



HM Treasury

# Treasury Minutes

**Government response to the Committee of Public Accounts on the Seventy-Eighth to the Eighty-First and the Eighty-Third to the Eighty-Fifth reports from Session 2017-19**



# Treasury Minutes

**Government response to the Committee of Public Accounts on the Seventy-Eighth to the Eighty-First and the Eighty-Third to the Eighty-Fifth reports from Session 2017-19**

Presented to Parliament  
by the Exchequer Secretary to the Treasury  
by Command of Her Majesty

May 2019

TREASURY MINUTES DATED 16 MAY 2019 TO THE COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS ON THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH TO THE EIGHTY-FIRST AND THE EIGHTY-THIRD TO THE EIGHTY- FIFTH REPORTS FROM SESSION 2017-19

© Crown copyright 2018

This publication is licenced under the term of the Open Government Licence v.3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](http://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third party copyright information, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at [www.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications)

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at: [public.enquiries@hmtreasury.gov.uk](mailto:public.enquiries@hmtreasury.gov.uk).

Print ISBN 978-1-5286-1291-3

ID CCS0519207474 05/19

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum.

Printed in the UK by the APS Group on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

## Government responses to the Committee of Public Accounts Session 2017-19

#	Report Title	Page
78	Improving Government planning and spending HM Treasury / Cabinet Office	1
79	Excess Votes – 2017-18 HM Treasury / UK Supreme Court	8
80	Capita's contract with the Ministry of Defence Ministry of Defence	10
81	Rail Management and timetabling Department for Transport	15
83	Clinical Commissioning Groups Department of Health and Social Care / NHS England	19
84	Bank of England's central services Bank of England	23
85	Auditing Local Government Department of Health and social care / Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government	24

# Seventy-Eighth Report of Session 2017-19

## Cabinet Office and HM Treasury

### Improving government planning and spending

#### Introduction from the Committee

Through spending reviews, HM Treasury (the Treasury) sets spending limits for departments over approximately three to five years, by reference to fiscal forecasts from the independent Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR). The last spending review, in 2015, allocated £4 trillion for total public spending for the five years to 2020–21 and the next review is due in 2019. The Treasury controls spending through its 20 spending teams, which make up around one fifth of the Treasury's total workforce. Departments, led by accounting officers, plan and deliver their objectives and are accountable for their delegated budgets. The Cabinet Office monitors the delivery of departments' objectives and government policy. It oversees departmental planning and since 2015 has required departments to prepare an annual internal business plan, known as a single departmental plan (SDP). SDPs set out how departments will carry out their objectives, deliver services and track performance. In 2016, the previous Committee recommended that the Treasury and Cabinet Office work together on an approach that would ensure value for money across government, in time for the next spending review.

Based on a report by the National Audit Office, the Committee took evidence, on 12 December 2018 from the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury. The Committee published its report on 8 February 2019. This is the Government response to the Committee's report.

#### Relevant Reports

- NAO report: [Improving government's planning and spending framework](#) – Session 2017-19 (HC 1679)
- PAC report: [Improving government planning and spending](#) – Session 2017-19 (HC 1596)

#### Government responses to the Committee

**1: PAC conclusion: *We are concerned that the Treasury and the Cabinet Office lack the skills and experience they need to challenge over-optimism and ensure departments make realistic plans.***

**1: PAC recommendation: *By June 2019, the Treasury and the Cabinet Office should write to us with its action plan to fill the gaps in skills, experience and behaviours needed across the Treasury, Cabinet Office, functions and departments. Specifically for Treasury spending teams, this action plan should identify strategies to:***

- ***Reduce staff turnover rates;***
- ***Recruit more people from outside the Treasury and Whitehall.***

1.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

#### Recommendation Implemented

1.2 The Treasury and the Cabinet Office are committed to ensuring we have the right skills, experience and behaviours across the Civil Service. Specifically in relation to Treasury Spending Teams, the Treasury will continue to build on the work already done to date to:

I. Reduce staff turnover through:

- a. The introduction of a new grade (E2) to reward and recognise experienced professionals. Initially there were 60 posts at the new grade, now there are over 160,

demonstrating the Treasury's commitment to recognising experience and offering a range of posting options for staff at this grade.

- b. The modernisation and reform of the current pay structure (within Civil Service pay guidelines). This includes current and planned work to review existing professional allowances and explore other non-pay rewards.
- c. A significant investment in continued staff development, including policy skills development. We are developing learning 'hubs' for every profession and function in the department to ensure access to development for all. We have developed a development programme for our graduate entrants which offers 6 weeks of formal policy learning over the first year of their programme, and a modular policy leadership programme for those promoted to Range E (grade 7). Formal training is also available for key professions, including a Masters in Economics, Masters in Public Policy and a fast track finance qualification.

II. Recruit more people from outside the Treasury and Whitehall through:

- a. Advertising all posts across Whitehall as a minimum (except in exceptional circumstances)
- b. Continuing to encourage external loans and secondments to help staff develop broader experience, whilst reviewing our approach to managing those out of the department. The department typically has around 6% of its staff as loans/secondments in from other departments or partner organisations such as the Bank of England, and around 11% of Treasury staff on loans/secondments out.
- c. Running an external recruitment campaign for experienced policy professionals and establishing an apprenticeship route into the department for all our core professions and functions, including finance and, from 2019, economics. To support this, we are implementing the cross-Whitehall 'Success Profiles' which has a greater focus on assessing technical and professional skills.

1.3 Across the Civil Service more broadly, the ambition set out in the Civil Service Workforce Plan is to have career pathways that encourage the building of a breadth of experience and depth of expertise. To do this we are building professional career frameworks that make clear the opportunities available for individuals to gain the skills and experience they need to develop, in a structured way within a profession. Career frameworks support the building of professional capability and the development of deep experts. Career pathways, building on career frameworks, will open up opportunities to diverse pools of skilled people, facilitating movement in and between professions and departments. They will make clear what is expected of our future leaders and support the talent pipeline to our most senior roles. Of the 10 priority professions, 6 (Analysis, Commercial, DDaT, Finance, HR and Project Delivery) have frameworks to support the building of individual capability. The remaining 4 (Communications, Operational Delivery, Policy and Property) are due to deliver in the near future.

1.4 The Cabinet Office is committed to strengthening standards and capability across the functions. Each function is developing a Blueprint which sets out the forecast of future work and business improvement plans. The first of these has already been completed, by the Commercial function. Over the next one to two years, the functions will:

- develop and implement functional standards that demonstrably improve delivery outcomes, reduce risk and enable value for money in departments;
- strengthen functional capability at the centre and within departments by identifying, recruiting and developing talent across the functions and encouraging adoption of relevant technology and processes;
- improve departments' access to functional expertise to improve the deliverability of their plans, and to resolve emergent delivery issues; and
- help departments to continuously improve their ability to deliver government priorities by benchmarking capabilities and working with departments to effect improvements where needed.

1.5 The Cabinet Office, via the Infrastructure Projects Authority, has also been working with the Functions and HM Treasury to strengthen deliverability skills and experience to allow for more robust scrutiny of Departmental plans. Treasury spending teams have taken part in bespoke training designed and delivered in conjunction with Oxford Said Business School, and as such are better able to support delivery of major projects, whether by challenging business cases or working collaboratively with departments to prevent delivery deterioration. We have also produced how-to guides to complement HM Treasury's Green Book to support officials in preparing or assessing spending review bids. Guides produced to date include: Benchmarking, Inflation, Reference Class Forecasting, Risk and Contingency and Digital and Transformation.

1.6 The increased demand for scarce skills both in the Civil Service and wider employment market means that the Cabinet Office continues to review attraction and retention strategies for the specialisms facing particular capability shortages or challenges. The initial focus has been on the development of flexible reward structures in priority functional areas; and for the Senior Civil Service work is underway with the professions to introduce specialist pay ranges for roles that face demonstrable attraction, recruitment or retention issues. We are considering initiatives that reward Civil Servants for building capability in role for both SCS and delegated grades, and the 2018/19 Civil Service Pay Remit Guidance has given departments the flexibility to introduce arrangements that enable capability-based reward for growth in competence.

1.7 As highlighted at the hearing, a planning maturity model has been developed by a cross-departmental group. By providing an objective vision of good planning that is applicable across government, the planning maturity model supports departments to consider steps to improve and further integrate their planning processes. In the longer term, departments may wish to consider initiatives to achieve a greater level of planning maturity in specific planning categories. The planning maturity model can help to show areas of strength and weakness, assist in a targeted approach to capability building and provides an opportunity to learn from other departments.

**2: PAC conclusion: *The Treasury and the Cabinet Office's overall approach to planning and spending can encourage short-term decisions rather than long-term sustainability, which risks value for money.***

**2: PAC recommendation: *When issuing guidance for the next spending review and future SDPs, the Treasury and the Cabinet Office should require departments to show how their plans and funding bids deliver long-term, sustainable value for money. They should report back to the Committee on this, demonstrating how they ensured SDPs were central to spending review decision-making for each department.***

2.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Winter 2019**

2.2 As the Chancellor set out in his Spring Statement, the upcoming spending review aims to have a renewed focus on outcomes and maximising the value achieved for taxpayers' money. The government published a revised version of the Public Value Framework alongside guidance on how to use it most effectively, and that will support this focus. Spending review guidance will set out how the spending review will be run, including providing instructions for departments on how their plans should capture the outcomes and performance achieved for money invested in public services. Guidance will be issued to departments ahead of the spending review.

2.3 The Treasury and the Cabinet Office have been working to improve the planning and performance framework. Since 2015, the Treasury and Cabinet Office have introduced Single Departmental Plans (SDPs), which now form the basis of this framework.

2.4 Treasury and the Cabinet Office intend to use the SDP as the basis for driving forward planning, performance and value. Ahead of the spending review, and explicitly to inform the spending review, departments' 2019/20 SDPs and performance information will inform:

- baseline information on all planned department activity;

- how departments will measure their performance, including against the Public Value Framework;
- the affordability and deliverability of departments' objectives.

2.5 After the spending review, departments will be expected to develop new medium-term SDPs to cover their new settlement from 2020-21 – and continue to update them annually.

2.6 In addition to a renewed focus on outcomes, the spending review – in line with the past three spending reviews – aims to include a zero-based review of capital spending. As part of this, departments will need to set out their rationale and evidence base for existing and future capital spending priorities as we seek to maximise the value on our investments over the long-term. The spending review will also review policies across departments to understand how government spending contributes to human capital formation, which is important for boosting UK productivity and ensuring that everyone can achieve their potential.

2.7 The Treasury's Balance Sheet Review has also made good progress in its work on long-term sustainability through cost-effective management of government assets and liabilities, as reflected in the announcements in the 2018 Autumn Budget. The Treasury continues the work of the Review through the forthcoming Spending Review and is integrating it into the Spending Review guidance.

**3: PAC conclusion: *We are frustrated that the Treasury and the Cabinet Office's lack of action to prevent departments working in silos has, in some cases, led to cost-shunting and poorer services for the public.***

**3: PAC recommendation: *In advance of the 2019 Spending Review, the Treasury and the Cabinet Office should write to us to explain what they will do to incentivise joint departmental plans and delivery, clearly stating how this is different from their previous approach. Given the importance of SDPs to the 2019 Spending Review and the commitment to joined-up working, the Cabinet Office should share SDPs across departments.***

3.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Autumn 2019**

3.2 The Treasury and Cabinet Office are committed to further incentivising joint departmental plans and bids at the next spending review. As set out in the Budget 2018 Red Book, the next spending review 'will aim to ensure that policy issues are considered across departmental boundaries'.

3.3 The guidance for spending review 2019 intends to encourage joint-working between departments and joint departmental submissions for cross-cutting areas of work. That will be accompanied by cross-departmental discussions of both departments and functions.

3.4 The Treasury will continue to work constructively with the finance community across Whitehall to ensure spending and objectives are considered across institutional boundaries. We will take a cross-cutting approach to the spending review that can demonstrate value for money with a credible plan for implementation. The 2019 spending review will set out explicit areas for cross-cutting work, such as National Security, led by the Cabinet Secretary. These will look at the evidence base for policy interventions across departmental boundaries.

3.5 This will be the first spending review to be informed by the work of the Costing Unit and the functions. Since the 2015 spending review and the Financial Management Review, the role of the Finance Function to better understand costs and outcomes and the role of the Treasury to see across departments from the centre has been strengthened by the creation of the Costings Team. The Costing Team is a central team with dedicated resource working with departments to look at cost issues with a whole of government perspective. The result of the work of the Costing Team gives a clear understanding of where costs or outcomes lie across multiple government departments and where the drivers may lie in the spending by one department, but the costs or outcomes materialise in another.

3.6 The Government functions also help to prevent siloed working: setting strategic direction by developing and implementing cross-government strategies; developing and delivering services and products that are commonly required across government; and by setting and assuring standards which create a coherent and mutually understood way of doing business across organisational boundaries.



3.7 Departments engage with each other throughout the SDP process– Treasury and Cabinet Office, in addition to setting out this expectation in the 2019/20 guidance, coordinate cross-departmental finance and planning networks to support this, with different departments presenting on their SDP. Extracts from departments' SDPs are routinely shared across all departments as part of the SDP good practice guide, which is compiled by Treasury and the Cabinet Office and provides illustrative examples of good practice from previous SDP rounds. Within the SDP, departments are asked to clearly identify cross-government programmes within their plan, and where joint working exists, align metrics and work areas.

**4: PAC conclusion: *We are concerned that, unless management of planning and spending are brought together more effectively, the next spending review will not fully address the problems surrounding the financial sustainability of the public sector.***

**4: PAC recommendation: *In advance of the next spending review, the Treasury and the Cabinet Office should write to us to explain how they will work together, along with functions and departments, to better challenge the realism of departments' plans and the wider effect on sustainable public services.***

4.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Autumn 2019**

4.2 The Government is committed to building on the lessons from the previous spending review to ensure that departments' spending plans are based on realistic assumptions with a real focus on deliverability.

4.3 SDPs will be a key input in to the spending review. To ensure departments are producing robust, deliverable plans for 2019/20 the Treasury and Cabinet Office have introduced the following:

- increased scrutiny from the centre on affordability and deliverability of a department's draft SDP;
- Accounting Officer and Secretary of State sign-off of their department's SDP will be informed by whether Functional Directors within the department consider the plan to be affordable and deliverable. Non-Executive Directors are expected to provide external challenge;
- tighter expectations on risk management. Departments are required to set out their principal risks and describe how these risks will be managed and mitigated.

4.4 The embedding of the Public Value Framework (PVF), including in SDPs, will further align planning and spending. The PVF is a conceptual framework for assessing how effectively funding is turned into delivery, and will play a key role in the systematic tracking of key outcomes across government.

4.5 Treasury Spending Teams can now draw upon functional expertise, for example, project delivery expertise in the Infrastructure and Projects Authority and commercial expertise from the Government Commercial Function. The intention for the next spending review is to draw on those functions' expertise in the way HM Treasury and Cabinet Office assess departmental plans. The 2019 spending review is also intended to enhance the focus on delivery realism in two ways; firstly, the Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA), working across the functions will be scrutinising departmental plans to focus on deliverability, and secondly the zero-based review of capital spending will explicitly test the realism of departments' capital plans. The work of the IPA and the functions includes a more sophisticated approach to risk through increasing use of the Government Major Projects Portfolio (GMPP) data, benchmarks and reference class forecasts, and upskilling departments on project delivery.

**5: PAC conclusion: *Despite our previous recommendation, the Cabinet Office has failed to ensure that public SDPs provide Parliament and the public with the information they need to hold departments to account.***

**5: PAC recommendation: *To help taxpayers see what they are getting for their money, the Cabinet Office should ensure that the public single departmental plans for 2019–20 include, for each objective: how departments will deliver it; with what money and people; and how success will be measured, by when.***

5.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Summer 2019**

5.2 The Government supports the Committee's desire to further increase transparency, and to provide Parliament and the public with the information they need to hold departments to account.

5.3 As outlined in the April 2019 Government Financial Reporting Review, the Treasury recognises the importance of financial reporting as a means through which to scrutinise the government's use of public money. The review sets out how the Treasury and Cabinet Office are committed to improving the quality of departmental reporting through single departmental plans and other reports. In particular, Cabinet Office and Treasury are supporting departments to make improvements to the public plans to enhance usability and transparency. This includes encouraging departments to include additional financial and workforce information, and provide better performance indicators. As such, the guidance issued to departments this year by Cabinet Office and Treasury sets out that:

- 'departments should break down their allocated spending and headcount under each strategic objective'
- 'departments should include a performance section for each objective'
- departments should include 'indicators that collectively allow the public to assess whether the department is achieving its objective'
- departments should use performance information from credible sources and ensure it is presented in a useable way so that departmental work can be assessed

5.4 This year, the internal processes and timetable for producing public and internal plans have also been aligned to ensure that departments understand that public plans reflect internal plans as closely as possible.

5.5 Treasury and Cabinet Office have worked closely with departments to develop planning maturity, particularly with respect to standardising financial and workforce reporting. However, all departments have found it challenging to provide a breakdown of allocated spending and headcount under strategic objectives in this year's public plans. As SDPs will be central to decision-making for the upcoming spending review, and departments will develop new medium-term SDPs to cover their new settlement from 2020/21, we expect all departments' financial and workforce planning to mature. Treasury and Cabinet Office will continue to work with departments towards the aim of including additional financial and workforce information in future public single departmental plans.

5.6 As the Committee has pointed out, the public plans have improved year on year since 2015 and from May 2018 included key financial and workforce information, including on DEL, AME, EU Exit Allocations and headcount. Treasury and Cabinet Office agree with the Committee that these plans could be improved further. Alongside the Government functions, we will continue to work very closely with departments as they produce their plans, to build on the progress that has already been made and continue to push for further improvements, including the Committee's recommendations.

**6: PAC conclusion: *It remains to be seen whether the Treasury's latest initiative to improve value for money will lead to long-term change.***

**6: PAC recommendation: *By June 2019, the Treasury should write to us to explain how and when it will develop the public value framework and embed it in day-to-day decision making. It should include specifics on which departments or areas of public spending it will prioritise, and we are particularly interested to hear about plans for areas covered by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and the Department of Health & Social Care.***

6.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

### **Recommendation Implemented**

6.2 In line with Sir Michael Barber's original recommendations, the Treasury piloted use of the Public Value Framework through a series of reviews with volunteer departments during 2018. Based on the insights gained through this process, a revised version of the framework has been developed and was published alongside Spring Statement 2019 earlier this year.

6.3 The publication of this revised version of the framework marks the beginning of the Treasury's next phase of work on embedding the robust assessment of public value across government spending programmes. The pilot reviews demonstrated the value of the framework as a powerful, multi-purpose diagnostic tool that can be used in various ways to assess and improve performance. As set out by the Chancellor at Spring Statement 2019, the forthcoming spending review will have a renewed focus on outcomes. The Public Value Framework will play a key role in the systematic tracking of key outcomes across all areas of government (including those mentioned by the Committee) and will be used to monitor and drive progress in delivering in key areas of government spending as set out in departmental SDPs. Full details on the role of the framework in the spending review will be set out at the spending review launch later in the year.

6.4 The Treasury will continue to carry out public value reviews in specific areas of delivery on an ongoing basis. The Treasury are continuing to discuss possible future projects with departments that could be run to strengthen evidence. Lessons learned from these reviews will inform our approach to supporting departments to use the framework in a way that will have the greatest impact. The Treasury is also continuing to work closely with the Cabinet Office to ensure this work aligns with and supports existing planning and performance tools, such as SDPs. Departments have begun including their performance against the framework as part of their 2019/20 SDPs. From 19/20 onwards, departments are including information in their SDPs about their performance against the Public Value Framework and the improvements they will make to maximise public value.

# Seventy-Ninth Report of Session 2017-19

## HM Treasury

### Excess Votes 2017-18

#### Introduction from the Committee

This Report is part of the framework of control over government spending. Resource-based Supply requires departments to estimate and manage the financial resources they need during each financial year on an accruals basis for commitments to provide services, and on a cash basis to meet commitments as they mature. Parliament authorises departments' proposed cash spending and use of resources.

HM Treasury is responsible for monitoring and overseeing departments' compliance with the limits authorised by Parliament and for controlling adjustments to the approved limits during the financial year. If a department needs to adjust its budget during the year it has one opportunity to do so via a Supplementary Estimate, which is approved by Parliament towards the end of the financial year. In 2017–18, Parliament granted total net resources of £746.7 billion and total cash of £488.0 billion in Supply Estimates to 57 vote-funded bodies.<sup>1</sup>

Resource-based Estimates reflect accruals and non-cash consumption of resources, such as depreciation. A cash limit is also voted by Parliament together with a non-budget line, through which departments are required to record adjustments to their prior year costs. Parliament expects departments to stay within the limits they are voted. Any expenditure outside the limits authorised by Parliament potentially undermines parliamentary control over public spending. A breach of any of the budgetary control limits, the cash limit or the non-budget line results in the need for the expenditure to be regularised through the Parliamentary Excess Votes process.

Under Standing Order of the House of Commons number 55(2) (d), the Committee of Public Accounts scrutinises the reasons behind any individual bodies exceeding their allocated resources, and reports to the House of Commons on whether it has any objection to making good the reported excesses. Once the Committee has reported, Statements of Excesses will be presented to Parliament, to be voted into the Supply and Appropriation (Anticipation and Adjustments) Act. The passing of this Act authorises the additional grant by Parliament to regularise the excesses incurred by departments.

Figure 1 shows the excesses incurred in 2017–18. Parliament is being asked to approve additional budget for the excess reported in this table.

The Committee published its report on 14 February 2019. This is the Government's response to the Committee.

Figure 1: Summary of 2017-18 Excesses

Department	Non-budget expenditure Excess / Amount to be voted
United Kingdom Supreme Court	£665,000

#### Relevant Reports

- [Central Government Supply Estimates 2017-18 - Supplementary Estimates](#), February 2018 (HC 808)
- [The Supreme Court Annual Report and Accounts 2017-2018](#), June 2018 (HC 1032)

#### Government response to the Committee

**1 PAC conclusions: *The United Kingdom Supreme Court (UKSC) breached its Non-Budget Expenditure Limit by £665,000.***

**1a PAC recommendations: *Under the terms of the Standing Order of the House of Commons number 55(2)(d), the Committee recommends that Parliament provides the additional resources by means of an Excess Vote.***

1.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

#### **Recommendation implemented**

1.2 The Treasury agrees with the excesses outlined by the Committee in their report.

**1b PAC recommendations: *While we recognise the assurances given to us in oral evidence, the United Kingdom Supreme Court should also write to us within one month, providing further detail on the 'root and branch' review it is carrying out to guard against it making accounting errors in future.***

1.3 The UK Supreme Court [\*has provided a written response\*](#) to the Committee's recommendation, that has subsequently been agreed with the members of the Committee.

1.4 A review has been undertaken to guard against making future accounting errors. This has resulted in 'walkthrough' meetings and continuing dialogue with the professional valuers, cross referencing of the accounts production plan to the latest financial and accounting guidance, continued learning and development of the finance team, links with other government departments on accounting matters together with discussions of new and/or emerging accounting standards.

# Eightieth Report of Session 2017-19

## Ministry of Defence

### Capita's contracts with the Ministry of Defence

#### Introduction from the Committee

In 2012, the Army sought to reform its approach to recruitment. It established the Recruiting Partnering Project and committed £1.3 billion over ten years. The Project's aim is to recruit the quantity and quality of soldiers that the Army requires each year (including officers and other ranks, regulars and reserves) and save money. As part of this, it entered into a ten-year, £495 million contract with Capita Business Services Ltd (Capita) to bring in its expertise in recruitment and marketing. However, Capita has missed the Army's annual targets for recruiting regulars and reserves every year since 2013 – with a shortfall that ranged from 21% to 45% of the Army's recruitment requirement. The size of the shortfall has increased over the last three years and in 2017–18 Capita recruited 7,000 fewer regular and reserve soldiers and officers than was required. It expects to be 40% below target in 2018–19. The Army originally forecast the Programme would achieve savings of £267 million by 2022 but has now reduced this to £180 million.

On the basis of a report by the National Audit Office, the Committee took evidence from the Ministry of Defence (the Department) on 14 January 2019. The Committee published its report on 1 March 2019. This is the Government's response to the Committee's report.

#### Relevant Reports

- NAO report: Investigation into the [British Army's Recruiting Partnering Project](#) Session 2017-19 (HC 1781)
- PAC report: [Capita's contracts with the Ministry of Defence](#) Session 2017-19 (HC 1736)
- Ministry of Defence report: [The Defence Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2018 to 2030: A Force for Inclusion](#)

#### Government responses to the Committee

**1: PAC conclusion: The Recruiting Partnering Project contract was overly complex and poorly implemented, and both the Army and Capita must share responsibility for Capita's terrible performance in recruiting new soldiers since 2012.**

**1: PAC recommendation: As they consider the options for recruitment beyond 2022, the Department and Army should demonstrate how they are applying the lessons learned, and how they are considering radical new ideas for recruitment across the frontline Services. We expect to see significant improvements when we examine this issue again. The MoD should write to the Committee by September 2019 to share their updated recruitment plans.**

1.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

#### Recommendation implemented

1.2 The Department recognises that the Recruiting Partnering Project (RPP) was initially overly complex, and there are lessons that need to be taken forward. A dedicated programme, called the Future Recruiting Programme (FRP), has already been established tasked with identifying the best approach to attract and select our future workforce, following the expiry of the RPP contract, and will cover all three armed services. As part of this programme, lessons from the previous project are being captured to inform development of the programme. The Army will also continue to seek to develop and transform RPP to enable the most seamless transition to FRP in due course. The Department is happy to write to the Committee to update them on the progress by the end of September 2019.

1.3 Furthermore, significant work has also been undertaken over the past year, collectively with other central government departments and the Cabinet Office, to address lessons learned more broadly from

recent outsourcing. The output of this work is actively shaping the Department's future outsourcing strategy.

**2: PAC conclusion: *It has taken Capita and the Army far too long to address under-performance.***

**2: PAC recommendation: *The Department should report by the end of September 2019 on the specific actions it is taking to simplify and streamline the recruitment process, explaining how it is piloting these changes and demonstrating how they are helping to reduce recruitment times***

2.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

#### **Target implementation date: Summer 2019**

2.2 Significant actions have already been undertaken to drive efficiency and effectiveness into the recruitment process, including changes in process to reduce the time it takes for applicants to join the Army, and efforts to increase the conversion of applications into enlistments. Role model serving soldiers are now being utilised throughout the recruiting process and a review is ongoing, including medical entry policy. Improvements are also all supported by the new IT system which is now delivering significant benefits.

2.3 Reducing the length of the process and improving conversion rates remain key to recruiting success. Capita and the Army have piloted a transformational change project to deliver enhancements in the recruiting pipeline to address these critical issues. This pilot has recently successfully concluded, achieving a median reduction in Time of Flight from application to the candidate being loaded onto training, with the fastest candidate completing the process in 21 days. The project will now see changes to the recruitment process rolled out nationally across the Summer. Importantly, the pilot also demonstrated increased candidate satisfaction. The Department is happy to write to the Committee to update them on this by the end of September 2019.

**3: PAC conclusion: *Capita and the Army have introduced improvements to their approach, but it remains to be seen whether they will be successful.***

**3: PAC recommendation: *The Army should report to us at the end of each financial year with a breakdown of performance against key metrics, including enlistments, conversion rates, recruitment times and a breakdown of voluntary drop-outs. It should also provide an update on Capita's performance against the contract KPIs and the actions it has taken in response to any under-performance.***

3.1 The Government agrees Committee's recommendation.

#### **Recommendation implemented**

3.2 As the Committee highlights in its conclusion, the Department has already made several improvements. These are already showing tangible signs of success in the record number of applications in January 2019 to join the Army as a Regular soldier. These improvements should now begin to start translating into increased basic training starts and then full-time trade trained strength, but this will take some time due to the necessary length of the recruitment and training processes. The Department is monitoring the indicators of improvement closely.

3.3 The Department releases detailed quarterly personnel statistics showing the manning level of the Armed Forces, including inflow and outflow figures<sup>1</sup>. It will be happy to update the Committee on performance against contract key performance indicators by the end of September 2019.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/quarterly-service-personnel-statistics-index>

**4: PAC conclusion: The Army has not yet altered its mindset to ensure recruitment policies keep pace with rapid changes in society, better understanding of certain medical conditions and the pressing need to attract cyber specialists.**

**4: PAC recommendation: The Army should write to us within 6 months to explain how - while ensuring that recruitment standards are maintained - it is planning to revise its entry criteria to recruit the skills that are needed in the future; to ensure that new joiners reflect the breadth of society; and to take account of developments in the understanding of certain**

4.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

#### **Recommendation implemented**

4.2 In October 2018, the Department published '[The Defence Diversity and Inclusion Strategy 2018 to 2030: A Force for Inclusion](#)', setting out its aims to be appropriately representative of UK society. Additionally, the Army is ranked in the Stonewall Top 100 and has one of the country's largest apprenticeship schemes. External mentoring schemes, including BAME and gender programmes, have also been implemented to promote diversity within the Army's leadership.

4.3 Army recruiting policy remains dynamic, being constantly reviewed against security, physical fitness, medical, appearance and educational standards, whilst safeguarding operational standards and effectiveness. Ongoing research linked to physical entry standards better aligns military roles to their physical requirements, improves physical development, reduces injury and allows better tuned entry standards. Progress with medical entry standards has seen changes to initial selection standards, supported by a pre-conditioning course where appropriate. The Department has also formed a Medical Employment Policy Symposium to improve the way that medical process supports recruiting and retention across the Armed Forces. Mental health entry standards have already been amended to better reflect improving public awareness, with muscular-skeletal injury and respiratory conditions being reviewed and dermatology standards will follow in due course.

4.4 The Department remains committed to make it easier for people to move across the 'Whole Force' over their career, working collaboratively with industry to make skills, including Cyber, available across organisational boundaries. The development of alternative employment frameworks will identify and then deploy levers that will attract and retain key capabilities.

4.5 The Department would be happy to update the Committee by the end of September 2019.

**5: PAC conclusion: We are highly sceptical that the Army will secure the intended benefits – including financial savings – before the contract ends in 2022.**

**5a: PAC recommendation: As part of the annual update to the Committee recommended above, the Army should provide a full breakdown of the savings from the Recruiting Partnering Programme.**

**5b: PAC recommendation: The Army should explain its progress in establishing whether it is able to adapt and use the online recruitment system after 2022, and at what cost.**

5.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendations

#### **Recommendations implemented**

5.2 The Army remain confident that the Recruiting Partnering Project will deliver around £180 million in benefits. The Department has a robust investment approval process, with projects of this size requiring approval from HM Treasury, and re-approval where there are significant changes to the expected benefits. The Department is happy to write to the Committee on this as part of the wider update by the end of September 2019.



5.3 The Department explained [in its letter to the Committee](#) of 29 January 2019 following the oral evidence session on 14 January 2019 that the provision of a fully integrated information and communications technology (ICT) solution has formed part of the contract since the original signature, along with the associated intellectual property (IP). In relation to the IP, the Department secured access to free user rights in-perpetuity, allowing it to use, copy or modify the ICT solution. This can be either by the Department, or a third-party supplier. Capita will only apply a maintenance fee to provide additional support where the Department finds itself unable to provide the technical ability to resolve issues itself. This additional support could equally be provided by any other third-party agent.

**6: PAC conclusion: Capita and the Department also failed to work together effectively on the other major Capita contract to transform the Department's management of its estate, which has now been terminated five years early.**

**6: PAC recommendation: As it reforms its commercial practices and capabilities, the Department should embed the lessons from its relationship with Capita, and, before the summer, write to us setting out how it is improving the commercial performance of all its constituent parts, and how it will measure success**

6.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

#### **Recommendation implemented**

6.2 The Department recognises that lessons learned from its relationship with Capita should be used as it reforms commercial practices and capabilities. The Department is implementing the Cabinet Office methodology of supplier partnering across all of its strategic suppliers. Capita is already part of the cross-Government programme. This programme uses a defined comprehensive performance management methodology that holds suppliers to account but works collaboratively with them to address issues and to improve continuously. The Department is happy to share full details of this methodology with the Committee by the end of September 2019. In addition, the Department has focused on improving commercial skills through a functional leadership model, investment in senior commercial leadership and a focus on developing key commercial skills for staff through a comprehensive training programme.

**7: PAC conclusion: We remain very concerned at the slow progress in improving military housing and at the lack of transparency around the major developments currently under way.**

**7: PAC Recommendation: The Department should provide us with a further update on progress with its work improving military housing by 31 July 2019, given the slippage on the Future Accommodation Model and the close connection between this work and the ongoing Annington Homes reviews, which remain the subject of negotiation.**

7.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

#### **Recommendation implemented**

7.2 The Department fully recognises that the provision of decent living standards and excellent customer service is essential to supporting operational capability and maintaining morale on the front line. It also recognises that continued effort is required to support service personnel and their families and remains committed to improving the condition and standard of the Service Family Accommodation (SFA) estate; sustaining current improved levels of response repair performance; and enhancing customer service. Taken together, it is considered these steps will help to improve satisfaction levels.

7.3 More than 95% of the Department's properties are at the Decent Homes Standard and no homes are allocated to personnel below that standard. In the last four years, the Department has invested more than £530 million in SFA improvements including fitting external wall insulation and replacing windows, doors, roofs and boilers to improve thermal efficiency; installing new kitchens and bathrooms to maintain modern standards; and general refurbishment to ensure a good quality of accommodation for our Armed Forces and their families. During the 2018-19 financial year, this investment allowed a continued focus on heating and electrical up-grades, damp and mould remediation, and larger upgrade projects to support

Army re-basing. The Department is happy to write separately to the Committee with an update on SFA housing standards.

7.4 Amey are currently contracted to provide the Department with a range of military infrastructure and housing services, including the repair and maintenance of SFA and other assets on the defence estate. Overall Amey has been fulfilling its contracted obligations with regards to core services. Over the last twelve months, improved performance has been sustained and this has been reflected in both Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) and Amey Customer Satisfaction Survey results. The DIO Customer Satisfaction Survey has shown a 4% increase in satisfaction (62% to 66%) with the overall standard of SFA from February 2018 to January 2019. Alongside this, in January 2019 Amey achieved 94% against a 95% Key Performance Indicator for its response maintenance performance.

7.5 In relation to the renegotiation of the contract with Annington Properties Ltd, agreement has been reached on a number of terms that will strengthen the relationship and provide benefits to both parties, including agreeing a mechanism to optimise use of the Defence estate and reduce the number of vacant properties. The Permanent Secretary has written to the Committee separately with an update on this subject<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/public-accounts/Correspondence/2017-19/Letter-from-Stephen-Lovegrove-to-Meg-Hillier-MP-on-Annington-Homes-Negotiations-Update-190329.pdf>

# Eighty-First Report of Session 2017–19

## Department for Transport / HMT

### Rail management and timetabling

#### Introduction from the Committee

The Department for Transport (the Department) is responsible for setting the strategic direction for the rail industry in England and Wales, including improving access to the railway for people with disabilities. It funds Network Rail to maintain and enhance rail infrastructure (£47.9 billion between 2019 and 2024). The Department also funds and oversees significant rail improvement programmes led by organisations created to manage these programmes, including High Speed Two (High Speed Two Limited) and Crossrail (Crossrail Limited; a wholly owned subsidiary of Transport for London). The Department contracts private sector companies to run train services through a system of franchising and, along with the Office of Rail and Road, holds these companies to account for their performance. The Department currently oversees 14 franchises. If franchises fail or are terminated, the Department can bring these back under government control until a new franchise can be let. In May 2018, timetable changes were introduced affecting 46% of train times across the rail network. The Department's management of the rail industry led to unacceptable disruption lasting for many weeks across the south-east and north of England. The Department is also responsible for overseeing and funding investment in the strategic road network, primarily through its Road Investment Strategy which is expected to cost £12.8 billion between 2015 and 2020.

The Committee took evidence, on 10 December 2018, from the Department for Transport (the Department) and Network Rail on rail franchising, Crossrail and the Department's handling of other rail programmes in the UK. The Committee published its report on 27 February 2019. This is the Government response to the Committee's report.

#### Relevant Reports

- PAC report: [Rail management and timetabling](#) – Session 2017-19 (HC 1793)
- Department for Transport report: [The Inclusive Transport Strategy](#) – July 2018

#### Government responses to the Committee

**1: PAC conclusion: *The Department did not ensure, as it should have done, that those responsible for the railway are clear about their roles and that they work together effectively. This has contributed to major disruption and misery for passengers.***

**1: PAC recommendation: *As part of its response to the ongoing rail review, the Department must set out once and for all a clear governance and accountability structure for the railway, including what the Department retains responsibility for and how it will gain assurance that the wider system is functioning as it intends.***

1.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

#### Target implementation date: Autumn 2019

1.2 The Williams Rail Review has been established to recommend the most appropriate organisational and commercial frameworks to deliver the Government's vision for rail. The Review will recommend an industry structure that promotes clear accountability and effective joint-working, with the agility to respond to future challenges and opportunities and deliver major change programmes.

1.3 The Review's final report will be a White Paper, which will set out the Government's intentions for reform of the rail sector. It will be published in autumn 2019, and will define the roles and responsibilities of the Secretary of State for Transport as well as other industry partners and bodies. In addition, in line with the recommendations of the Office of Rail and Road's independent inquiry into the timetable

disruption in May 2018, the review will consider how major infrastructure and service change programmes can best be delivered and assured on a system-wide basis, providing increasing certainty for passengers, freight customers and funders.

1.4 Recognising the need for more rapid changes to ensure the successful delivery of timetable changes in the period prior to the implementation of the Rail Review's findings, the Department has taken steps to act on the wider recommendations of the Office of Rail and Road's inquiry. The Department has written to the Office of Rail and Road confirming that it will review the terms of reference of its programme boards to ensure that they properly take account of risks and issues across the fields of infrastructure, franchise, rolling stock and timetabling, as well as the assurance mechanisms available to these boards, including Industry Readiness Boards or equivalent where appropriate. The Department anticipates updating the relevant terms of reference by the summer of this year.

**2: PAC conclusion: *We are concerned that the Department is still not adequately protecting taxpayers' money in its management of Govia Thameslink Railway and that there is a lack of transparency about the profit rate that the company will be able to earn from its franchise.***

**2a: PAC recommendation: *Within three months of this report, the Department must set out: details of the profit cap that it applied to Govia Thameslink Railway***

2.1 The Government disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

2.2 Although the Government disagrees with the recommendation, it does accept the Committee's concern about transparency. The Department does not release the details of profit caps on any of its franchises. This information is market sensitive and its release would therefore be prejudicial to the interests of the Department, the operators and their owning groups.

2.3 However, the Department can confirm that GTR has made no profit to date over the course of the franchise and will make no profit this financial year; and draws the Committee's attention to the owning group's update to the market following last year's settlement which reduced their prediction for the margin over the franchise term from 0.75-1.5% to 0.75-1%.

**2b: PAC recommendation: *Within three months of this report, the Department must set out: how the £15 million passenger improvement fund will be spent, including the tangible improvements from it that passengers can expect.***

2.4 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Summer 2019**

2.5 GTR has put a combined £30 million into the passenger improvement fund and the special compensation scheme for passengers affected by the timetable disruption. The £15 million passenger improvement fund is being split among all stations managed by GTR and all stations served by Thameslink. This is banded through the tiers of the special compensation scheme, with stations more affected by the disruption receiving more money. GTR are in the process of consulting with rail users, user groups, passenger representatives (including London TravelWatch and Transport Focus) and MPs who will determine how this money is spent at a local level.

2.6 The guiding objective of this programme is to deliver 'tangible improvements for passengers' – but the Department cannot comment on the specific details, as this will be decided by passengers, rather than by GTR or the Department. Once these decisions have been made, GTR will work to deliver these improvements within the final years of this franchise, which ends in September 2021.

**3: PAC conclusion: *The Department's failure to learn the lessons from previous programmes means that its strategic management of the railways is not evolving quickly enough to be able to procure and execute complicated projects such as Crossrail so that they do not face cost increases and delays.***

**3: PAC recommendation: *The Department should, within three months of this report, set out how it plans to systematically capture and learn lessons from programme delivery so that it avoids repeating the same mistakes experienced on some programmes again.***

3.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Summer 2019**

3.2 The Department and the Infrastructure and Projects Authority published a joint report<sup>4</sup> on lessons for government departments sponsoring major projects in April 2019. The report will identify transferrable lessons and themes. An implementation programme is being developed to share these lessons with those overseeing major projects in the Department and its arm's-length bodies. The Infrastructure and Projects Authority is also developing proposals for engaging across government.

3.3 The Project Delivery Profession in the Department also has work underway to assess how all its major projects and programmes can improve how they identify, capture, apply and share lessons. Initial work has analysed the existing learning practices and identified barriers through surveys and interviews with project leaders. This will be combined with best practice and leverage expertise from learning organisations to develop solutions to enable sustainable and effective learning. It is planned to roll this out during summer 2019.

**4: PAC conclusion: *It is unacceptable that passengers still do not know when the improvements to services that the Department promised them from the failed East Coast franchise will be delivered.***

**4: PAC recommendation: *By summer recess, the Department should write to the Committee setting out in detail when the new direct services to towns and cities such as Huddersfield, Sunderland and Middlesbrough, promised on the east coast railway when the VTEC franchise was awarded will begin, reflecting the latest plans for necessary infrastructure enhancements.***

4.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Summer 2019**

4.2 The Department will write to the Committee in the summer of 2019 to provide an update on the anticipated delivery of services announced at the start of the Virgin Trains East Coast (VTEC) franchise which have not yet been delivered. A number of these services are dependent on the delivery of infrastructure enhancements and/or require additional rolling stock. London North Eastern Railway (LNER) continue to work closely with Network Rail to support their work in completing the necessary ECML upgrade works and will confirm the timeline for the introduction of additional services as this work progresses. This would have been the case whether VTEC or LNER were operating the franchise. The first of the new Class 800 trains are scheduled to be introduced on the London – Leeds route on 15 May 2019.

**5: PAC conclusion: *The Department and rail industry have been too slow to act to make the railway more accessible for passengers with disabilities.***

**5: PAC recommendation: *The Department should write to the Committee by the summer recess setting out how it will ensure that train operating companies and station operators make sure that passengers with disabilities can use the railway, and to set out an enhanced monitoring regime to make sure that the companies are complying with the plan.***

5.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Summer 2019**

5.2 The Department is committed to ensuring that disabled people have the same access to the rail network as everyone else, being able to travel confidently, easily and without extra cost. The Department launched the Inclusive Transport Strategy<sup>5</sup> in July 2018, which set out the key policy and investment priorities to deliver a more inclusive transport system. By 2030, the Department envisages equal access for disabled people using the transport system, with assistance, if physical infrastructure remains a barrier.

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/lessons-from-transport-for-the-sponsorship-of-major-projects>

<sup>5</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/728547/inclusive-transport-strategy.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/728547/inclusive-transport-strategy.pdf)

5.3 The Office of Rail and Road (ORR), is the custodian of the Disabled People's Protection Policy (DPPP), which is a license condition and monitors train operating companies' compliance with its requirements. The ORR is committed to ensuring train operating companies and station operators, including Network Rail, comply with their obligations to provide this assistance to which rail passengers are entitled. The ORR has implemented a 'Core Data' compliance monitoring framework that requires companies to routinely report on key areas of performance that affect passenger outcomes. All the core data ORR collects are published on the ORR Data Portal. The ORR website also provides a range of accessibility data for each train and station operator in a summary dashboard<sup>6</sup>. Compliance monitoring plays an important role in holding train operating companies and station operators to account for the services they provide to passengers.

5.4 The ORR has launched a consultation as part of its review of the DPPP guidance document. After considering all responses, the ORR intends to work with consultees to finalise its proposals and deliver the ambitious agenda for change it set out in the consultation, for the benefit of all disabled rail passengers. Alongside publication of the final guidance, the ORR will set out an enhanced monitoring regime to ensure operators deliver the requirements of the new guidance.

5.5 The ORR and the Department will write jointly to the Committee before the summer recess of 2019 providing an update on monitoring performance in this area and setting out the progress the Department has made to improve rail accessibility since the publication of the Inclusive Transport Strategy.

**6: PAC conclusion: *We continue to be concerned that the Treasury's and the Department's lack of a clear plan for what will replace PF2 funding for some major road improvement projects risks squeezing funding already allocated elsewhere.***

**6: PAC recommendation: *Within three months of this report, the Department and Treasury should write to the Committee clearly outlining the range of financing structures available to fund the A303 Stonehenge tunnel and Lower Thames Crossing projects, how this will affect the budget of £25.3 billion for Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2) funding, what the effect will be on other road projects in RIS2 and how it will appraise the cost and risk implications of these options to protect the public finances over the long-term. In particular, now that these projects will not receive any PF2 funding.***

6.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: December 2019**

6.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation and the response will follow the Spending Review

6.2 In its October 2018 budget statement, the government announced that it will not pursue any new PF2 contracts for new projects, as the model was inflexible, overly complex and constituted a fiscal risk.

6.3 The government remains committed to progressing the Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) and A303 Stonehenge (A303) and continues to take plans forward to the current timetable. This is demonstrated by the submission of the A303 Development Consent Order, and the start of the LTC consultation in October 2018. The business cases for both schemes will be considered in due course in 2019.

6.4 The Government announced draft funding of £25.3bn for the second Roads Investment Strategy (RIS2 - covering 2020-2025) in October 2018. The final funding envelope and investment strategy, including the schemes to be delivered and their prioritisation, will be agreed between DfT and HMT by the end of 2019.

6.5 All capital will be considered in the round at the spending review. The department will write to the Committee by the end of 2019.

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://orr.gov.uk/rail/publications/consumer-publications/annual-rail-consumer-report>

# Eighty-Third Report of Session 2017-19

## Department of Health and Social Care

### Clinical Commissioning Groups

#### Introduction from the Committee

Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) are responsible for planning and commissioning most of the hospital and community NHS services in their local areas. CCGs are led by a Governing Body made up of GPs, other clinicians and lay members. They replaced primary care trusts in April 2013. In 2018, there were 195 CCGs. In 2017–18, CCGs spent £81 billion primarily on purchasing health services for their local populations. Of this, approximately 1.4% (£1.1 billion) was spent on CCGs' running costs.

Since commissioning was introduced into the NHS in the early 1990s, there have been several changes to the structure of NHS commissioning organisations. Most recently, more emphasis has been placed on the wider geographical planning of health services with the introduction of Sustainability and Transformation Partnerships. The most advanced partnerships have become Integrated Care Systems. CCGs are engaging increasingly in joint working. There have been eight formal mergers of CCGs since 2013 and most now share an accountable officer. The NHS Long Term Plan set out that Integrated Care Systems will cover the whole of England by 2021 resulting in a significant reduction in the number of CCGs, with CCGs covering a larger population.

Based on a report by the National Audit Office, the Committee took evidence on the 9 January 2019 from the DHSC, NHS England and Clinical Commissioning groups. The Committee published its report on 8 March 2019. This is the Government's response to the Committee's report.

#### Relevant reports

- NAO report: [A review of the role and costs of clinical commissioning groups](#), Session 2017–19, HC 1783, 18 December 2018.
- PAC report: [Clinical Commissioning Groups](#) – Session 2017-19 (HC 1740) 8 March 2019
- Government document: [NHS Long Term Plan](#) – January 2019

#### Government responses to the Committee

**1: PAC conclusion: *We are concerned about the impact on patient outcomes if the performance of CCGs does not improve, especially as they become responsible for commissioning services across larger populations.***

**1: PAC recommendation: *NHS England should report back to us by the end of 2019 on the actions it has taken to ensure all CCGs are performing effectively and have high quality leadership as they take on responsibility for commissioning across larger populations.***

1.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

#### Target implementation date: Winter 2019

1.2 At present, NHS England (NHSE) and NHS Improvement's (NHSI) independent statutory roles and responsibilities remain, and in order to ensure continuity, joint teams will use approaches currently set out in the Improvement and Assessment Framework (IAF) to monitor commissioner performance and identify support needs. This will continue to include a measure of both the quality of leadership within the CCG and its contribution to the effectiveness of working relationships in the local systems.

1.3 The overall IAF rating and leadership measure form one proxy for how CCGs are performing and NHSE can provide an update after the 2018-19 assessment of CCGs concludes in Summer 2019. NHSE

and NHSI will use 2019-20 to develop a more purpose-built framework for system-led oversight. This will also include a focus on leadership across the system and the constituent organisations.

1.4 The [NHS Long Term Plan](#) (LTP) recognises that the development of individuals with the right system leadership skills is a key success factor for the development of Integrated Care Systems (ICSs). In response, in Quarter 4 of 2018-19, NHSE supported 23 systems (including CCG leaders) with seed funding to scale or kick-start place based leadership programmes, providing leaders across health, social care and voluntary sectors with the skills to lead across organisational boundaries. In 2019-20, they will continue to offer similar support as well peer-to-peer networks and specific offers for clinical leaders and ICS/STP Leaders. As we move towards implementing the ICS accountability and performance framework and begin identifying the key features of effective ICSs, there will be a greater emphasis on NHSE and NHSI regional teams supporting ICSs in a holistic, integrative way, looking across the whole system and tailoring support programs to match local development needs.

**2: PAC conclusion: *It is not clear how many CCGs there will be by 2021, or the final structure of Integrated Care Systems.***

**2: PAC recommendation: *When reporting back to us at the end of 2019, NHS England should provide an update on what it expects the structure of NHS commissioning to be by 2021. This should include: how local circumstances are being taken into account as it determines the structure of CCGs and Integrated Care Systems; an update on the expected number of CCGs; the number and configuration of Integrated Care Systems; and an estimate of the redundancy costs CCGs will incur.***

2.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Winter 2019**

2.2 The LTP sets out the basic architecture for an ICS and it is now for local systems to design and implement the detail. All sustainability and transformation partnerships (STPs) will become ICSs by April 2021, typically with one CCG per ICS and a single set of commissioning intentions. NHSE will be able to update on numbers of CCG merger applications for April 2020 when in receipt of applications later this year. A key consideration in assessing proposed CCG mergers is the ability to engage with GPs and local communities at a locality level.

2.3 Systems and CCGs are at an early stage in responding to the LTP and there are a number of variables which will determine how CCGs consolidate their functions and staff, and achieve the 20% savings in CCG administrative costs outlined in the 2019-20 Planning Guidance. It is therefore not feasible to provide an estimate of redundancy costs at this point, but NHSE will provide further information by the end of 2019.

**3: PAC conclusion: *There is a risk that CCGs will lose touch with the needs of their local populations as they commission services across larger populations.***

**3: PAC recommendation: *When reporting back to us at the end of 2019, NHS England should set out the actions it has taken to ensure that local GPs have input into CCGs' decisions and that CCGs remain focussed on the needs of local populations as they cover larger populations.***

3.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Winter 2019**

3.2 The LTP set out a clear expectation for primary care in general, and Primary Care Networks (PCNs), to have a voice in ICS decision-making, through an accountable clinical director for each PCN and representation at system level. How systems choose to implement system-level representation is their choice.



3.3 More broadly the GP contract expands upon the role Clinical Directors will play in shaping and supporting their ICS. They will help ensure the full engagement of primary care in developing and implementing local system plans to implement the LTP.

3.4 The Department and NHS England will support CCGs who wish to merge over 2019-20, and the guidance and criteria for CCG mergers has recently been revised<sup>7</sup>. Strategic, integrated commissioning capacity and capability; clinical leadership; and the ability to engage with local communities will form key elements of the criteria for approval. There is also an expectation to demonstrate that each of the existing CCGs have engaged with, and seriously considered the views of, their GP member practices, and local Healthwatch, in relation to the merger.

**4: PAC conclusion: *We are concerned that, as Integrated Care Systems develop, accountability systems will be weakened, and the performance of individual CCGs will become less transparent.***

**4: PAC recommendation: *The Department should, in its next accounting officer systems statement, expand on the current description of Integrated Care Systems and how they will be held to account for their joint decisions and responsibility for improving the health of their population.***

4.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Summer 2019**

4.2 In line with current legislation, CCGs will ultimately remain accountable for fulfilling their statutory duties and for improving their own performance. ICSs will therefore not weaken accountability or expectations of transparency for CCGs. Further, NHSE & NHSI retain their statutory regulatory responsibilities in relation to individual organisational performance, and will continue to publish annual assessments to support transparency and accountability.

4.3 The Long Term Plan set out a direction of travel which focuses less on the performance of individual entities within the health system and more on system-wide performances. Integrated Care Systems (ICSs) bring together local organisations to redesign care and improve population health, creating shared leadership and action. This will help ensure that the whole system is working together to ensure the highest quality care for patients, as well as putting the NHS on a more sustainable footing.

4.4 As set out in the Long Term Plan, legislative changes would accelerate progress but the NHS can deliver the ambitions in the LTP without legislative changes. In order to support this goal, NHSE and NHSI are developing a full ICS accountability and performance framework, which we expect to build on existing work to encourage collective accountability for financial and operational performance, including system control totals. This will consolidate the current amalgam of local accountability arrangements and provide a consistent and comparable set of performance measures. These measures will focus more on health outcomes and population health rather than activity, and will align system incentives towards proactive, preventative care.

4.5 This standardised framework creates a basis against which ICS performance can be understood, and has the double benefit of being able to identify well-performing areas and understanding exactly what intervention needs to be taken where ICS performance is below standard. ICS performance will be assessed against the ICS accountability and performance framework, and they will agree objectives with their NHSE and NHSI regional directors, which will incorporate "national and local priorities for care quality and health outcomes, reductions in inequalities, implementation of integrated care models and improvements in financial and operational performance."

4.6 The Department supports these ambitions, and once these measures are implemented, will consider how the next accounting officer systems statement can be meaningfully expanded to better describe the accountability arrangements created for Integrated Care Systems. In line with HM Treasury

<sup>7</sup> 'Procedures for clinical commissioning groups to apply for constitution change, merger or dissolution – April 2019'  
<https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/procedures-for-clinical-commissioning-groups-to-apply-for-constitution-change-merger-or-dissolution/>

guidance, this will be reviewed at the end of the 2018-19 financial year and republished should material changes to the Department's accountability arrangements have taken place. We will provide an update in summer 2019 on progress towards this recommendation.

4.7 The NHS has made proposals for legislative changes to allow commissioners and providers to create joint committees; and proposes a duty on all organisations working together in a system that promotes collaboration and integration in a consistent manner, to achieve the triple aim of better health for everyone, better care for all patients, and efficient use of NHS resources, both for their local system and for the wider NHS. The Government agrees that future legislation changes should provide appropriate accountability arrangements for ICSs and are exploring options to do so.

**5: PAC conclusion: *Delivery of the NHS Long Term Plan will be slowed without legislative changes.***

**5: PAC recommendation: *The Department should ensure that required legislative changes are developed and brought forward in a timely way so that progress on the NHS Long Term Plan is not delayed.***

5.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

**Target implementation date: Spring 2020**

5.2 The NHS has been clear that it can deliver the NHS Long Term Plan without any legislative changes, and the Government expects the NHS to make considerable progress in delivering the LTP within the existing legislative framework.

5.3 The Government has been clear that it will consider any proposals from the NHS for legislative changes that will accelerate the delivery of the LTP. The NHS has recently published its proposals<sup>8</sup> for legislation change and is currently undertaking a public engagement exercise, which is asking patients, staff, partner organisations and other interested members of the public to give their views on the proposals.

5.4 It is vital any changes have support from across the NHS, and the Department await feedback from this engagement process. The ability of the Government to bring forward legislation will also be affected by decisions made on allocating parliamentary time. The Department will keep the Committee updated on the legislative process.

---

<sup>8</sup> 'Implementing the Long Term Plan - Proposals for possible changes to legislation'  
[\[https://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/publication/implementing-the-nhs-long-term-plan\]](https://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/publication/implementing-the-nhs-long-term-plan)

# Eighty-Fourth Report of Session 2017-19

## The Bank of England

### Bank of England's central services

#### Introduction from the Committee

The Bank of England (the Bank) is responsible for monetary and financial stability in the U.K. In practice, it has a wide range of differing roles including: setting monetary policy; setting policy for financial stability; supporting financial markets; and the settlement of transactions. The Bank is primarily funded by income from interest-yielding financial assets and fees charged to bodies using its services. It receives no direct taxpayer funding or grants from government. Following the financial crisis, the Bank expanded in size and took on additional responsibilities such as the regulation of financial institutions.

The Bank had 4,202 staff in 2017–18 and cost £647 million to run. The number of staff in the Bank has more than doubled since 2011–12 when it had 1,796 full-time equivalent staff, largely because it absorbed the Prudential Regulation Authority in 2014. The Bank has committed to improving its effectiveness by 2020, focusing on the way it works and how it communicates. In 2017, the Bank introduced a headcount cap of 4,281 full-time equivalent staff and in 2018, it committed to capping its running costs at £476 million a year, excluding the cost of producing bank-notes and staff pensions. The Bank's central services are responsible for Human Resources, technology, property, procurement, security and financial management. As such they have an important role in facilitating the changes needed to enable the Bank to work more efficiently and effectively and to control costs. In 2016, the Bank of England and Financial Services Act gave the National Audit Office power to examine the way in which the Bank uses its resources. This is the first time that this Committee has been able to examine the Bank's operations.

Based on a report by the National Audit Office, the Committee took evidence, on 21 January 2019 from the Bank of England. The Committee published its report on 13 March 2019.

#### Relevant Reports

- NAO report: [Managing Bank of England's Central Services](#) - Session 2017-19 (HC 1884)
- PAC report: [Bank of England's central services](#) – Session 2017-19 (HC 1739)

#### Government responses to the Committee

The Bank has written to the Chair of the Committee to acknowledge its report and to confirm that it will write to the Committee again by the end of June 2019 with a full response to its recommendations

# Eighty-Fifth Report of Session 2017-19

## Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government / Department of Health and Social Care

### Auditing Local Government

#### Introduction from the Committee

Public bodies spending taxpayers' money are accountable for their stewardship of the resources entrusted to them. In 2017–18, 495 local authorities, local police and local fire bodies were responsible for approximately £54 billion of net revenue spending, and 442 local NHS bodies received funding from the Department of Health & Social Care of approximately £100 billion. These local bodies should account properly for their use of resources and manage themselves well. In 2017–18 local public bodies spent about £64 million on external audit, which provides independent assurance on how public money is used and accounted for.

Taxpayers expect that the auditor will be able to confirm that accounts have been properly prepared and that local bodies have arrangements to manage their business and finances. When they cannot, auditors can qualify their opinion on the accounts or their conclusion on the arrangements to secure value for money. Local auditors also have a range of additional reporting powers and duties to provide information or to prompt action in certain circumstances and are expected to use their public reporting powers to highlight failings. These are important tools for the auditor to bring attention to issues that need to be addressed as they require the body to consider and respond to the issue(s) in public.

On the basis of a report by the Comptroller and Auditor General, we took evidence from the Department of Health & Social Care, NHS England, NHS Improvement and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government on 28 January 2019 about local auditor reporting in England. We also took evidence in a preliminary session from: the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Performance Board, Worcestershire County Council; Chair of the Audit Committee, Hackney Council; Director of Finance, East Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust; and a Partner from Ernst & Young's local government and public sector division. The Committee published its report on 15 March 2019. This is the Government response to the Committee's report.

#### Relevant Reports

- NAO report: [Local auditor reporting in England 2018 – Session 2017-19 \(HC 1864\)](#)
- PAC report: [Auditing Local Government – Session 2017-19 \(HC 1738\)](#)

#### Government responses to the Committee

**1: PAC conclusion: Local auditors are identifying significant weaknesses in an increasing number of local bodies' arrangements to secure value for money, with limited consequences for the local bodies themselves. In 2017–18, more than 1 in 5 local public bodies did not have proper arrangements in place.**

**The numbers are worst for local NHS bodies such as clinical commissioning groups and hospital trusts, where local auditors qualified 38% of their conclusions in respect of value for money arrangements.**

**While most of the audited bodies who responded to the NAO's information request claim to have plans in place to address the weaknesses highlighted, only 5% could say they had fully implemented their plans. Even where local auditors use their additional reporting powers to draw the public's attention to a particular issue, this still does not always lead to immediate action.**

**Central government departments also need to do more to hold local bodies to account for their performance and management arrangements; at present there is no direct consequence of receiving a qualified report from a local auditor.**

**1: PAC recommendation: *Departments should set out, by the end of September 2019, clear expectations of how local bodies should respond to weaknesses reported by local auditors in 2018–19, including the potential consequences for local bodies who fail to improve.***

1.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

#### **MHCLG response**

##### **Target implementation date: April 2020**

1.2 The 2018-19 audit reports for most local public bodies will not be available before 30 September 2019 and will require some time to note and evaluate the weaknesses reported by local auditors over this period. Before the end of 2019, the Department will also be reviewing the local audit regime (through a Post Implementation Review (PIR) of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (2014 Act)). Since this will also consider these issues, the Department proposes to respond to the Committee's recommendation by April 2020, when the PIR is complete.

1.3 The Department is always looking for ways to help local taxpayers scrutinise their local councils and hold them to account. Councillors and statutory officers have critical roles to play in this, and the Department expects all councils to act swiftly to address any issues raised by auditors. How councils respond to issues identified through audit and any potential consequences will form part of the Post Implementation Review mentioned above. Furthermore, the National Audit Office is currently consulting on changes to the current Code of Audit practice, which may also provide an opportunity to consider whether it should include guidance on the auditor's role in checking action taken by councils in response to audit recommendations.

#### **DHSC response:**

##### **Target implementation date: September 2019**

1.4 Working in conjunction with NHS England and NHS Improvement, the Department will issue guidance to health bodies on local audit arrangements. This will include clear expectations of how local NHS bodies should respond to weaknesses reported by local auditors.

1.5 However, local audit reports rarely highlight new information and are retrospective in nature. Local bodies and their regulators will already be addressing any performance issues through well-established performance monitoring and management arrangements. These proactive arrangements ensure inadequate performance triggers consequences, resulting in actions and interventions being taken on a timely and continuous basis.

**2: PAC conclusion: *Departments are not doing enough to act on the performance information they gather and provide local bodies with an overview of issues that could help them strengthen their arrangements. Local bodies should take auditors' concerns seriously and address them promptly, but there appear to be few consequences for those who do not. Central government departments can and do gather information about the issues on which local auditors report. But when significant concerns are highlighted at individual bodies, central departments are not doing enough to make sure that local bodies take prompt corrective action, or to share learning that could help other bodies avoid the same problems.***

**2: PAC recommendation: *Departments should report by the end of September 2019 on how they have made use of the information gathered through their monitoring arrangements in 2018–19 to:***

- *identify concerns and examples of good practice for wider sharing; and*
- *challenge local bodies to demonstrate they are strengthening their arrangements.*

2.1 Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

## MHCLG Response

### Target implementation date: April 2020

2.2 As described above in response to recommendation 1, the availability of the 2018-19 audit reports and the forthcoming PIR of the 2014 Act will affect the ability to report on this recommendation in the timescale proposed by the Committee, but the Department will work with the owners of other key elements of the local audit framework and ensure that, where issues of wider concern or good practice have been identified, they are shared appropriately. The Department will also reflect on the circumstances where local bodies may be challenged to show how they are strengthening their arrangement and aim to respond once the PIR is completed in April 2020.

2.3 The level of non-standard audit reports is already monitored. For example, auditors are required to notify the Department if they issue a Public Interest Report and the Department takes account of other non-standard reports as detailed in Public Sector Audit Appointment Ltd's annual reports into the work of auditors to give it an overview of the local audit framework. The Department may also become aware of non-standard reports as part of its overarching stewardship work. The Department welcomes the news that the NAO is also planning to report on such issues in future. However, the retrospective nature of audit reports means the Department would usually already be aware of any serious audit concerns before formal auditors' recommendations are made.

## DHSC Response

### Target implementation date: September 2019

2.4 For local health bodies, monitoring arrangements for providers are codified in NHS Improvement's Single Oversight Framework and for commissioners in NHS England's Improvement and Assessment Framework. Both NHS Improvement and NHS England already have existing arrangements to identify concerns and good practice in local bodies, and to share this learning among the respective sectors and help local bodies to improve. The concerns identified by these monitoring arrangements throughout the year closely align with non-standard audit reports issued by local auditors, which are analysed when they are issued at the end of the year. As in local government, local auditors are required to notify the Department if they issue a PIR, although these are very rarely issued.

**3: PAC conclusion: *Some local bodies do not make all of the information reported by the local auditor about their performance and management readily available, weakening local transparency. Local auditors' reports provide information about the key risks that auditors have identified and how the body is addressing them, as well as independent assurance over whether the local body has properly accounted for its money and had proper arrangements in place to manage its business and finances.***

***The extent to which local bodies put information received from local auditors in the public domain varies between sectors and between individual bodies. Even where information is available, it is not always easy to locate. Central departments stated that a wide range of performance information is in the public domain, but acknowledged it can be hard for citizens to find out about what is happening inside large public bodies.***

**3: PAC recommendation: *Departments should, by the end of September 2019, set out clearly to local bodies their expectations of the information that should be made publicly available to improve transparency, including information provided by the local auditor.***

3.1 The Government agrees with this recommendation.

## MHCLG Response

### Target implementation date: September 2019

3.2 The information that local authorities should make publicly available in relation to their accounts is detailed in the Department's 2014 Open and Accountable Local Government Guide. This information is also included in the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 and the Local Government Transparency code 2015. The Local Audit (Public Access to Documents) Act 2017 also enables interested parties – including journalists and bloggers - to access accounting information so that they could compare accounts from

different authorities for use in reporting. Dependent on any recommendations made by the Post Implementation Review, or as a result of the NAO's review of the code of audit practice, the Department will consider whether more guidance is needed in terms of the language used or presentation of the information provided by auditors.

3.3 The Department will write to local authority chief executives to remind them of their legal duties in this area and current expectations of the accounting information that should be made available to the public.

### **DHSC Response**

#### **Recommendation Implemented**

3.4 Health bodies already have extensive requirements to publish information locally. HM Treasury requirements for annual reports are fully adopted for local NHS bodies, and arrangements in the NHS go further in some areas. These include, for example, the NHS Standard Contract requiring NHS providers to publish their register of interests on their website, and requirements for providers to publish service standards such as A&E waiting times data, which is then made available by NHS Digital for the wider public. NHS Improvement and NHS England further supplement these arrangements in some areas. For example, local provider accounts data is published in searchable collated format, and commissioner Improvement and Assessment Framework ratings are disclosed online via the "MyNHS" web tool.

**4: PAC conclusion: *The lack of accessible and transparent information reduces the extent to which citizens can hold local public bodies to account for their performance and management. Information that sets out publicly how well local public bodies are managing their business and finances and highlights where there are significant weaknesses helps citizens hold their local public bodies to account. If this information is difficult to locate or presented in language that is difficult for the lay-person to understand, it is less useful. Where local bodies do publish information provided by local auditors, departments accepted that it can be hard for any citizen to find it.***

**4: PAC recommendation: *Departments should, by the end of September 2019, set clear expectations of how local bodies should ensure that the information provided is accessible to all users and enables citizens to hold local bodies to account.***

4.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation

### **MHCLG Response**

#### **Target implementation date: September 2019**

4.2 As detailed above in recommendation 3 the Department will write to local authority chief executives reminding them of their legal duties and the need to ensure that the information provided is clear and accessible to all. More generally, the Department is planning to publish policy proposals to improve the openness of local authority data by December 2019 and will ensure these proposals specifically cover arrangements around accountability.

4.3 Dependent on any recommendations made by the Post Implementation Review, or as a result of the NAO's review of the code of audit practice, the Department will consider whether more is needed in terms of the language used or presentation of the information provided by auditors.

### **DHSC Response**

#### **Target implementation date: September 2019**

4.4 Working in conjunction with NHS England and NHS Improvement, the Department will reaffirm expectations of all local health bodies regarding the requirements surrounding the accessibility of published information.

**5: PAC conclusion:** *We are concerned that, as partnership working becomes more complex, accountability arrangements will be weakened, and the performance of individual local bodies will become less transparent. Local public bodies are increasingly working in partnership to provide public services and these arrangements are becoming more complex. These are often non-statutory arrangements and can involve NHS bodies (commissioners and providers), local authorities and other public or private organisations.*

*Over the last three years, concerns over partnership working arrangements have increasingly been a reason for local auditors qualifying their value for money conclusions. But local auditors can only report on the arrangements in place within the individual bodies they audit, so only provide a partial view of how a partnership is performing. Central departments currently say little in their Accountability Systems Statements about how they use information reported by local auditors.*

*It is crucial, that central departments explain in overall terms what assurance they take from local audit findings and ensure that partnership funding arrangements and lines of accountability are absolutely clear and transparent.*

**5: PAC recommendation:** *Departments should, in their next accounting officer systems statements, expand on:*

- *the use of the assurance provided by local auditors; and*
- *how they will get assurance in areas not covered by local audit, such as how partnerships are held to account for joint decisions and responsibilities.*

5.1 The Government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

#### **MHCLG Response**

##### **Target implementation date: September 2019**

5.2 Local auditors play a vital role in offering assurance both to the Department and to local taxpayers about the financial management of councils, and their arrangements to ensure public money is spent wisely. However, whilst it is an important part of the Department's monitoring and assurance framework, it is only one part of a wider accountability framework to ensure that decision making is robust and transparent, and as it is retrospective, it is not necessarily that helpful in identifying risk going forward, although it may highlight a trend of concern, either across several authorities or in a single body. Whilst the Department's Accounting Officer System Statement (AOSS) is clear on the role of audit, we will examine the current wording to ensure that it reflects the issues raised by the Committee.

5.3 The scope of audit and guidance on appropriate use of the powers comes via the NAO's Code of Audit Practice and supporting documents. The Code will be renewed in 2020, and we have already had informal discussions with the NAO about key areas of possible focus and will be responding to their recently published consultation.

5.4 We will also consider how we might best gain further assurance about risk across the wider system, such as in relation to partnership working. It is important to ensure that departments are able to account for expenditure that they are responsible for and that it is being spent effectively.

#### **DHSC Response**

##### **Target implementation date: September 2019**

5.5 DHSC will consider how the Department's Accounting Officer System Statement (AOSS) can be meaningfully expanded to better describe the accountability arrangements in these areas by September 2019. When describing the accountability framework surrounding partnership working the Statement will be clear that lines of accountability are aligned to statutory entities, with accountabilities including all activity associated with joint working. The expanded description will be included in the Department's next AOSS, which in line with HM Treasury guidance will be reviewed at the end of each financial year and republished should material changes to accountability arrangements have taken place.



## Treasury Minutes Archive<sup>9</sup>

Treasury Minutes are the Government's response to reports from the Committee of Public Accounts. Treasury Minutes are Command Papers laid in Parliament.

### Session 2017-19

Committee Recommendations: 523  
 Recommendations agreed: 474 (91%)  
 Recommendations disagreed: 49 (9%)

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
December 2017	Government response to PAC report 1	Cm 9549
January 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 2 and 3	Cm 9565
March 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 4-11	Cm 9575
March 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 12-19	Cm 9596
May 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 20-30	Cm 9618
June 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 31-37	Cm 9643
July 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 38-42	Cm 9667
October 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 43-58	Cm 9702
December 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 59-63	Cm 9740
January 2019	Government responses to PAC reports 64-68	CP 18
March 2019	Government responses to PAC reports 69-71	CP 56
April 2019	Government responses to PAC reports 72-77	CP79
May 2019	Government responses to PAC reports 78-81 and 83-85	CP97

### Session 2016-17

Committee Recommendations: 393  
 Recommendations agreed: 356 (91%)  
 Recommendations disagreed: 37 (9%)

November 2016	Government responses to PAC reports 1-13	Cm 9351
December 2016	Government responses to PAC reports 14-21	Cm 9389
February 2017	Government responses to PAC reports 22-25 and 28	Cm 9413
March 2017	Government responses to PAC reports 26-27 and 29-34 <sup>10</sup>	Cm 9429
March 2017	Government responses to PAC reports 35-41	Cm 9433
October 2017	Government responses to PAC reports 42-44 and 46-64	Cm 9505

### Session 2015-16

Committee Recommendations: 262  
 Recommendations agreed: 225 (86%)  
 Recommendations disagreed: 37 (14%)

December 2015	Government responses to PAC reports 1 to 3	Cm 9170
January 2016	Government responses to PAC reports 4 to 8	Cm 9190
March 2016	Government responses to PAC reports 9 to 14	Cm 9220
March 2016	Government responses to PAC reports 15-20	Cm 9237
April 2016	Government responses to PAC reports 21-26	Cm 9260
May 2016	Government responses to PAC reports 27-33	Cm 9270
July 2016	Government responses to PAC reports 34-36; 38; and 40-42	Cm 9323
November 2016	Government responses to PAC reports 37 and 39 (part 1)	Cm 9351
December 2016	Government response to PAC report 39 (part 2)	Cm 9389

<sup>9</sup> List of Treasury Minutes responses for Sessions 2010-15 are annexed in the Government's response to PAC Report 52

<sup>10</sup> Report 32 contains 6 conclusions only.

## Treasury Minutes Progress Reports Archive

Treasury Minutes Progress Reports are the Government's response on the implementation of recommendations from the Committee of Public Accounts. Treasury Minutes Progress Reports are Command Papers laid in Parliament.

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
January 2012	Session 2010-12: updates on 13 PAC reports	Cm 8271
July 2012	Session 2010-12: updates on 28 PAC reports	Cm 8387
February 2013	Session 2010-12: updates on 31 PAC reports	Cm 8539
July 2014	Session 2010-12: updates on 60 PAC reports Session 2012-13: updates on 37 PAC reports	Cm 8899
March 2015	Session 2010-12: updates on 26 PAC reports Session 2012-13: updates on 17 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 43 PAC reports	Cm 9034
February 2016	Session 2010-12: updates on 8 PAC reports Session 2012-13: updates on 7 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 22 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 27 PAC reports	Cm 9202
July 2016	Session 2010-12: updates on 6 PAC reports Session 2012-13: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 15 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 22 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 6 PAC reports	Cm 9320
January 2017	Session 2010-12: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2013-14: updates on 5 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 7 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 18 PAC reports	Cm 9407
October 2017	Session 2010-12: updates on 3 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 7 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 12 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 26 PAC reports Session 2016-17: updates on 39 PAC reports	Cm 9506
January 2018	Session 2010-12: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 5 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 4 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 14 PAC reports Session 2016-17: updates on 52 PAC reports	Cm 9566
July 2018	Session 2010-12: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 4 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 9 PAC reports Session 2016-17: updates on 38 PAC reports Session 2017-19: updates on 17 PAC reports	Cm 9668
March 2019	Session 2010-12: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 4 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 7 PAC reports Session 2016-17: updates on 22 PAC reports Session 2017-19: updates on 46 PAC reports <sup>11</sup>	CP70

<sup>11</sup> Contains updates on Treasury Minutes – Session 2017-19 – up to October 2018

CCS0519207474  
978-1-5286-1291-3