

**Social Security Advisory Committee**

**Minutes of the meeting held in room 5.21/5.22  
Caxton House, Tothill Street, London, SW1H 9NA**

Members: Paul Gray (Chair)  
Carl Emmerson  
Colin Godbold  
Chris Goulden  
Jim McCormick  
Dominic Morris  
Seyi Obakin  
Judith Paterson  
Charlotte Pickles  
Liz Sayce  
Victoria Todd

Apologies: Rachael Badger  
Bruce Calderwood  
Gráinne McKeever

Guests and Officials: See Annex A

**Items 1 - 3. Private Sessions**

*[RESERVED ITEMS]*

**4. The Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016 (Consequential and Transitional Savings Provisions) Regulations 2016<sup>1</sup> (Paper 28/16)**

4.1 The Chair welcomed to the meeting the following DWP officials: Michelle Pester (G6, Working Age), Trevor Pendergast (G7, Employment and Support Allowance and Work Capability Assessment policy), Paul Lapraik (SEO, Working Age – Childcare, Earnings, Work, Self-Employment) and Amy Morgan (Lead Analyst in the Department's ESA Analysis Division). In particular, he thanked the officials for bringing the draft regulations to the Committee when they were not subject to formal reference.<sup>2</sup>

4.2 The Department's intention was that the draft regulations would come into effect on 3 April 2017 – the date on which sections 15 and 16 of the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016 were due to be commenced. Section 15, when enacted, would

---

<sup>1</sup> The draft regulations were subsequently renamed the Employment and Support Allowance and Universal Credit (Miscellaneous Amendments and Transitional and Savings Provisions) Regulations 2017.

<sup>2</sup> The draft proposals were not subject to formal reference, in accordance with section 173(5)(a) of the Social Security Administration Act 1992.

remove the work-related activity component (WRAC) for those who were entitled to an Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) and who were placed in the work-related activity group following the work capability assessment. Section 16 would similarly remove the limited capability for work (LCW) element for anyone entitled to Universal Credit (UC) and who has LCW. These draft regulations provided the rules whereby an existing ESA or UC claimant with a health condition or disability at the point of change would continue to retain entitlement to the WRAC or LCW element respectively.

4.3 It was explained that the purpose of these proposals was to ensure that anyone with an existing entitlement to the WRAC or the LCW element would continue to keep it as long as entitlement to ESA or UC continued and for as long as they have LCW. The rationale for removing the WRAC and the LCW component for new claims for ESA and UC respectively was that only one person out of every hundred who leaves the Work-Related Action Group each month and therefore the policy was not working as intended. The Government had therefore taken the view that £60m - £100m of the savings each year by withdrawing these two additional elements from the basic benefit could be better deployed supporting claimants with health or disability issues into work.

4.4 The following questions were raised by Committee members in discussion:

- (a) **Was there a misalignment between ESA and UC insofar as someone on ESA trying out work which fell outside the permitted work rules would lose entitlement to the WRAC, but someone doing the same amount of work on UC would go back to the LCW component if the work ceased or reduced in hours or earnings within six months?**

The normal linking rule of 12 weeks in ESA would apply in this situation, so that entitlement to the WRAC would not be lost immediately. The 12 week linking rule was a part of the normal rules related to ESA and did not need to be spelt out separately in the draft regulations. There was no linking rule in UC. It was acknowledged that there was a difference between 12 weeks linking rule in ESA and the re-award/re-claims process in UC, but the two benefits were structured differently and served different purposes.

- (b) **How would the changes be communicated?**

Communications colleagues within the Department were working with policy experts to produce a package of messages and information which would be conveyed in different forms so that claimants were fully aware of the changes. At the same time guidance for work coaches would be updated so that they would be able to advise claimants seeking to understand the implications of any decision they might make.

- (c) **Regulation 14 of the draft regulations provided, in effect, that protection existed where “the claimant made a claim before the relevant date” (ie 3 April 2017). However that caused some confusion when contrasted with the wording used in the preceding draft regulation which referred to the amendments applying “where a claimant has an award of employment**

**and support allowance.” To put the matter beyond doubt, could the Department confirm that the protection would apply in each of the following three situations: (i) where a claim had been made before the relevant date but a determination had yet to be given; (ii) where the claim had been made in time but the seven day waiting day period meant entitlement would begin after the relevant date; and (iii) where a claim had been disallowed but an appeal had been made and was pending?**

Yes – in all those circumstances where a claim would have been made and, provided it was before 3 April 2017, any entitlement to the WRAC or LCWS component would be protected. It would also include situations where a claim for ESA was made within three months of the start of the period of claim where the start date was before 3 April 2017 but the claim was made after that date.

- (d) Was there potential for a different outcome depending on where a person lived? For example, because entitlement to contribution-based ESA would run out after a year a person might wait 12 weeks and break the period of limited capability for work before submitting another ESA claim which would be based on later tax years. That change would mean that anyone doing so would lose the WRAC. In contrast someone in a full service area might be better off claiming UC and getting the LCW element.**

The Department would consider that question and respond in writing<sup>3</sup>.

- (e) Would a woman who was entitled to ESA before 3 April and came off ESA because she claimed a Maternity Allowance lose the WRAC when she returns to ESA?**

The intention was that this should not happen, but DWP would check and report back to the Committee<sup>4</sup>.

- (f) Situations might arise where a person inadvertently lost the additional component without appreciating the effect of their decision eg through visiting family overseas. The guidance would therefore need to go far wider than merely covering the regulations. A great deal of thought should go into prescribing the kinds of situations which might arise and where people would need accurate advice.**

---

<sup>3</sup> The Department subsequently advised that, as with the answer to question (a), different rules applied to UC and ESA because they were structured differently and served different purposes. Which of these forms of support might be better for a person would depend on their individual circumstances. The roll out of UC had to be phased, given the numbers involved in the migration process, and this would inevitably mean that people would be affected differently as a consequence. It was important that this was done in a safe and secure manner.

<sup>4</sup> The Department confirmed after the meeting that the draft regulations would protect the position of a woman who was entitled to the WRAC and entitlement ended because of a Maternity Allowance award. Where a repeat claim for ESA was made, then the WRAC would be re-instated.

The Department acknowledged that point and would look at its communications to try to ensure that claimants are made aware of the implications of their actions.

**(g) How would the change affect someone who had transferred to ESA from Incapacity Benefit and who were transitionally protected?**

The Department's intention was to protect claimants in that category in exactly the same way as those who had claimed ESA as part of the conversion process before 3 April 2017. However the Department would check that the legislation actually achieved that effect and confirm that to the Committee<sup>5</sup>.

**(h) The regulation headed 'claimants entitled to the LCWRA element before 3 April 2017' allowed for a claimant to drop down from receipt of the LCWRA element to the lower LCW element. In doing so would that claimant lose any other transitional protection to which they might be entitled if they tried a job or changed their status as a single claimant or joint-claimant? Could that be checked?**

Again the intention was not to deprive claimants of any existing transitional protection and the Department would check the legislation to ensure that it reflected the policy intent and report back to the Committee<sup>6</sup>.

**(i) It was understood that a person could try work and come off UC within a period of six months and not lose entitlement to the LCW element. If that person accepted work which would remove entitlement to the LCW element but without taking them out of UC altogether, would they also be protected for six months?**

Again the Department would look at that specific query and respond in writing<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Department confirmed after the meeting that the draft regulations would protect entitlement to the WRAC for all claimants who had been converted to ESA from Incapacity Benefit, including where the conversion took place after 3 April 2017.

<sup>6</sup> The Department subsequently confirmed that, under the draft regulations, claimants entitled to the LCWRA element before 3 April 2017 who then had a review work capability assessment after that date and were found to have limited capability for work, would receive the LCW element in their UC award. This would apply where the claimant had continuous limited capability for work and work-related activity prior to 3 April 2017 and up to and including the date on which the LCW determination was made. If the claimant then tried work and their UC award ended due to the level of their income (earnings in this case), the LCW element would be protected where the claimant had a further award of UC within six months of the previous award ending. The claimant would have to continue to have limited capability for work throughout this period. These transitional provisions would also apply where, immediately before the further award commenced, the previous award had terminated because the claimant had ceased to be a member of a couple or had become a member of a couple.

<sup>7</sup> The Department subsequently confirmed that the aim was for the transitional provisions to operate to safeguard the LCW element where claimants ceased to be entitled to UC due to their earnings but who then made another claim for UC. Provided that the claimant had continued to have limited capability for work, the LCW element would be included in the UC award. If the claimant was not taken out of UC altogether because of earnings, then they would retain the LCW element.

- (j) The argument for having an additional LCW element in ESA and UC respectively was that claimants in this category tended to stay on benefit for longer periods and therefore had additional longer term needs. If new claimants could no longer rely on their basic benefit to source such additional needs, had the Government considered the impact that might have on other budgets and funds?**

Yes it was acknowledged that there might be an impact on other budgets from claimants who did not find work. The issue of financial support would be addressed in the forthcoming Green Paper.

- (k) Not everyone who would claim ESA or UC on the grounds of having limited capability for work from 3 April 2017 could reasonably be expected to be supported back into work. For that reason the Department needed to look very carefully at the balance between removing the additional sums paid at present and using them to support people back into work. The plans needed to be carefully evaluated and monitored to ensure that the balance being struck was well founded and that it produced better positive outcomes overall.**

The Department noted the point and would be monitoring and assessing the impact of the changes from April 2017.

- (l) Paragraph 32 of the Explanatory Memorandum referred to the work-incentivising effect of removing the WRAC or LCW equivalent and providing additional employment support for the sick and disabled. Paragraph 34 referred to claimants returning to work as a consequence of the measure. Could the Department give some indication of the content of the extra support which the Task Force of experts established by the Government had recommended and which would be presumably based on projections as to numbers moving into work and numbers staying on benefit?**

No firm projections had been made. The impact of the proposals remained uncertain. The intention was that with support more would go into work than at present. As far as the content of the extra support being offered was concerned, there would be more detail set out in the Green Paper.

- (m) How would the WRAC/LCW group be targeted with extra support?**

Details of how the additional employment support will be targeted would be set out in the Green Paper.

- (n) Was anything emerging from the pilots referred to in the explanatory material that would give an indication of the kind of support that might work in advance of the proposals coming into force?**

The pilots had not yet been completed and until they were no decisions would be taken. The intention was that the results of the pilots would be made available upon request although not published<sup>8</sup>.

**(o) Could the Department not publish the Equality Analysis?**

The Department would re-consider its position and respond to the Committee outside of the meeting<sup>9</sup>.

**(p) What would happen with passporting? Entitlement to secondary benefits was dependent upon getting the WRAC/LCW element in some cases.**

The Department had been endeavouring to ensure that whatever entitlement existed before 3 April 2017 would continue afterwards where the circumstances were the same. Nonetheless it was recognised that ultimately it was a decision for other Government departments and other bodies responsible for administering the secondary benefit in question.

**(q) If the work capability assessment were to change, as was expected in the forthcoming green paper, with the result that there would no longer be a work-related assessment group, how would this be factored into the transitional protection provided for in these draft regulations?**

The draft regulations provided protection for existing claimants at the point of change on the 3 April 2017. If the Work Capability Assessment were to be changed in the future, the Government would have to decide whether the change would just apply to new claims or to the stock as well. Traditionally changes of this nature have been limited to those making new claims rather than to existing claimants who were normally transitionally protected.

**(r) The data when it emerged would need careful analysis because it was likely to vary on the basis of geography. It would also be helpful to look at it on the basis of age, as there would be a sub-group of older and less qualified people where a different approach might be needed. The Committee would like to see analysis on such aspects.**

---

<sup>8</sup> The Department subsequently advised that the pilots had not yet been completed and until they were, no decisions would be taken. It was also confirmed that all of the pilots referred to in the Equality Analysis would be published during the course of 2017. Evidence was now publically available for the following:

- a proof of concept looking at telephone support to improve wellbeing and work feasibility - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/telephone-support-psychological-wellbeing-and-work-feasibility-pilot-evaluation>
- a proof of concept considering Group Work - <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/group-work-psychological-wellbeing-and-work-feasibility-pilot-evaluation>

<sup>9</sup> The Department subsequently advised that the Committee's comment to consider publishing the Equality Analysis had been noted but that it was standard Departmental procedure to provide them only on request.

Officials noted the request of the Committee and agreed that considering geographic variation as well as other demographic factors would be important, as far as was feasible, when considering outcomes for this group.

4.5 The Chair thanked the officials for attending and addressing the questions raised by the Committee. He reminded them of their commitment to come back to the Committee on several points where questions had been raised in relation to the draft legislation. He also expressed the willingness of the Committee to advise on some of the key communications material and guidance when it became available. Finally the Chair encouraged the officials to make every effort to ensure that the monitoring and evaluation undertaken fed through into the detail and design of the support on offer as resources were transferred. The Committee had focused upon the content of the extra support which was to be made available as a result of these changes, and it was important that decisions taken by the Government with regard to reducing the financial help given to new claimants could be subsequently justified in retrospect by the additional support made available to the client group and which led to proportionately more of them moving into work.

## **5. Social Security (Credits and Crediting and Treatment) (Consequential and Miscellaneous Amendment) Regulations 2016**

5.1 The Chair thanked David Crowther (SEO, Jobseeker's Allowance and Income Support within the Working Age Directorate) for attending the meeting to present these draft regulations. He also expressed the Committee's compliments on providing an impressively thorough and clear set of papers to accompany the regulatory proposals.

5.2 These draft regulations were being brought forward by DWP as a consequence of the National Insurance Contributions Act 2015 introduced by HMRC which, among other changes, made significant changes in the way Class 2 National Insurance contributions (NICs) were paid and collected. These changes impacted around five million self-employed people in the country. Some of the changes did not mesh well with existing DWP legislation and amendments had to be brought forward to make the necessary adjustments.

5.3 The following main questions were raised by the Committee in discussion:

- (a) The communications products made available for those affected would be important. Was there scope to segment the product on the basis of the person concerned, so that where the individual communicated with the Department on-line, a digital communication could be sent? The Committee would also welcome having an opportunity to comment on the communications products as they were being developed.**

The difficulty with segmentation as suggested was that the numbers involved were not great and there was uncertainty as to whether Class 2 contributions would continue for long.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> DWP subsequently provided the following written note – 'There was no time to introduce any amendment to IT and the numbers impacted made the potential cost of this prohibitive. On sharing

**(b) The lesson for claimants would seem to be that they ought to make their payments of Class 2 NICs early.**

Under HMRC's changes, the "due date" for Class 2 NICs had now become 31 January after the end of the tax year, bringing it in line with the due date for income tax and Class 4 NICs. The changes first affected the Class 2 NICs for 2015/16, and so those NICs were not due until 31 January 2017. It was true that claimants would ideally make their payments of Class 2 NICs well before 31 January, and HMRC would encourage early payment. However, HMRC already encouraged early payment of tax and Class 4 contributions each year, and experience suggested it tended not to make a great deal of difference. People were naturally prone to leave payments until they were due. The timing of Christmas made early payment difficult for many people.

On the issue of early payment of Class 2 contributions, there was also the fact that periods of sickness were rarely predictable and it would therefore be unusual for a self-employed person to associate the need to pay Class 2 NICs early in the event that they might be sick in January and in need of contributory ESA.

**(c) How long would it take for a payment representing Class 2 NICs to be paid and registered by HMRC?**

It took five working days in normal times, but was likely to take around eight working days in respect of payments made on or shortly before the due date, given the sheer volume of people who might delay paying until then. One of the difficulties for claimants was that the DWP would not accept a proof of payment acknowledgment as indicating that Class 2 NICs had been paid; the Department's position was that they needed to see that HMRC had officially recorded the payment in question.

**(d) What about the people who, for whatever reason, could not afford to pay full self-assessment liabilities but nevertheless wanted to pay their Class 2 contributions?**

Claimants who could not afford to pay all their tax and NICs liabilities but nevertheless sought to pay Class 2 NICs to HMRC would need to advise HMRC very specifically what the payment was intended for. Without doing so there was a tendency that the payment would be accepted by HMRC but not allocated towards Class 2 or recorded as a Class 2 contribution.<sup>11</sup>

---

communications products with the Committee, DWP timelines are very tight and any detour from External Communications plans would mean that we cannot be ready for go-live. SSAC can be assured that we are working with both DWP External Communications and GDS to ensure our messages and delivery meet the existing DWP standards and presentational format.'

<sup>11</sup> DWP subsequently provided the following note: '*HMRC aim for the taxpayer to pay their self-assessment liabilities in full. The contributor might also be paying off arrears for a previous year (with penalties if they default). So, if the contributor cannot afford to meet all his self-assessment liabilities but nevertheless specifically wishes to pay his Class 2 NICs for benefit purposes, they will have to impress fact this on HMRC - otherwise, for example, HMRC might just allocate the money to clear past debts. This will come down to our communication messaging but we cannot legislate for claimant behaviour - all we can do is provide robust messaging. We are making customers aware of*



- (e) **Was there a way claimants could be spared the uncertainties and confusion inherent in a system where they received a letter telling them they were not entitled to contributory ESA and then a second letter telling them that they were? There were important implications for Housing Benefit in particular. A decision notice explaining the reason for the change might help.**

A change in the decision notice was not feasible due to IT constraints but a request would be made to DWP communications colleagues to consider a one-page flyer to go with the decision notice for those affected.<sup>12</sup>

- (f) **At paragraph 7.2 of the Explanatory Memorandum there was a reference to “a new draft letter to inform ESA and JSA claimants, in appropriate cases, that their disallowance decision will be revised if they pay their Class 2 NICs to HMRC by the end of January.” Was that a completely new letter or an add-on?**

It was almost certainly an add-on although that would be checked with a response being submitted to the Committee outside of the meeting<sup>13</sup>.

- (g) **On that same point it was important that claimants receiving a revised decision notice telling them that they were entitled to benefit were also prompted to contact their local authority if Housing Benefit was an issue. Without doing so mistakes were likely to be made.**

Noted. The Department would monitor and evaluate the changes so that things could be put right if they are found not to have gone well.<sup>14</sup>

- (h) **Although not limited to this change, there was sometimes a problem where somebody claimed ESA but only entered details relevant to**

---

*this across the piece e.g. on GOV.UK, our contact centre scripts over the phone and in our notification letter.*

<sup>12</sup> DWP subsequently provided the following note in response to both questions at (e) and (f): ‘Any “one page flyer” added into the decision letter envelope would constitute an IT change and we had neither the time nor the funding to be able to do that especially as the requirement to notify is limited to just January of each year. We have, however, devised a separate notification to supplement (but not accompany) the decision. This will be sent out by first class post and be timed to arrive no later than the decision letter. It will outline to the claimant the reason why their claim has been affected, how they can rectify this (encourage payment) and what they need to do if they cannot pay in full. These letters will be issued to those impacted in January each year, until Class 2 abolition takes effect from April 2018. (If Class 4 NICs are, in future, to attract entitlement to contributory benefits, we will review the position as necessary.) It must be stressed that the new notification is not a decision letter; rather it provides clarification of what the claimant needs to do in order to get their claim progressed. Moreover, this should not be the first time this message would have been given to the individual as by this stage they should have had at least two telephony contacts during which these key messages would have been delivered’.

<sup>13</sup> See the footnote to the answer given at paragraph 5.3(e).

<sup>14</sup> DWP subsequently provided the following note: ‘As before, our supplementary notification is not a decision letter but a clarification. The period concerned is just one month (January) each year and the vast majority of those impacted will receive ESA (income-related) until their position is settled. With ESA, any change in entitlement that affects HB, and that is recorded on the system, is automatically notified to the local authority Housing Benefit (HB) teams through existing IT interfaces. This would then prompt a review of the HB entitlement on grounds on low income. The customer would receive the existing notification of a change in their entitlement from DWP. HB teams would contact the customer regarding their continued HB entitlement.’

**contributory ESA. Should they not be entitled to contributory ESA, possible entitlement to income-related ESA could be easily overlooked?**

It occasionally happened that, when the details relevant to a determination on income-based ESA was lacking and the Department was under pressure to get money out urgently, a decision awarding contribution-based ESA would be made. It was helpful to claimants but made for confusion with ESA being one benefit and requiring a single claim and a single decision.

5.4 The Chair thanked David Crowther for attending and addressing the questions raised by the Committee so frankly and helpfully. He advised him that the Committee were content that draft proposals could proceed to making and laying in Parliament without having been taken on formal reference by the Committee. A formal note to that effect would be issued by the secretariat.

5.5 David Crowther advised the Committee that this would be his last visit to present draft regulations before retiring. He wished it to be placed on record that he was grateful to the Committee and its secretariat for its constructive engagement and support over many years. The Chair extended the Committee's best wishes to David on his retirement.

**6. The Childcare Payments (Amendment No 2) Regulations 2016 and the Childcare Payments (Eligibility) (Amendment No 2) Regulations 2016 (Papers 29/16 and 30/16)**

6.1 Fiona Grist and Phil Mattacks (both from HMRC) and Ella Carpenter from HMT were welcomed to the meeting by the Chair.

6.2 In May the Committee approved amendments to HMRC childcare legislation. The Childcare Payments (Amendment) Regs 2016 amended the Childcare Payments Regs 2015 and the Childcare Payments (Eligibility) (Amendment) Regs 2016 amended the Childcare Payments (Eligibility) Amendment) Regs 2015. Those provisions stemmed from the Childcare Payments Act 2014. Following those changes two further sets of amendments were brought forward reflecting additional changes. They were brought to the Committee for scrutiny in accordance with the agreed Memorandum of Understanding between the Committee, HMRC and HMT.

6.3 The proposals represented a disparate set of miscellaneous amendments which, amongst other more minor changes, would simplify the approach to calculating the minimum income a parent would need to become eligible for Tax-Free Childcare, clarify the rules in relation to start-up periods for self-employed parents and require claimants and their partners to have a National Insurance number rather than merely provide information relevant to determining one.

6.4 The following main questions were raised by Committee members in discussion:

- (a) **Could you clarify how the rule on combining earnings from normal employed earner's employment and self-employment to reach the threshold for entitlement to Tax-Free Childcare would work?**

The intention was that a person could qualify by their employed earnings alone, or by their self-employed earnings alone. If neither was sufficient to reach the minimum income threshold they could use a combination of the two. In such cases however any assessment would be made on the basis of expected earnings over the forthcoming three months. HMRC were seeking to avoid getting into a level of complexity which would be required if the assessment was based on a 12 month period. The assessment would be based on a reasonable expectation of earnings rather than on an actual prediction which would then be checked backwards. The aim was to give people the best chance of satisfying the test.

- (b) There was however a question as to whether unamended regulation 9 of the Childcare Payments (Eligibility) Regulations 2015 (SI 2015 No 448) would allow a combination of the two types of payment. The words “from the work” in both sub-paragraphs (1)(a) and (1)(b) of regulation 9 arguably raised a doubt as to interpretation.**

The new wording of regulation 10(5) of the Childcare Payments (Eligibility) Regulations was designed to secure the policy intention that both types of payment could be combined.

- (c) Regulation 10(5) seemed to serve a different purpose. Regulation 9 gave the definition and regulation 10(5) applied it. It was not clear that regulation gave the flexibility contended for it by HMRC.**

HMRC would check the wording of these provisions with lawyers to ensure that the policy intention was secured and report back to the Committee.

- (d) Could HMRC provide some worked examples so that it could be seen how people would be affected by these changes?**

HMRC would supply some examples as requested.

6.5 The Chair thanked the officials for attending and responding to the Committee's questions.

## **7 Current issues/AOB**

### *Postal regulations*

7.1 The Committee agreed that, *the Pensions (Schemes that were Contracted-out and Graduated Retirement Benefit) (Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2017* 2016 could be cleared by post and proceed without the need for presentation at a plenary session of the Committee. The secretariat would notify the officials concerned accordingly.

7.2 The Committee also considered *the Employment and Support Allowance (Consequential Amendment) (Police Injury Benefit) Regulations 2016* under the procedures for considering draft regulations postally. Although the Committee was content that they could proceed without the need for formal reference, some concern was expressed that injured members of the police may have received inconsistent

treatment as individual Police Services had interpreted the Home Office legislation in different ways. It was agreed that the secretariat should contact the Home Office officials advising them that the regulations could be made but drawing attention to the DWP's Legal Entitlement and Administrative Practices (LEAP).

*Date of next meeting*

7.3 The next official meeting was scheduled to take place on Wednesday 9 November, with the Stakeholder day being held on 10 November.

**Attendees**

Guests and Officials

- Item 4: Michelle Pester (G6, Working Age)  
Trevor Pendergast (G7, Employment and Support Allowance and Work Capability Assessment policy)  
Paul Lapraik (SEO, Working Age – Childcare, Earnings, Work, Self-Employment)  
Amy Morgan (Lead Analyst in the Department’s ESA Analysis Division).
- Item 5: David Crowther (SEO, Jobseeker’s Allowance and Income Support within the Working Age Directorate)
- Item 6: Fiona Gist (HMRC, Benefits and Credits)  
Phil Mattacks (HMRC, Benefits and Credits)  
Ella Carpenter (HMT)

- Observers Anne Brown (HEO Strategy, Working Age Benefits)  
Mark Williams (HEO Work and Health Unit Delivery)  
Jacqueline Larrett (SEO Strategy Ageing Society and State Pensions)

- Secretariat: Denise Whitehead (Committee Secretary)  
Will Farbrother (Researcher)  
Michael Coombs (Assistant Secretary)  
Paul Mackrell (Assistant Secretary)