done in July and that by the end of July, and that it would be fully executed by the end of July.
- MK recommended moving HMT Approvals milestone to the right for HSS Appeals. Rename the milestone to "DBT proposal to HMT on appeals process".

#### **Upcoming Comms**

- CC reflected on the date for publishing scheme stats and that it lined up with the week the general election, and if the publication of the data could be fast tracked before the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. Though it was also discussed that the appointment of an administration would likely have an impact on the date that the latest scheme stats were published.
- CC noted that for the rest of the tracker, that it accurately reflected the breadth of upcoming comms.
- SR commented that the HSS line on the March 2025 deadline was to be adjusted to "TBD" and that phase 7 of the inquiry should also be added to the comms tracker.

#### **Project Dashboards**

- CC covered this slide by exception, reflecting on the RAG ratings and if they needed to be re-evaluated.

- SR came in on HSS, that it was heading in a green RAG rating direction. Also commenting that the project was meeting its 40 day turnaround target. RB responded to this point, mentioning that the GLO project also shared the same target for processing claims and that this could be an opportunity for the teams to share lessons and learnings.
- SRR's plan was to be rebaselined, SR reflected that this would impact the workstreams RAG rating.

#### **Scheme Statistics**

- CC Reflected on the data, noting that due to the publication dates of the data, and the dates on which the programme board was in the calendars, that it was quite outdated.
- EW2 responded to this, mentioning that due to sensitivities of publishing real time data, that a more up to date cut of the data was not being presented at the programme board.
- But that a more up to date cut of the data could be produced specifically for the programme board, at the discretion of the board.
- EW2 also added that at the next board a visual of the data would be provided.

#### **Issues**

- JM walked the board through the standing issues, noting that the issue related to system capacity could be stood down in the coming months as the Post Office team stepped closer to being fully resourced in terms of admin and contract resource.
- JM also highlighted that the family members issue had been added to the list to be tracked via the programme board.

#### **Risks**

- JM highlighted the Phase 7 inquiry risk, though noted that as a risk it is scored low and there were a number of mitigations in place to ensure this risk was well managed.