

# Social Security Advisory Committee Annual Report 2018-19





## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Foreword .....                                | 3  |
| About Us.....                                 | 5  |
| Summary of our advisory role in 2018-19 ..... | 6  |
| Secondary legislation.....                    | 6  |
| Independent Work Programme.....               | 7  |
| Universal Credit: managed migration.....      | 7  |
| Young people living independently.....        | 9  |
| External engagement.....                      | 10 |
| Our stakeholders.....                         | 11 |
| Stakeholder engagement.....                   | 11 |
| Understanding impact throughout the UK.....   | 12 |
| Relationship with DWP Ministers.....          | 13 |
| Committee development.....                    | 14 |

### List of annexes

- Annex 1: Regulations scrutinised by the Committee: 1 April 2018 - 31 March 2019
- Annex 2: Presentations to the Committee
- Annex 3: Universal Credit managed migration: summary of recommendations and Government response
- Annex 4: Young people living independently: summary of recommendations and Government response
- Annex 5: Committee membership during 2018-19
- Annex 6: Committee members' biographies
- Annex 7: Attendance record
- Annex 8: Fees and expenses paid to Committee members
- Annex 9: Register of Members' interests



## Foreword

Although the Social Security Advisory Committee considered just 15 sets of draft secondary legislation in this reporting year - far fewer than we would typically expect in a twelve-month period - it would be a mistake to think that we have had a quiet year!

One set of regulations that came our way, *The Universal Credit (Transitional Provisions) (Managed Migration) Amendment Regulations 2018*, dominated the agenda for most of the year. We had significant concerns about the sheer scale of the operational challenges facing the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), and also the risk of financial hardship being faced by claimants as they moved from fortnightly to monthly payments. Those concerns led to a decision to take the regulations on formal reference, requiring the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions to present both our advice, and the Government's response to our recommendations, to Parliament.

Our subsequent advice, which was informed by a record number of respondents to our public consultation, was well received by the Government with the majority of our recommendations accepted. These were recommendations that would make a tangible difference for claimants – for example the introduction of a two week run on of benefit for out of work claimants who were reliant of fortnightly benefits.

We were also pleased that the Committee's advice to Government on this occasion generated much constructive debate - both between the Committee and Government and more widely - about issues that would have an impact on millions of people. Our debate and engagement with DWP continues and we are considering ways in which we might provide timely and supportive advice to DWP on a number of remaining challenges within Universal Credit implementation.

Aside from our scrutiny of regulations, we have also spent a significant amount of our time looking in some detail at a varied set of broader issues relating to social security as part of our independent work programme. For example, over the past year we have published a report considering challenges facing young people living independently, and have been undertaking research in two other areas:

- the effectiveness of the claimant commitment in Universal Credit; and
- separated parents and the social security system.

Our research findings and recommendations will be published shortly.

## Social Security Advisory Committee



The Committee's many and varied stakeholders have again provided an invaluable source of evidence and views throughout the year. This has informed our thinking and helped to shape our advice to the Government. We look forward to developing these relationships further next year.

Finally, I would like to place on record my gratitude to my Committee colleagues for applying their considerable expertise and experience so effectively to our work. I am delighted to be part of such a strong and cohesive team.

My thanks also extend to Judith Paterson who left us at the beginning of the year to take up an appointment with the Scottish Commission on Social Security, and to our former Chair, Paul Gray CB, who stepped down in this reporting year after seven years in post. The Committee is grateful to both colleagues for their excellent contributions to the Committee's work during several years of distinguished service.

**Liz Sayce**  
**Interim Chair<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor Sir Ian Diamond, who was appointed on 1 August 2018, stepped down from the Committee on 6 August 2019 (the next reporting period) following his appointment as the National Statistician. Liz Sayce has been appointed interim Chair while the Department for Work and Pensions undertakes a recruitment exercise to appoint a permanent successor to Sir Ian.



## About Us

Established by the Social Security Act in 1980, the Social Security Advisory Committee is an independent statutory body that provides advice on social security and related matters.

The Committee's main responsibilities are to:

- perform a mandatory scrutiny of most of the proposed regulations that underpin the social welfare system on behalf both of the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions and of Parliament; and to
- provide advice and assistance to the Secretary of State, whether in response to a specific request or on the Committee's own initiative.

Advice offered formally by the Committee in relation to proposals for legislation must be published by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, along with the Government's response to our conclusions and recommendations. There is no obligation upon the Secretary of State to respond to other forms of advice from the Committee, or to act upon any of the advice we offer.

In addition to the scrutiny of proposals for legislation, the Committee has general advisory functions. For example, where resources permit, we:

- informally scrutinise regulations that are exempt from our statutory scrutiny;
- respond to public consultation exercises conducted by Government and others where we believe that we can add value;
- respond to specific requests for advice from Ministers and officials;
- undertake our own detailed studies as part of the Committee's independent work programme;
- provide comment on a range of draft guidance and communications produced by both the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC).

The Committee performs a similar role for the Department for Communities in Northern Ireland.

The Committee also has a non-statutory role offering advice to Treasury Ministers and HMRC on Tax Credits, National Insurance, Child Benefit and Guardian's Allowance.



## Summary of our advisory role in 2018-19

### Secondary legislation

During 2018-19, the Committee considered 15 packages of regulations and draft proposals covering a broad range of issues. We provided feedback and observations on each of these, including in correspondence to Ministers where we considered that appropriate.<sup>2</sup>

We concluded that one of these, *The Universal Credit (Transitional Provisions) (Managed Migration) Amendment Regulations 2018*, required a more detailed scrutiny. We therefore took them as a formal reference, undertaking a large scale public consultation to ensure that the advice we produced for the Secretary of State was well-informed and had considered the issues from a range of perspectives. Of the remaining proposals presented to the Committee:

- **two** packages of regulations had already been laid as the Secretary of State's view was that the urgency of the matter meant it was inexpedient to refer them;<sup>2</sup>
- **four** were presented under our Memorandum of Understanding with HM Revenue and Customs; and
- **six** were considered to be straightforward and non-contentious, or of a minor and technical nature, and therefore cleared by correspondence.

The final two sets of regulations were subject to our standard scrutiny arrangements in accordance with section 172 of the Social Security Administration Act 1992, with advice and feedback provided during that scrutiny process.

Our 2017-18 annual report noted that the flow of draft secondary legislation being presented to the Committee for scrutiny had slowed considerably. We identified two likely triggers for that:

- the Government had undertaken to limit the extent of further major changes to the policy framework for working age social security following the fundamental reforms initiated at the start of the decade; and
- the extent to which Parliamentary time and focus had been dominated by the UK's withdrawal from the European Union.

---

<sup>2</sup> A full list of draft regulations scrutinised by the Committee can be found at Annex 1.



Those factors have continued to influence a significant decline in the overall numbers of draft regulations submitted this year, with the volume of regulations coming our way amounting to just a quarter of the number scrutinised in 2016-17.

## Independent Work Programme

During this year the Committee, as part of its independent work programme, looked at a number of challenges facing young people living independently, presenting its advice to the Secretary of State in May 2018. It also commenced, and undertook consultation exercises on, two further research projects:

- The effectiveness of the claimant commitment in Universal Credit; and
- Separated parents and the social security system.

The Committee's findings and recommendations will be published in autumn 2019.

## Universal Credit – managed migration

Despite the lull in legislative proposals being presented to the Committee, there was one set of regulations which dominated the agenda for most of the year. DWP officials brought *The Universal Credit (Transitional Provisions) (Managed Migration) Amendment Regulations 2018*, which set out the next phase of Universal Credit roll-out, to our meeting on 20 June 2018.

The original proposal required millions of claimants on 'legacy' benefits to make a claim to Universal Credit, presenting a huge operational challenge for the Department of Work and Pensions, and potentially leaving claimants at risk of financial hardship as they moved from fortnightly to monthly payments.

Having carefully examined the Government's proposals, we recognised that the challenge facing DWP was exceptionally difficult. For example, it would be a huge logistical task to contact millions of people, who could be receiving up to four different benefits administered by three different organisations, collect any additional information needed to determine entitlement, and seamlessly terminate legacy benefit awards (with different rules and definitions) as Universal Credit awards commenced, without leaving any gaps or overlaps in entitlement.

Many of our concerns with these proposals focussed on the claims process itself and on the move to monthly payments. We argued that the migration plans should, as far as is possible, minimise the risk to claimants. The proposals presented to the Committee in June 2018 did



not do that. In fact, in some respects, it was evident that the Department had reduced its own risk by transferring it to claimants – most obviously, through the proposal to require all existing claimants to make a fresh claim for Universal Credit.

In examining each of the proposals, we considered the following questions:

- is it **deliverable**? Is it likely to work or would it be too complex or unwieldy?
- is it **explicable**? Will those affected understand it and what they must do?
- is it **proportionate** to the problem it is trying to solve?
- is it **fair**? For example, does it impose disproportionate burdens on particular groups of people?

Our recommendations focussed on those aspects of the proposals that did not meet the above criteria. In particular, calling on the Government to undertake a rigorous and transparent assessment of its operational readiness – including the potential impact on different groups of claimants – and to engage delivery partners and claimants in developing its detailed delivery plans and communications. Our recommendations also made clear that the responsibility for ensuring that claimants are moved safely onto Universal Credit should rest with the Government. We considered it particularly important that a safe transfer to Universal Credit took place for those claimants who would find on-line processes difficult or who faced other barriers to completing a new claim.

The Government responded positively to the Committee's recommendations. First the Chancellor of the Exchequer, during his Budget statement on 29 October 2018 and in line with our recommendations, made clear the Government's intention that the migration to Universal Credit should be as smooth as possible and announced that out of work claimants who were reliant upon fortnightly benefits would receive a two week run on of benefit. A week later the then Secretary of State<sup>3</sup> delivered a positive response to the majority of our remaining recommendations.<sup>4</sup>

As the Committee's advice is for the benefit of Parliament as well as the Secretary of State, we were pleased to respond positively to an invitation from the Work and Pensions Select Committee to give evidence on our report on 14 November 2018.

We subsequently scrutinised, but decided against the formal reference of, the additional provisions inserted into the draft *Universal Credit (Managed Migration Pilot and Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2019*.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Rt Hon Esther McVey MP

<sup>4</sup> A full list of recommendations and an indication of the Government response can be found at Annex 3





DWP is facing a considerable long-term challenge in ensuring the safe delivery of these proposals. We are considering how we might provide more proactive and timely advice and support to the Department on residual challenges that remain within Universal Credit. We have started to discuss with DWP colleagues where we might add most value, for example consent in Universal Credit.

## Young people living independently

For several decades, under governments of all parties, the benefit system has treated young adults less generously than other adults, particularly those who are living independently. The reasons for this approach go beyond an ambition to reduce benefit expenditure. The aims have been to discourage young adults from setting up home before they can afford to, and to avoid eroding work incentives for young people who are likely to earn less than older people.

This policy stance has a clear rationale for many young people, where there is a reasonable expectation for them to remain living in the family home as they establish themselves in the labour market. But for a significant minority of young people – for example care leavers or those subject to abuse – it is not a realistic or defensible assumption. The Committee therefore decided to examine this approach more closely to gain a better understanding of the cumulative impact of these policies on vulnerable young adults who had no choice but to live independently, and whether the protections put in place for them are working effectively.

In talking to these young people, and those who provide support to them, we found evidence of great financial difficulty, debt, and hardship amongst those who inevitably have little experience of budgeting.

During our research project, we witnessed many good examples of Jobcentre staff and voluntary organisations working with commitment, energy and imagination to help such young people into stable accommodation, training, and the early stages of a productive, working life. But despite this support, many of the young adults we spoke to were of the view that they are ‘being set up to fail’ by the way the benefit system operates.

Our report acknowledged the good practice that we observed – both in terms of policy design and operational delivery. However, we concluded that there is more that could be done to put the social security treatment of young independent adults onto a sounder footing. We also acknowledge that the benefits system should be designed to enable young people to prepare effectively for their working lives. The majority of young people have the option of living with their parents or other relatives until they have resources to live independently. But our research found that there is a significant section of young people who have no choice but to live independently. Multiple factors make living conditions hard for this group, including the limited supply of available, affordable housing; increased incidence of mental health problems;



benefit delays and budgeting problems; and increased frequency of insecure work. Much of this cannot be tackled by DWP alone. But in this environment, we argued that DWP needs to augment its support offer to help enable vulnerable young claimants to move into, and remain in, paid work.

Our recommendations were designed to improve the experience of, and create more positive outcomes for, independent young people on benefits – without undermining the objective of successive governments to avoid encouraging independent living where young people do have a genuine choice.<sup>5</sup> These include: reviewing benefit and Local Housing Allowance rates against what is affordable and available, increasing the generosity of housing support for some young care leavers, improving access to emergency funds, offering more flexible benefit payment options, implementing measures that will lead to reduced use of sanctions, and trialling youth specialist work coaches or advisors. We are of the view that taken together, these actions would ensure that young people are able to afford essentials, find safe housing, and build a positive relationship with the Jobcentre, ultimately enabling better access to work.

While we had a constructive dialogue with the Department at senior levels both during and after our review was completed, we were disappointed that the Department did not feel able to address some of the evidence we found of financial hardship among this cohort of young people, and a need for a range of specific measures to support this vulnerable group to become confident and successful adults. For example, we take the view that rejecting our proposal to trial youth specialist advisors to support work coaches in their interactions with young people with particularly complex needs is an opportunity missed. This and other enhancements to the front-line service would not only build the capacity but crucially reinforce the very positive behaviours we observed among some highly dedicated and passionate work coaches who care deeply about and support this group of young people who have faced a tough start to their lives.

## External engagement

It is a priority for this Committee that our advice is well-informed, evidence-based and that it takes account of a wide range of perspectives – including that of claimants and taxpayers. Our network of stakeholders on whose experience and expertise we draw, contains over 500 organisations and bodies representing a wide spectrum of interests and insights. This includes policy-makers, think tanks, local authorities, employers, voluntary sector organisations representing and/or serving the interests of claimants, and academia drawn from England, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales. Their input to our work is greatly valued.

---

<sup>5</sup> A full list of recommendations can be found at annex 4



Maintaining such contacts, cultivating new ones and continuing to forge dynamic ongoing relationships is an important priority for the Committee. For example, in 2018-19 we were delighted to receive requests from both New Zealand's Minister for Social Development (Hon Carmel Sepuloni) and the UN Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights (Philip Alston) to discuss issues of mutual interest.

In line with many other organisations, we consider it important to be transparent about our work. Our reports, correspondence with Ministers, minutes of meetings, and responses to Freedom of information requests are all published on our [website](#). We also endeavour to keep interested parties up to date with developments through regular stakeholder meetings, blogs by Committee members and via our twitter account ([@The\\_SSAC](#)). We are also transparent about the costs associated with delivering our work. This report sets out, at annex 6, the fees and expenses claimed by Committee members during 2018-19.

## Our stakeholders

### *Stakeholder engagement*

We have moved away from our traditional stakeholder engagement, which typically involved two large set piece events each year, to ensure that we have more timely, relevant and tailored conversations. These may take the form of roundtable discussions, workshops or visits.

For example, in order to inform our report on the draft legislation enabling the Universal Credit Managed Migration project, we wanted to scratch beneath the surface of some of the issues highlighted in the responses to our consultation exercise. We therefore arranged a number of workshops for policy experts; for those who provide support direct to claimants; and for organisations who have an operational interest in implementation (in particular local authorities). We also visited charities specialising in helping people with mental health issues in recognition of the particular challenges facing that group leading to a potential risk that individuals in this group could face a substantially reduced amount of benefit for a prolonged period of time. We listened directly to the experience and views of claimants, which was invaluable. The Committee values the opportunity to hear about the experiences and concerns of those directly impacted by proposals – whether as a claimant, adviser or someone involved in its delivery (including work coaches).



Consequently, we met with representatives from Mind as well as claimants who are supported by the charity. Mind was a conspicuous contributor to our consultation exercise, and many of the individual comments we received from claimants or their appointed representatives came because they had been encouraged to do so by Mind. We also visited Headway – a charity specialising in providing support to people with brain injuries. What we heard and discussed reached beyond the strict parameters of the Universal Credit managed migration project, touching on many wider issues. We learned, for example, of the impact DWP staff can have, often unknowingly – both positively or negatively – by their manner and tone. We also heard from claimants who felt that work coaches responded differently if they were seeking to support a claimant whose impairment was clearly visible. Some claimants feel that, because they have an ‘invisible’ condition, some members of staff may question their credibility. There is a belief that those with a highly visible physical impairment have one less barrier to confront.

## Understanding impact throughout the UK

We also consider it important to have a strong understanding of the impact of the UK government’s welfare policies in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales where different challenges and opportunities may exist. We therefore ensure that regular stakeholder engagement takes place. This engagement is normally led by the Committee member who has been appointed to represent the interests of that nation, however each year we endeavour to additionally undertake a Committee visit to one of them.

In 2019, we visited Scotland, meeting staff based at the main site of Social Security Scotland in Dundee – the Executive Agency responsible for delivery of eleven payments transferring from DWP to the Scottish Government. Officials from the Agency explained how the legally-enshrined principles of dignity and respect, raising take-up and contributing to poverty reduction were being put into practice. The Scottish Government had, under devolved powers, begun the process of taking responsibility for benefit provision, starting with the Carers Allowance Supplement and the Best Start Grant. This process is set to accelerate in the future.

During our visit we also travelled to Edinburgh to meet Shirley-Anne Somerville MSP who serves as Cabinet Secretary for Social Security and Older People, Scottish Government officials and Members of the Scottish Parliament’s Social Security Committee. While there was a general consensus that much had been achieved in less than a year since the enabling legislation had been passed, at the same time there was a recognition that some of the biggest tests still lie ahead – for example, designing an assessment and redeterminations system for the Scottish replacement for the Personal Independence Payment.



The Committee's visit to Scotland concluded with a meeting with Sally Witcher, the Chair of the Scottish Commission on Social Security (ScoSS). The Commission will take on a similar scrutiny role for Scottish regulations as well as having an oversight role on how the system is faring and a reporting relationship to the Scottish Parliament. While our remits are clear and distinct, we welcome SCoSS as a new peer and look forward to building a strong and effective working relationship. This process will be helped by the fact that former Committee member, Judith Paterson, has been appointed to ScoSS.

In summary, given the scale and complexity of the change being managed, much of what we observed in Scotland was encouraging and we would urge both the UK and Scottish Governments to further strengthen their collaborative working.

## Relationships with DWP ministers

The Committee's primary role, as set out in statute, is to provide advice to the Secretary of State, therefore a constructive relationship with the DWP's ministerial team is important. In recent years we have played our part in building a robust and candid relationship with Ministers, in keeping with the Committee's status as an independent expert adviser. That relationship had been strengthened during the relative stability of the Ministerial team in successive governments since 2010. Although we have experienced a greater amount of churn in both Secretaries of State and the Committee's sponsor Ministers over the past couple of years, the strong foundation of mutual trust and respect that has been built between Ministers and Committee members in recent years has served us well in the development of relationships as new Ministerial appointments are made.

We are particularly grateful to the Ministerial team for their willingness to engage with the Committee on a frequent basis, whether that be private keep in touch meetings with our Chair, or informal private sessions with the full Committee. This serves to help gain understanding of the respective roles played by both sides, and establish the reputation of the Committee as a trusted adviser which strives to provide constructive and supportive advice.

In the absence of a Minister for Communities in Northern Ireland, we have worked closely with officials in the Department for Communities on all appropriate social security matters.



## Committee development

The Committee reflects on its performance, and seeks to identify lessons learned, on a regular basis. For example:

- additionally, after each of our main projects have been completed, Committee members are invited to provide feedback on what aspects of the work has gone well and to identify areas for improvement. This feedback covers all aspects of the project and its outputs;
- the Committee sets aside time at least once a year to reflect on our priorities, performance, and underpinning governance arrangements. These discussions may be informed by effectiveness reviews, and/or a skills audit;
- officials who attend SSAC meetings to present draft proposals to the Committee are invited to provide feedback (anonymously) on their experience. The feedback received is reviewed at the Committee's following meeting to ascertain whether there are any practical ways we can improve the scrutiny process;
- our DWP Partnership colleagues undertake an annual 360-degree feedback exercise with key colleagues in DWP, HMRC and other relevant departments (including devolved administrations). The outcomes are reviewed and discussed during our Chair's annual review with the Department; and
- the Department also undertakes an Annual Assurance Assessment of the Committee, and any issues identified as part of that process would be considered by the Committee.

We seek to ensure that our knowledge of relevant policies, and the delivery of them, remains as up-to-date as possible by arranging presentations from officials and visits to operational sites.

Although our resources are limited, we are also determined to deliver as professional a service as possible on all aspects of our work. With that in mind, we have started to look to other similar sized organisations, or other bodies with similar independent advisory roles, to determine what learning and best practice we can embed within our business. For example, in 2018-19 we were particularly grateful to a number of communications professionals who provided advice and shared their expertise with us.

## Annex 1: Regulations scrutinised by the Committee: 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019

### A DWP Regulations

(1) The following set of regulations was taken on formal reference by the Committee in accordance with section 172(1) of the Social Security Administration Act 1992:

- The Universal Credit (Transitional Provisions) (Managed Migration) Amendment Regulations 2018

Following the Committee's report, the Government decided to divide the regulations into two – the Universal Credit (Transitional Provisions) (SDP Gateway) Amendment Regulations 2019 and the Universal Credit (Managed Migration Pilot and Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2019. The Universal Credit (Transitional Provisions) (SDP Gateway) Amendment Regulations 2019 consisted of identical provisions in relation to the Severe Disablement Premium and did not therefore come back to the Committee. The Universal Credit (Managed Migration Pilot and Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2019, on the other hand, contained provisions substantially different from the previous version and were re-submitted to the Committee. On that occasion the Committee decided not to take the re-worked version on formal reference.

(2) The following set of regulations was not referred to the Committee because it appeared to the Secretary of State to be inexpedient to do so by reason of urgency (section 173(1)(a) of the Social Security Administration Act 1992). When the regulations were subsequently presented to the Committee for retrospective scrutiny, the Committee decided that they should not be formally referred in accordance with section 173(2) of the Social Security Administration Act 1992.

- The Universal Credit (Restriction on Amounts for Children and Qualifying Young Persons) (Transitional Provisions) Amendment Regulations 2019 (SI 2019/27)

(3) The following sets of regulations were scrutinised at one of our monthly meetings where it was decided that they should *not* be formally referred to the Committee in accordance with section 173(1)(b) of the Social Security Administration Act 1992:

- The Universal Credit and Jobseeker's Allowance (Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2018 (SI 2018/1129)
- The Social Security (Treatment of Arrears of Benefit) Regulations 2018 (SI 2018/932)
- The Universal Credit (Managed Migration Pilot and Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2019
- The Child Support (Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2019

(4) The following sets of regulations were scrutinised by the Committee by post. In each case it was decided that the regulations did not need to be referred to the Committee:

## Social Security Advisory Committee

- The Social Security (Claims and Payments) (Social Fund Maternity Grant) (Amendment) Regulations 2018 (SI 2018/989)
- The Social Security Benefits Up-rating Regulations 2019 (SI 2019/552)

### **B Northern Ireland Regulations**

- (1) The following set of regulations was scrutinised at one of our monthly meetings where it was decided that they should *not* be formally referred to the Committee in accordance with section 150(1)(b) of the Social Security Administration (Northern Ireland) Act 1992:
  - The Social Security (Income-related Benefits) (Amendment) Regulations (NI) 2019 (SR 2019/23)
- (2) The following set of regulations was not referred to the Committee because it appeared to the Department for Communities to be inexpedient to do so by reason of urgency (section 150(1)(a) of the Social Security Administration (Northern Ireland) Act 1992). When the regulations were subsequently presented to the Committee for retrospective scrutiny, the Committee decided that they should not be formally referred in accordance with section 150(2) of the Social Security Administration (Northern Ireland) Act 1992.
  - The Social Fund and Income-related Benefits (Miscellaneous Amendments & Savings) Regulations (NI) 2018 (SR 2018/192)
- (3) The following set of regulations was scrutinised by the Committee by post. The Committee decided that the regulations did not require formal reference:
  - The Social Security (Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2018 (SR 2018/149)

### **C HMRC Regulations**

- (1) Draft regulations coming to the Committee from HMRC in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding and scrutinised at a meeting were as follows:
  - The Child Tax Credit (Amendment) Regulations 2018 (SI 2018/1130)
- (2) Draft regulations coming to the Committee from HMRC in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding and scrutinised by post were as follows:
  - The Child Benefit, Tax Credits and Childcare Payments (Section 67 Immigration Act 2016 Leave) (Amendment) Regulations 2018 (SI 2018/788)
  - The Tax Credits, Child Benefit and Childcare (Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2019 (SI 2019/364)
  - The Tax Credits and Child Trust Fund (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (SI 2019/713)



## Annex 2: Presentations to the Committee

- Professor Peter Dwyer (University of York) - Welfare Conditionality
- National Audit Office - Universal Credit
- Equality and Human Rights Commission - Cumulative Impact of Tax and Welfare Reforms
- Social Metrics Commission - measuring poverty
- DWP - Universal Credit Full Service Evaluation
- National Audit Office – Motability scheme
- Office for Budget Responsibility – Welfare Trends Report 2019

## Annex 3: Universal Credit managed migration: recommendations

Our recommendations on transitional protection and on lowering the risks in the migration process are set out below.

### Operational Readiness

1. We recommend that, **before the testing phase of the managed migration process commences**, the Department should **publicly define** what it considers good operational readiness to be. It should then undertake a rigorous and transparent **assessment** of whether it has met those criteria (and, if not, what challenges remain). In undertaking this assessment, due consideration should be given to how effectively Universal Credit is currently operating, taking account of the evidence available after the completion of the first phase of the roll-out programme at the end of this calendar year. [RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED IN PRINCIPLE]
  
2. We also recommend that:
  - the Department work more closely with local authorities, housing associations, advice giving and other organisations in developing its detailed plans; [RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED]
  
  - an initial stage of testing should cover a range of different practical ways of moving people onto Universal Credit; [RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED]
  
  - ‘dummy runs’ featuring claims in a cross-section of claimant scenarios – including those identified in vulnerable situations – should be evaluated with necessary adjustments being made before actual migration begins;<sup>6</sup> [RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED IN PRINCIPLE]
  
  - the **test and learn phase** should prioritise developing strategies for identifying and supporting those who might **find it more challenging**. These might include young people living independently, homeless people, and people who have communication or cognitive difficulties; [RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED]
  
  - the test and learn phase should also allow for **fundamental changes** to be made to the structure of the policy if the evidence led to the conclusion that it was necessary, for example being prepared to change the requirement to make a claim if the evidence shows its effects are negative and loads unreasonable risks on the claimant; [RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED] and

---

<sup>6</sup> Dummy runs should include trialling processes, including invitation letters, with real claimants (obviously with their consent) but without actually moving them onto Universal Credit.

- *the Department should explore **all potential options for communications** needed for this exercise, including text messages, telephone calls, home visits and advertising campaigns. All forms of communication should be tested against claimants from segmented groups and/or their representatives. Arrangements should also be put in place to ensure that claimants with disabilities receive information in the format that they need.*  
[RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED]

### Publishing an Impact Assessment

We do not believe that the impact of the changes on this huge and diverse group of people is fully explored or explained.

3. *We recommend that, by the end of March 2019, the Department publish a **detailed impact assessment of the migration plans**, setting out the ways in which, and the extent to which, they may have an impact on claimants and/or their family members. We believe that such an assessment should be conducted by segmenting those migrated on the basis of **protected characteristics**, as well as by other key experiences such as homelessness, lone parenthood and existing legacy benefit entitlement. The assessment should extend to any impact on local authorities and third sector bodies. An **action plan for mitigating the effects of any adverse impacts** identified should be published alongside the assessment.*  
[RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED IN PRINCIPLE]

### Transferring Claims

A key feature of the Department's proposals is that everyone is asked to make a new claim. This is not managed migration as many people had expected. We are of the strong view that **the responsibility for ensuring that claimants are migrated safely to Universal Credit rests with the Government.**

4. *We therefore recommend that the Department conduct a careful segmented analysis of the claimant groups who will be manage migrated so that any scope for dispensing with the need for a claim can be identified and acted upon. This analysis should be published. Where a claim for Universal Credit is unavoidable, we recommend that the Department pre-populates as much of the digital claim form as possible. **Claimants should not be expected to produce data that the Department already holds, particularly if it is information that has been verified and is unlikely to have changed.** The Department should also make the claiming process simpler, for example by removing the requirement for people to attend interviews in cases where there are no work-related requirements and so no need to add to the claimant commitment, or where identity has already been established.* [GOVERNMENT HAS AGREED TO EXPLORE OPTIONS]

## Social Security Advisory Committee

### Implicit Consent

The move to explicit consent in Universal Credit appears to be affecting the ability of welfare rights workers, family members and other advocates to help claimants. At the same time, the Department has clear responsibilities to safeguard personal data which we are told are constantly under attack.

- 5. We recommend that the concept of 'implicit consent' which applies in legacy benefits should be extended to Universal Credit, but with appropriate safeguards in place to ensure that personal data held by the Department are not compromised.** *This Committee is keen to work with the Department and other interested parties to identify what those safeguards should be. This work should be completed, and conclusions published, by the end of March 2019. [GOVERNMENT HAS AGREED TO EXPLORE OPTIONS IN COLLABORATION WITH SSAC]*

### Defective Claims

The Department proposes that people can only make one claim to Universal Credit if they are to retain transitional protection. However, there are a range of reasons why a claim might not work and the claimant has to reclaim. **If a claimant is able to make a successful claim within the time limits, we believe transitional protection should apply.**

- 6. We recommend that the Department omit the rule that making a defective claim prevents transitional protection in a subsequent successful claim for Universal Credit. [RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED]*

### Alternative Methods of Claiming

Digital inclusion is important and beneficial to claimants, however we are not at the point yet where digital capability has reached near universal coverage among all customer groups nor all parts of the country. The Department, therefore, needs to demonstrate **greater flexibility in supporting claimants who have difficulty with managing digital engagement.**

- 7. We recommend the Department actively publicises and gives greater prominence to the availability of alternative methods of claiming Universal Credit. Those who find it very difficult to manage the digital method of claiming Universal Credit should be **pro-actively offered the option of making their claim by telephone.** And for those who would find it difficult to make either a digital or telephone claim, the option of taking a claim during a home visit should also be pro-actively offered. In those cases where the Department has identified that someone has found the digital process difficult, they should work with the claimant to provide ongoing support for digital management of their Universal Credit award. [RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED]*

Mitigating the effect of missing the deadline

The Department proposes that claimants who do not respond within one month to their invitation letter will lose their entitlement to benefit unless the delay was a consequence of a 'prescribed category'. The Committee accepts that for some claimants there has to be a trigger point which will prompt them to respond, however the proposal as it stands again transfers risks to claimants. We think these can be ameliorated without putting the overall migration at risk.

8. We recommend that the Department put in place **protection for those who miss their deadline date and who do not qualify for the one month backdating rule in Universal Credit**. There are various technical possibilities for such a safety net, but we are drawn to two in particular that we recommend the Department explores further:

(i) adopting tax credit practice, by establishing a **grace period** after the legacy benefit award has been terminated, where the claim for Universal Credit can be made without having to show good cause for backdating; or

(ii) suspending payment of the legacy benefit for a period pending receipt of the claim for Universal Credit, without terminating entitlement to legacy benefit so that arrears of the legacy benefit can be paid to an individual when they have made their claim.

[RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED OPTION (i)]

Gap to the first payment of Universal Credit

We do not believe that out of work claimants whose circumstances have not changed, and who may be completely reliant on benefits paid fortnightly, should bear the risks of the Government's policy that Universal Credit be paid monthly. **The Government is, in effect, offering them a choice between financial hardship as they wait for their first payment, or getting into debt by requesting an advance payment. We do not believe that this is acceptable.**

9. We strongly recommend that the Department review what steps it can take to mitigate the effects of its policy. **Our preference is that out of work benefits should automatically run-on for two weeks**, as Housing Benefit now does. If the Government cannot accept this, then **repayment terms for any advance should be more flexible than the current arrangements**, in recognition of the fact that it is the Government that has put claimants in the situation of needing a loan. [RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED]

### Transitional Protection (TP)

The Committee recognises that the Department has given careful consideration to its proposals on transitional protection. However we are of the view that there are a number of issues that require further attention.

Firstly, the arrangements for some of the people who have savings over £16,000. This group would not normally be entitled to Universal Credit but some receiving tax credits do have savings above this limit. The

Department's transitional protection proposals will allow them to receive Universal Credit for a year. However a consequence is that they will also become entitled to support for their housing costs which might mean that they will receive more in Universal Credit than would have been the case in tax credits, only to lose all entitlement after twelve months.

10. *We recommend that the Department should not allow former tax credit claimants with capital over £16,000 to temporarily receive a higher Universal Credit amount than they were previously getting, simply because their housing costs are now included in their award. We are of the firm view that, **whilst transitional protection should ensure claimants do not receive less under Universal Credit than they received under legacy benefits, it should not lead to them receiving more than their entitlement under legacy benefits.** We suggest that claimants in such circumstances be treated as having no housing costs. [RECOMMENDATION REJECTED]*

We were also concerned about the treatment of people with fluctuating earnings who stand to lose transitional protection if their income takes them off Universal Credit for four months.

11. *We recommend that **no-one whose earnings take them off Universal Credit should lose Transitional Protection unless their earnings have been above the Universal Credit threshold for six consecutive months – not the Government's proposal of four.** [GOVERNMENT AGREED TO SEEK FURTHER EVIDENCE]*

Finally, the Government's challenge in meeting its commitment for people receiving tax credits is particularly difficult. There are a number of different ways in which it can be achieved. We felt that this was an area that required more evidence.

12. *The Department should also, ahead of the Parliamentary debates on these affirmative regulations, publish some worked examples of tax credit claimants with changes in circumstances (particularly in relation to earnings and patterns of working) which have and have not been reported to HMRC, showing how the total legacy amount is calculated. We would like to be assured that the method of calculating this amount achieves the Government's commitment that there will be no cash losers for existing claimants when Universal Credit is implemented. [RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED IN PRINCIPLE]*

## Annex 4: Young People Living Independently - recommendations

The full set of recommendations set out in the Committee's report are that the Department for Work and Pensions should:

1. Ensure every young person aged under 25 is proactively offered a choice about whether their housing-related benefits are paid directly to their landlord or into their own bank account, and about whether Universal Credit is paid to them fortnightly or monthly. *[RECOMMENDATION REJECTED]*
2. Place a duty on Jobcentre work coaches to inform young people about all available grants and funds. Consider ring-fence funds to provide additional support towards work-related costs, such as buying equipment or work-specific clothing, or travelling to and from work. *[DWP PARTIALLY AGREED WITH RECOMMENDATION]*
3. Change the application of sanctions for young people living independently via a number of adjustments to the sanction process to decrease the risk of inappropriate sanctioning.
  - a. First, before referring to a decision maker, increase the number of attempts at contacting the young person (trailing six attempts) to understand why they did not comply, and ensure these attempts are made over at least two days and via multiple channels (e.g., phone call, text, email); *[DWP DID NOT AGREE SIX ATTEMPTS SHOULD BE MADE, BUT AGREED ALL REASONABLE ATTEMPTS SHOULD BE MADE TO MAKE CONTACT]*
  - b. Second, ensure that any known support workers for vulnerable young people are contacted before a decision is made – to understand any attenuating issues; *[RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED]*
  - c. Third, trial a 'yellow card' system whereby the first instance of non-compliance results in a clearly explained warning; *[RECOMMENDATION REJECTED]* and
  - d. Fourth, test the current communication materials used in the sanctions process with independent young people themselves. They should adjust those materials based on the feedback. *[RECOMMENDATION ACCEPTED]*
4. Trial both youth specialist work coaches and also specialist advisors who support work coaches in their interactions with young people with complex needs – focusing first on those living independently. This should be evaluated, and rolled out more widely if successful. *[RECOMMENDATION REJECTED]*
5. Exempt care leavers from the Shared Accommodation Rate and the under-occupancy penalty until they reach age 25. *[DWP TO KEEP UNDER REVIEW]*

## Social Security Advisory Committee

6. Monitor the numbers of 16 to 24-year olds living independently who are eligible for but not in receipt of benefit. Tackle the barriers to claiming the benefits to which they are entitled and receiving the support they might need. *[RECOMMENDATION REJECTED]*
7. Publish evidence demonstrating the affordability of basic living costs for a young person living independently on benefits and take action if these rates are not enough to cover essential living costs. *[RECOMMENDATION REJECTED]*
8. Publish evidence on the affordability and availability of housing for young people at the Shared Accommodation Rate in every Broad Market Rental Area, and take action where affordability is too low. *[DWP ACCEPTS WHAT RECOMMENDATION IS PROPOSING, BUT BELIEVES IT IS ALREADY DOING THIS SO REJECTS NEED TO DO MORE AT THIS STAGE]*



## Annex 5: Committee Membership during 2018-19

### Committee Membership

Paul Gray CB (*Chair*)<sup>7</sup>

Sir Ian Diamond (*Chair*)<sup>8</sup>

Bruce Calderwood

David Chrimes

Carl Emmerson

Chris Goulden

Phil Jones

Jim McCormick

Gráinne McKeever

Dominic Morris

Seyi Obakin OBE

Judith Paterson<sup>9</sup>

Charlotte Pickles

Liz Sayce OBE<sup>10</sup>

Victoria Todd

### Committee Secretariat<sup>11</sup>

Denise Whitehead (*Committee Secretary*)

Nishan Jeyasingam

Paul Mackrell

---

<sup>7</sup> Paul Gray stood down on 31 July 2018

<sup>8</sup> Sir Ian Diamond appointed 1 August 2018

<sup>9</sup> Judith Paterson stood down 31 January 2019

<sup>10</sup> Vice-Chair

<sup>11</sup> As at 31 March 2019

### Annex 6: Committee Members' Biographies<sup>12</sup>

#### Sir Ian Diamond

Professor Sir Ian Diamond took over the role as the Committee's chair in August 2018. Sir Ian was the Principal and Vice Chancellor of the University of Aberdeen until 31 July 2018. He currently holds the following non-executive roles:

- Chair of Plan International UK
- Chair of Department for International Development (DFID) Research Advisory Group
- Chair, Independent Commission on the College of the Future
- Chair of British Universities and Colleges Sport
- Chair of Edinburgh College of Further Education
- Chair, Council for Mathematical Sciences
- Chair of the Audit Committee, Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS)
- Board Member, UK Research and Innovation
- Board Member, UK Statistics Authority
- Board Member, Lancaster University
- Trustee, Population Investigation Committee

#### Bruce Calderwood

Bruce is a trustee of the Avenues Group, a charity specialising in supporting people with complex needs. He was for many years a senior official in DWP in a wide range of roles. He ended his civil service career as the director in the Department of Health responsible for policy on mental health, disability and equality. In this role he led the team which created the 2010 to 2015 coalition government's mental health strategy and its review of services for learning disabled people following the Winterbourne View scandal. He has been an instructor in Mental Health First Aid for the Armed Forces Community. He is currently the chair of Avenues South East, a charity which supports people with learning difficulties and autism. He is also a Specialist Adviser to the Care Quality Commission.

#### David Chrimes

David has been a practising barrister for over 25 years, currently as a Crown Advocate in the Crown Prosecution Service. In more recent years, he has developed expertise in employee representation, as a trade union representative. He is a member of the First Division Association (FDA) trade union's Executive Committee, where he chairs its Equality and Organising Committees. He has previously been a member of the Trades Union Congress (TUC) Disabled Workers Committee. David is the Social Security Advisory Committee's representative of workers. He is also a judge of the First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber).

---

<sup>12</sup> Members as at 31 March 2019

### **Carl Emmerson**

Carl is Deputy Director of the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS). He is an editor of the annual IFS Green Budget, and his research includes analysis of the UK public finances and the design of the tax and benefit system, in particular relating to state and private pensions. He has previously served as a specialist adviser to the House of Commons Work and Pensions Select Committee.

### **Chris Goulden**

Chris is Deputy Director of Evidence and Impact at the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in York. He is a former social researcher at the Home Office and Cabinet Office. Chris has also been a cancer researcher in the NHS, a member of the UK Commission for Employment and Skills Policy Expert Group and a member of the Social Research Association Board. He has a master's degree in social research methods from South Bank University.

### **Phil Jones**

Phil has been the Director of Prince's Trust Cymru since June 2016. Previously he was the Wales Area Manager for The Royal British Legion during the time of the charity's transformation. Before that, he served in the Armed Forces for over 25 years as an officer in the Royal Welsh. Phil represents the interests of Wales business in the Committee's business.

### **Dr Jim McCormick**

Jim is Associate Director for Scotland with the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and an advisory board member to Business in the Community (BITC) Scotland. In 2017 the Scottish Government appointed Jim as chair of the independent Disability and Carers' Benefits Expert Advisory Group. He was previously a member of the Commission on Local Tax Reform and Director of the Scottish Council Foundation (SCF), an independent think-tank. Jim represents the interests of Scotland in the Committee's business.

### **Prof Gráinne McKeever**

Gráinne is a Professor of Law and Social Justice at Ulster University and teaches social security law and policy to undergraduate and postgraduate law students. She is an executive director and former chair of the Law Centre, Northern Ireland, a not-for-profit specialist advice organisation. Gráinne has published widely in the areas of social security law and access to justice and is the assistant editor of the Journal of Social Security Law. She is also the Co-director of Ulster University's Law Clinic, through which postgraduate law students provide employment and social security advocacy for members of the public. She is the Northern Ireland representative on the Committee.

## Social Security Advisory Committee

### Dominic Morris

Dominic has advised senior decision makers and military commanders in strategy and change management on welfare's frontline and in war zones. His passion for welfare reform is a deeply personal one. Serious illness forced Dominic to give up flying in the RAF. Living with chronic pain, he started his work in the welfare system with the Prince's Trust and Millennium Volunteers getting young people back in to work. Such was the effect on him that he stood for Parliament, advocating the need to get welfare reforms right in order to get more young people into work and tackle the disability employment gap.

### Seyi Obakin OBE

Seyi is the Chief Executive of Centrepoin, a leading national charity working with young people who have experienced homelessness. He is a chartered accountant and has worked in corporate banking and a wide range of social housing provision. He has also been involved in research and inquiries into family life and the support families need, lifelong literacy and youth enterprise. Seyi is currently a Non-executive Director of HM Prison and Probation Service.

### Charlotte Pickles

Charlotte (Charlie) Pickles is Director at *Reform*. She was previously *Reform's* Deputy Director and Head of Research. Prior to returning to *Reform*, Charlie was Managing Editor at UnHerd.com, the comment and current affairs site.

Charlie has worked in a variety of roles covering working-age welfare and pension reform, criminal justice, poverty and social exclusion, and service delivery. During the Coalition Government she was Expert Adviser to Rt Hon Iain Duncan Smith MP, then Secretary of State for Work and Pensions. Before that she was Policy Director at the Centre for Social Justice. Charlie has also spent time working as a management consultant in the public sector practice of a global consultancy firm. Charlie is also a member of the NHS Assembly.

### Liz Sayce OBE

Liz is the Committee's vice-chair. She was the Chief Executive of Disability Rights UK until 31 May 2017, leading work to achieve equal participation for all, through programmes on independent living, career opportunities and shifts in cultural attitudes and behaviour. With a background in mental health and disability policy, previous roles include Director of Policy and Communications at the Disability Rights Commission and Policy Director of Mind. Liz led an [independent review into disability employment programmes](#) for government in 2011 and has published widely on mental health, disability and social participation. Liz is also a Non-Executive Director of the Care Quality Commission, a member of the committee of [Healthwatch England](#) and a member of the Disability Advisory Committee of the Equality and Human Rights Commission. She chairs a Commission on Equality in Mental Health, convened by the Centre for Mental Health.

## Victoria Todd

Victoria is Head of the Low Incomes Tax Reform Group (LITRG) team which is part of the Chartered Institute of Taxation. In that role she oversees LITRG's work across a range of tax and associated social security issues. Victoria also leads LITRG's work on tax credits, Universal Credit and childcare. She is a member of the Association of Tax Technicians and a fellow of the Chartered Institute of Taxation. Victoria is also a fee-paid First-tier Tribunal (Social Entitlement Chamber) Judge.

## Social Security Advisory Committee

### Annex 7: Attendance Record<sup>13</sup>

| Name              | April 2018 | June 2018 | July 2018 | September 2018 | November 2018 | December 2018 | January 2019 | March 2019 |
|-------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|------------|
| Paul Gray         | ✓          | ✓         | ✓         |                |               |               |              |            |
| Sir Ian Diamond   |            |           |           | ✓              | X             | ✓             | ✓            | ✓          |
| Bruce Calderwood  | ✓          | ✓         | ✓         | ✓              | ✓             | ✓             | ✓            | ✓          |
| David Chrimes     | ✓          | ✓         | ✓         | ✓              | ✓             | ✓             | ✓            | X          |
| Carl Emmerson     | ✓          | ✓         | ✓         | ✓              | ✓             | ✓             | ✓            | ✓          |
| Chris Goulden     | ✓          | ✓         | X         | ✓              | ✓             | X             | ✓            | ✓          |
| Phil Jones        | X          | X         | X         | ✓              | X             | ✓             | ✓            | ✓          |
| Jim McCormick     | ✓          | ✓         | X         | ✓              | ✓             | X             | ✓            | ✓          |
| Grainne McKeever  | X          | X         | X         | ✓              | X             | ✓             | ✓            | ✓          |
| Dominic Morris    | ✓          | X         | ✓         | ✓              | ✓             | ✓             | X            | ✓          |
| Seyi Obakin       | ✓          | ✓         | X         | ✓              | ✓             | ✓             | X            | ✓          |
| Judith Paterson   | X          | ✓         | ✓         | ✓              | ✓             | ✓             | ✓            |            |
| Charlotte Pickles | ✓          | ✓         | X         | ✓              | ✓             | ✓             | ✓            | X          |
| Liz Sayce         | ✓          | ✓         | ✓         | X              | ✓             | ✓             | ✓            | ✓          |
| Victoria Todd     | ✓          | ✓         | ✓         | ✓              | ✓             | ✓             | ✓            | X          |

<sup>13</sup> No formal Committee meetings took place in May, August and October 2018 and February 2019

## Annex 8: Fees and Expenses

| Member            | Travel    |               |         |                      |           | Subsistence   | Fees                | Total     |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------|---------|----------------------|-----------|---|---------------------|-----------|
|                   | Air       | Rail/<br>tube | Taxi    | Car & car<br>parking | Hotel     | Including PIA,<br>hotel allowance,<br>friends & family<br>allowance |                     |           |
| Ian Diamond       | £174.54   | £1,085.50     | £158.56 | £35.40               | £1,239.53 | £0.00   | £0.00 <sup>14</sup> | £2,693.53 |
| Paul Gray         | £0.00     | £0.00         | £0.00   | £0.00                | £0.00     | £0.00   | £7,392.24           | £7,392.24 |
| Bruce Calderwood  | £246.21   | £400.15       | £112.35 | £0.00                | £227.20   | £80.00  | £8,251.84           | £9,317.75 |
| David Chrimes     | £0.00     | £124.95       | £0.00   | £0.00                | £0.00     | £0.00   | £3,663.68           | £3,788.63 |
| Carl Emmerson     | £0.00     | £38.30        | £0.00   | £0.00                | £0.00     | £0.00   | £3,569.52           | £3,607.82 |
| Chris Goulden     | £0.00     | £937.00       | £0.00   | £60.00               | £223.20   | £45.00  | £2,473.84           | £3,739.04 |
| Philip Jones      | £276.48   | £1,437.20     | £0.00   | £158.60              | £792.98   | £90.00  | £5,452.72           | £8,207.98 |
| Jim McCormick     | £406.90   | £672.60       | £106.50 | £0.00                | £810.63   | £95.00  | £2,542.32           | £4,633.95 |
| Grainne McKeever  | £1,497.39 | £136.50       | 141.00  | £0.00                | £471.25   | £95.97  | £1,694.88           | £4,036.99 |
| Dominic Morris    | £0.00     | £232.50       | £0.00   | £37.80               | £0.00     | £0.00   | £1,960.24           | £2,230.54 |
| Seyi Obakin       | £0.00     | £141.35       | £0.00   | £0.00                | £166.60   | £55.00  | £3,501.04           | £3,863.99 |
| Judith Paterson   | £502.39   | £644.90       | £70.00  | £0.00                | £356.30   | £106.03   | £3,817.76           | £5,497.38 |
| Charlotte Pickles | £0.00     | £0.00         | £0.00   | £0.00                | £0.00     | £0.00   | £992.96             | £992.96   |
| Liz Sayce         | £0.00     | £0.00         | £0.00   | £0.00                | £0.00     | £0.00   | £3,115.84           | £3,115.84 |
| Victoria Todd     | £0.00     | £776.35       | £29.40  | £73.70               | £1,298.74 | £0.00   | £4,104.52           | £6,282.71 |

<sup>14</sup> Sir Ian Diamond has declined to accept a fee as SSAC Chair.

## Social Security Advisory Committee

### Annex 9: Register of Members' Interests<sup>15</sup>

| Member                                  | Interests  |
|---|--|
| Professor Sir Ian Diamond <sup>16</sup> | Chair of Plan International UK<br>Chair of Department for International Development (DFID) Research Advisory Group<br>Chair, Independent Commission on the College of the Future<br>Chair of British Universities and Colleges Sport<br>Chair of Edinburgh College of Further Education<br>Chair, Council for Mathematical Sciences<br>Chair of the Audit Committee, Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS)<br>Board Member, UK Research and Innovation<br>Board Member, UK Statistics Authority<br>Board Member, Lancaster University<br>Trustee, Population Investigation Committee |
| Bruce Calderwood                        | Specialist adviser to the Care Quality Commission inspections<br>Trustee of Avenues Group, a charity providing services to people with complex needs<br>Chair, Avenues South East (a subsidiary of Avenues Group)<br>Member of a strategic advisory group to Dimensions  |
| David Chrimes                           | Member of the FDA Trade Union and its Executive Committee<br>Member of the Disabled Persons' Transport Advisory Committee<br>Fee paid Judge of the First-Tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber   |
| Carl Emmerson                           | Employee at the Institute for Fiscal Studies<br>Advisory board member of the Office for Budget Responsibility  |

<sup>15</sup> Includes unremunerated roles

<sup>16</sup> As at 31 March 2019



|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Chris Goulden              | Deputy Director of Evidence and Impact, Joseph Rowntree Foundation<br>Member of the Social Policy Association   |
| Phil Jones                 | Director, The Prince's Trust Cymru  |
| Dr Jim McCormick           | Partner: McCormick-McDowell Research Partnership<br>Associate Director Scotland at the Joseph Rowntree Foundation<br>Chair, independent Disability and Carers Benefit Expert Advisory Group reporting to the Scottish Government<br>Advisory Board Member, Business in the Community Scotland   |
| Professor Gráinne McKeever | Professor of Law and Social Justice at Ulster University<br>Executive Director of the Law Centre, Northern Ireland<br>Academic panel member of the Administrative Justice Council   |
| Dominic Morris             | Partner: A.W. and E.A. Morris Partnership<br>UK Government Stabilisation Unit (Standing Joint Task Force)   |
| Seyi Obakin OBE            | Chief Executive, Centrepoint<br>Non-executive director of HM Prison and Probation Service   |
| Charlotte Pickles          | Director Reform<br>Member of the NHS Assembly   |
| Liz Sayce OBE              | Member of the Committee of Healthwatch England, a sub-committee of the Care Quality Commission<br>Board member, Care Quality Commission<br>Visiting Senior Fellow at the London School of Economics<br>Member of the Equality and Human Rights Commission's (EHRC) Disability Advisory Committee<br>Centre for Mental Health: Chair of a commission on mental health and equality |
| Victoria Todd              | Head of Low Incomes Tax Reform Group of the Chartered Institute of Taxation<br>Fee paid Judge of the First-Tier Tribunal, Social Entitlement Chamber<br>Member, Association of Tax Technicians<br>Fellow, Chartered Institute of Taxation   |

**SOCIAL SECURITY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Social Security Advisory Committee  
5th Floor Caxton House  
Tothill Street  
London SW1H 9NA

Telephone: 0207 829 3354  
E-mail: [ssac@ssac.gov.uk](mailto:ssac@ssac.gov.uk)

Follow the Committee on Twitter [@The\\_SSAC](https://twitter.com/The_SSAC)

