HM Treasury

Treasury Minutes

Government Response to the Committee of Public Accounts on the Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fifteenth reports from Session 2026-27

CP 1720

November 2026



Government of the United Kingdom
HM Treasury

Treasury Minutes

Government Response to the Committee of Public Accounts on the Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fifteenth reports from Session 2026-27

Presented to Parliament by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury
by Command of His Majesty

November 2026

CP 1720

© Crown copyright 2026

This publication is licenced under the terms of the Open Government Licence v.3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3.

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

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/official-documents.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at: public.enquiries@hmtreasury.gov.uk

ISBN 978-1-5286-6922-1

E03731551 11/26

Printed on paper containing 40% recycled fibre content minimum.

Printed in the UK by HH Associates Ltd. on behalf of the Controller of His Majesty's Stationery Office.

Government response to the Committee of Public Accounts Session 2026-27

Report Title	Page
Twelfth report: Government compensation schemes Cabinet Office	2
Thirteenth report: Regulation of water, energy and broadband Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport	8
Fifteenth report: Government's intervention in British Steel Ltd Department for Business, Innovation, Science and Trade	17

Twelfth Report of Session 2026-27

Cabinet Office

Government compensation schemes

Introduction from the Committee

Government compensation schemes are expected to provide people who have experienced harm, either directly or indirectly, from the actions or inaction of public bodies with the compensation or financial redress they are rightly entitled to. The NAO's report examined the operational phase of a selection of seven government compensation and financial recognition schemes, including Windrush, Post Office Horizon IT (looking at four separate schemes within it), LGBT Financial Recognition, and Infected Blood. Our report concentrates predominantly on the schemes examined by the NAO and their operations.

By February 2026, the government had paid around £3.5 billion in total across the seven schemes examined by the NAO, with up to another £11.4 billion potentially yet to be paid. The Infected Blood Compensation Scheme alone is estimated to pay out £12.8 billion. Schemes differ in fundamental ways that affect their complexity and progress to date, including expected cohort size. Some Horizon schemes expect to receive hundreds of claims, for example, while the Infected Blood Compensation Scheme anticipates potentially tens of thousands.

Some compensation schemes, such as the Windrush and some of the Horizon IT schemes, experienced significant issues in their early stages. For example, schemes' initial assumptions about likely claim volumes and processing capacity were often wrong, contributing to backlogs and lengthened processing times. These schemes needed to make changes in how they operated as a result, such as introducing fixed sum awards and providing better support to victims, to improve the claim process for victims.

There remains substantial variation across schemes in how long claims take to conclude, capacity for greater transparency and clarity during the claim process and scope for more structured and consistent cross government learning. The independence of schemes, and their design and operation, is also still a concern for victims, as only the Infected Blood Compensation Scheme is run independently of the department or organisation responsible for the original harm.

Based on a report by the National Audit Office, the Committee took evidence on 1 June 2026 and 4 June 2026 from the Cabinet Office, Home Office, Ministry of Defence, and the Department for Business and Trade. The Committee published its report on 9 September 2026. This is the government's response to the Committee's report.

Relevant reports

- NAO report: Government's compensation and financial recognition schemes – Session 2024-26 (HC 1817)
- PAC report: Government compensation schemes – Session 2026-27 (HC 88)

Government response to the Committee

1. PAC conclusion: Victims have lost trust in the bodies administering government compensation schemes. Bodies which they view as responsible for the initial harm caused.

1a. PAC recommendation: The Cabinet Office should:

provide a comprehensive update on the establishment of an independent body responsible for designing and administering government compensation schemes in order to end the practice of the body responsible for the harm designing and administering the redress

1.1 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: Spring 2027

1.2 The Government agrees to provide a comprehensive update and will aim to do so by spring 2027. Compensation policy leads from the Cabinet Office, the Department for Business, Innovation, Science and Trade (BIST), Home Office, Ministry of Defence and other departments will work together to progress this work ahead of the update and consider the feasibility of the government establishing an independent compensation body.

1.3 A central delivery body could offer some advantages; however substantial further consideration is required before committing to introducing any body, and any costs associated with an independent body would need to be considered by the Treasury. Further consideration is particularly required regarding the wider operational implications of a permanent standing body, especially concerning any change of responsibility for scheme design.

1.4 It is vital that people currently seeking redress are not adversely affected by the transition to a new body. A new body could take some time to establish, especially if primary legislation were required. Given how compensation schemes vary significantly in structure, legal framework, and operational approach, it is likely that the remit of any new body, should Ministers decide to establish one, would focus on future schemes rather than existing schemes, especially schemes with finite delivery periods.

1b. PAC recommendation: The Cabinet Office should:

outline how it plans to design and resource an independent body to ensure it can effectively build claimant trust and provide redress efficiently.

1.5 The government disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

1.6 The government agrees in principle with the Committee's conclusion that victims should not have to look to the bodies responsible for the original harm for the delivery of redress. However, the government is not committed to introducing an independent body at this time, and therefore cannot outline plans for designing and resourcing this at this point in time until further review has been carried out.

1.7 As set out in response to recommendation 1a, substantial further consideration is required before committing to introducing any body. Work is already underway to consider the feasibility of doing this as part of the government's response to the recommendations of the Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry, and the government expects to provide an update on this by spring 2027 as set out above.

2. PAC conclusion: There is no central oversight or coordination of government compensation schemes, and there is the risk that lessons learned from earlier schemes are lost.

2. PAC recommendation: Government should set out how it plans to create a formal structure to ensure lessons learned from existing and past government compensation schemes are centrally recorded for future schemes, with consideration given to a standing body to undertake such a task.

2.1 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: Spring 2027

2.2 The government agrees that it is essential to ensure lessons learned from past and present compensation schemes are centrally captured and retained. The primary mechanism for recording and considering these lessons is currently the Cross-Whitehall Compensation Scheme Network. Established in 2023 by the Cabinet Office team working on infected blood, and now chaired by the Department for Business, Innovation, Science and Trade, this informal network enables policy officials across government to share good practice on both existing and planned schemes.

2.3 The government recognises the value of a centre of expertise model, which could build on the foundation laid by the network. Further detailed consideration will be given to how this could be structured, including whether a model could be incorporated within a future independent body or maintained as a permanent centre of expertise within the Cabinet Office, such as the central team that supports overarching inquiries policy. Because options for centralising expertise are closely tied to broader considerations regarding scheme design and oversight, the government will set out its proposed approach alongside its update on recommendation 1a in spring 2027.

3. PAC conclusion: A failure to properly consult with the impacted communities has led to too many schemes being launched without fully understanding the issues faced by victims.

3. PAC recommendation: Before future compensation schemes launch, government should commit to:

a. working with groups and key individuals representing victims to effectively co-design the scheme from the outset; and

b. agreeing with groups and key individuals representing victims how long a scheme will be open to claims, what funded support and payment options will be available and what restorative justice activity will be provided to victims.

3.1 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Recommendation implemented

3.2 The government agrees with the importance of co-designing compensation schemes with impacted communities from the outset wherever possible, including establishing clear parameters on scheme duration, funded support, payment options, and restorative justice measures. The government has already demonstrated learning on this approach, having worked alongside subpostmasters to design the Horizon Group Litigation Order scheme and conducted public consultations and roundtables to refine key aspects of the Infected Blood Compensation Scheme.

3.3 While progress has been made, the government recognises that further learning must be embedded across future schemes. These principles will be communicated across government via the Cross-Whitehall Compensation Scheme Network in the first instance and incorporated into the design and setup of any future compensation schemes, as well as any potential standing body. Because this engagement model will apply as new schemes arise, there is no single target implementation date. Further progress in this area will also be closely aligned with work taken forward in response to recommendations 1 and 2.

4. PAC conclusion: Several government compensation schemes have failed to deliver compensation or financial redress to victims in a reasonable time.

4. PAC recommendation: Government must ensure for future compensation schemes that there is:

a. an outreach plan, including a commitment to identifying and contacting affected people whose details are already held by the relevant authorities, and associated budget to maximise take-up of the scheme to all those impacted by the associated harm;

b. performance metrics in place to ensure timely processing and payment of claims; and

c. a contingency plan to manage the risk of victims not being able to receive compensation or financial redress within the scheme's timeframe.

4.1 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Recommendation implemented

4.2 As the Committee's recommendation applies to future compensation schemes which are not yet established, a target implementation date is not applicable. In principle, these actions represent good practice that the government can adopt for future redress schemes. However, each compensation scheme is a government response to a distinct set of circumstances. Absolute consistency across compensation schemes is neither possible nor desirable. Some schemes operate with clear, known cohorts where details are already held by public bodies, whereas others, such as the Infected Blood Compensation Scheme, work with largely unknown cohorts. Identifying impacted groups is essential, but uncertainty regarding cohort size must never be allowed to prevent progress in the development and delivery of schemes. In these cases, the government makes clear commitments that any eligible claimants will receive the compensation they are due. Work then progresses in parallel with delivery to refine the government's understanding of cohort sizes.

4.3 Performance metrics and contingency plans are helpful tools, and the government will commit to establishing these as far as possible, bearing in mind that metrics and plans will often need to evolve as schemes are rolled out and delivered.

5. PAC conclusion: Too many victims require expensive and time-consuming legal support because of schemes' complexity and burdensome evidential requirements.

5. PAC recommendation: Ahead of launching future schemes, government should:

a. work with groups and key individuals representing claimants to determine what would be an appropriate evidence threshold for claimants to meet;

b. ensure fraud and error implications are considered and fully understood when setting a scheme's evidence threshold; and

c. where the evidential requirements are likely to require support, ensure that the cost of any support is not incurred by the victims.

5.1 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Recommendation implemented

5.2 The government agrees with the recommendation, and as with recommendations 3 and 4, a target implementation date is not applicable given its applicability to future schemes. The government agrees that overly burdensome evidence models can cause distress and retraumatise victims. The government recognises the importance of consulting impacted communities to help determine appropriate evidence thresholds wherever possible. Simultaneously, assessing fraud and error risks is essential in accordance with Managing Public Money guidance to ensure public funds are spent as intended. Fraudulent claims undermine scheme integrity and risk delaying payments to those in genuine need.

5.3 Tailored support models provide a means to balance fraud risk management with a sensitive, trauma-informed approach to evidence gathering. Nevertheless, compensation schemes vary significantly, and necessary evidential requirements will necessarily differ between schemes. While specific requirements for future schemes cannot be defined in advance, the government agrees in principle that working with impacted communities while ensuring evidence requirements also ensure the proper use of public money will help determine appropriate evidence thresholds and support for future schemes.

6. PAC conclusion: Most victims do not receive progress updates during the claim process and are not told how long their claim can be expected to take

6. PAC recommendation: Government should work with groups and key individuals representing victims to establish:

a. a framework outlining communication and victim engagement principles that are to be adhered to by future government compensation schemes; and

b. how it plans to ensure future schemes are more transparent and effective at providing updates to victims throughout the claim process, with consideration at the design phase given to using an app.

6.1 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: Autumn 2027

6.2 Recommendations 3, 4, and 5 set out a clear model for the victim-first development of future compensation schemes. Because schemes differ significantly a blanket approach cannot be applied. Working with diverse victim groups from the outset will help build bespoke services that work best for impacted communities. Transparency in the claims process is vital but must be balanced with appropriate fraud prevention measures. In the first instance, the cross-Whitehall network will begin considering how to develop this framework alongside wider thinking on the future model of redress delivery. Any independent body established to administer future schemes should be responsible for setting its own principles and engagement approaches to build trust.

6.3 Consideration can be given to technology-focused solutions, such as the recommended app, to provide claimants with convenient, regular updates. However, universal applicability across all schemes cannot be assumed, as specific cohorts may be less able or likely to adopt digital tools. Further consideration will be given to appropriate communication channels, which will be factored into ongoing thinking for the update to Parliament in spring 2027.

Thirteenth Report of Session 2026-27

Department for Digital Culture Media and Sport

Regulation of water, energy and broadband

Introduction from the Committee

Ofwat, Ofgem and Ofcom are the main regulators for the water, energy and broadband sectors, respectively. They each have a statutory duty to protect or further the interests of consumers, including those in vulnerable circumstances. These include duties to consider the needs of consumers with low incomes or disabilities, and those of pensionable age or who reside in rural areas.

The water, energy and broadband sectors have different market structures and levels of competition, which determine the regulators' approaches and powers. In broadband, customers can choose between a range of providers, offering varying network coverage and speeds, and can switch to benefit from better deals or if they are dissatisfied with their provider. Ofcom focuses on encouraging competition and investment to improve the experience of consumers. By contrast, water companies are regional monopolies, and consumers cannot switch between companies without moving home. Ofwat has licensing powers and dedicates substantial activity to protecting consumers through price controls.

Defining vulnerable circumstances is not straightforward. Ofwat, Ofgem and Ofcom all adopt definitions that treat vulnerability as a spectrum rather than something affecting a distinct group, reflecting the fact that anyone can find themselves in need of more support when personal circumstances change. As many as one in five consumers report struggling to afford their bills for these essential services. Recent increases in utility bills have disproportionately affected customers in financially vulnerable circumstances.

Consumers can also experience vulnerable circumstances for nonfinancial reasons, arising from factors such as mental health conditions, dementia and other long-term health conditions. These consumers can face barriers such as accessing services, understanding bills or contacting companies. Ofwat estimates that 52% of consumers may have additional communication, access and safety needs that would make them eligible for the Priority Services Register (PSR), a free UK wide service held by individual utility companies to help them identify such customers.

Based on a report by the National Audit Office, the Committee took evidence on 29 June 2026 from Ofcom, Ofgem and Ofwat. The Committee published its report on 11 September 2026. This is the government's response to the Committee's report.

Relevant reports

- NAO report: Regulating water, energy and broadband to protect consumers in vulnerable circumstances – Session 2026-27 (HC 27)
- PAC report: Regulation of water, energy and broadband – Session 2026-27 (HC 105)

Government response to the Committee

1. PAC conclusion: Awareness and take-up of social tariffs is low, meaning millions of eligible customers are missing out on financial support.

1a. PAC recommendation: Within six months, in order to improve accessibility and awareness of social tariffs, Ofcom and Ofwat should complete a review of how social tariffs are advertised and communicated, including accessibility of language. They should use this review to inform and provide best practice guidance for their sectors. They should share the key findings of this review with the committee.

1.1 Ofwat agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: Spring 2027

1.2 Ofwat will continue to engage with customer advocacy and representative groups and water company senior executives to review how social tariffs are promoted. Depending on the findings of this review, Ofwat will consider whether any changes are required to guidance or overall approach. Ofwat will write to the committee to share the findings of this review.

1.3 Ofcom agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: Spring 2027

1.4 Ofcom has recently reviewed the steps broadband providers take to ensure their social tariffs are easy to find and take up, and revised expectations as a result of this. Ofcom will share the findings of the review and the actions that have been taken with the Committee directly.

1b. PAC recommendation: Ofcom should review its accreditation requirements for price comparison sites, so that they feature information on social tariffs in searches that helps consumers make informed choices.

1.5 Ofcom disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

1.6 Price comparison sites are not required to be accredited by Ofcom. Nonetheless, Ofcom is engaging with price comparison sites to understand the information they currently provide about social tariffs and the scope for including further information. However, Ofcom notes the lack of commercial incentives for both providers and comparison sites to include social tariffs in broadband comparison tables.

2. PAC conclusion: The current system relies too heavily on customers in vulnerable circumstances being willing and able to repeat personal information to multiple companies.

2a. PAC recommendation: Ofcom, Ofgem and Ofwat should set out a plan for encouraging companies to contact customers proactively to identify whether they should be registered for additional services, such as the PSR.

2.1 Ofwat agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: Spring 2027

2.2 Ofwat already requires water companies to proactively promote additional support schemes, including the PSR. Ofwat's Service For All vulnerability guidance includes minimum expectations that "companies should take active steps to identify customers who require extra help who have not yet been identified" and that "companies should take steps to proactively increase customer awareness of the extra help available to those who need it". Following Ofwat's regulatory interventions, PSRs in water have grown strongly over recent years, from around 2% of households in 2020 to 15.6% of households in 2026. Nonetheless, there is more that companies can be doing in this area, and to support the Committee's recommendation, Ofwat will proactively engage with those companies where awareness of PSRs and affordability support schemes is lowest, to understand any barriers to progress.

2.3 Ofcom disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

2.4 Ofcom already has rules in place about identifying customers in vulnerable circumstances and has set out good practice in a guide for telecoms providers. Ofcom also requires providers to publicise additional services for disabled people. Ofcom will share this information directly with the Committee.

2.5 Ofgem agrees with this recommendation.

Target implementation date: Summer 2027

2.6 Ofgem recognises that greater proactive identification of consumers who may benefit from additional support is an important part of ensuring customers in vulnerable situations receive the help they need. In the energy sector, suppliers are already required to promote the Priority Services Register (PSR) and to take steps to identify consumers who may be eligible for additional support through their interactions with customers. However, Ofgem recognises that awareness of the PSR remains lower than it would like and that too many eligible consumers are not currently registered.

2.7 Ofgem is therefore taking forward work through a review of the PSR to consider how identification, awareness and registration can be improved, with a particular focus on reducing reliance on self-disclosure and ensuring eligible consumers are identified earlier in their customer journey. This includes considering the role of targeted communications, improved data sharing and closer working with consumer groups, charities and other sectors. Ofgem will continue to work closely with Ofcom, Ofwat, government and industry to support a more joined-up approach to identifying consumers who may need additional services and ensuring they receive appropriate support. It will also consider how success should be measured, focusing not only on registration rates but on the outcomes and support received by consumers.

2.8 Ofgem's PSR review work is being launched this autumn with a discussion paper. Stakeholder engagement will be carried out in autumn/winter 2026-27, during which evidence and views will be gathered on how the PSR should evolve.

2b. PAC recommendation: BIST should implement a multi-sector 'tell us once' PSR approach, including expanding PSR coverage to the telecoms sector, by September 2028.

2.9 The government disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

2.10 The government supports the objective of reducing the need for consumers to repeatedly provide the same information to multiple providers to access support.

2.11 BIST is working with the Government Digital Service in DCMS, regulators and other departments to explore potential options for a multi-sector "tell us once" approach

covering energy, water and telecommunications. BIST will continue to work with relevant departments to identify the organisation best placed to provide the policy, digital and operational delivery leadership. This will support the government in responding to the National Audit Office's recommendation of June 2026.

2.12 The government recognises the potential benefits of a joined-up approach, including improved customer experience, reduced administrative burdens and greater access to support for vulnerable consumers. However, discovery and feasibility work is needed to establish the appropriate delivery ownership, model and timetable. The government is therefore unable to commit to a September 2028 timetable at this stage.

3. PAC conclusion: Regulators have not done enough to ensure companies communicate proactively and clearly with all customers, and to make it easy for customers to contact them.

3a. PAC recommendation: Within 6 months, Ofcom, Ofgem and Ofwat should report back to us setting out a plan for how they will secure improvements in suppliers' communications with customers.

3b. PAC recommendation: They should write to us, setting out in what circumstances and how they will use their powers more forcefully to improve suppliers' communications with customers.

3.1 Ofwat agrees with the Committee's recommendations.

Target implementation date: Summer 2027

3.2 Clear communication with customers is a key requirement of Ofwat's customer-focused licence condition G. Ofwat will review its existing suite of guidance to companies and consider its existing requirements regarding companies' communications to customers. Following this review, Ofwat will consider whether any new or additional guidance to companies is needed to make clearer its expectations under condition G, which Ofwat can take enforcement action against if there is evidence of non-compliance. Ofwat will write to the Committee to set out its findings and proposed next steps.

3.3 Ofcom disagrees with the Committee's recommendations.

3.4 Ofcom has rules in place that set out how customers should be able to contact their provider when they want to make a complaint; on the information providers need to communicate to customers; and on the provision of communications in alternative formats for customers with disabilities.

3.5 Ofcom is taking action to address the concern that CISAS raised with the NAO about a provider's communications with its customers, so that it is clearer and resolves the issue.

3.6 Ofcom will provide further information directly to the Committee.

3.7 Ofcom routinely monitors complaints and other intelligence on the issues facing consumers, including compliance with rules governing customer communications, and takes action where appropriate.

3.8 Ofgem agrees with the Committee's recommendations.

Target implementation date: Summer 2027

3.9 Ofgem recognises that effective communication is essential to good consumer outcomes and recognises that some consumers, particularly those in vulnerable situations, continue to face barriers when seeking support.

3.10 Energy suppliers are already subject to substantial requirements and expectations relating to customer contact. Through the Standards of Conduct and wider consumer protection framework, suppliers are required to make it easy for consumers to contact them, provide fair and accessible support, and tailor communications to consumers' needs. Ofgem expects that customers should be able to contact suppliers through a range of channels, including telephone and digital routes, that contact methods are clearly signposted, and that consumers receive timely and appropriate responses.

3.11 Suppliers are also required to identify and support consumers in vulnerable situations, including promoting the Priority Services Register (PSR), taking reasonable steps to identify customers who may require additional support, providing communications in accessible formats, and proactively engaging with customers who may be struggling to pay or at risk of self-disconnection.

3.12 Recent evidence suggests progress is being made. Ofgem's Energy Consumer Satisfaction Survey found that 80% of customers who had tried to contact their supplier found it easy to do so, while 81% were satisfied with the range of contact methods available and 84% agreed those methods met their needs.

3.13 However, Ofgem recognises that further improvements are needed. Alongside Ofcom and Ofwat, Ofgem will write to the Committee within six months setting out planned actions to improve customer communications, particularly for consumers in vulnerable circumstances, and how progress will be monitored.

4. PAC conclusion: Customers in similar circumstances can receive different levels of support from their service provider

4a. PAC recommendation: Within 6 months, Ofcom, Ofgem and Ofwat should report back to us on how they plan to make definitions of vulnerability that inform companies support to consumers more consistent.

4.1 Ofwat agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: Winter 2027

4.2 Ofwat's definition of vulnerability was first adopted in 2016 and was incorporated into its Service For All vulnerability guidance in 2023, with the strong support of vulnerability experts and charities following extensive engagement. While Ofwat will not be reviewing its overall definition of vulnerability, it will review how water companies interpret regulatory requirements around PSR support and consider how these requirements can promote consistency of customer registration and identification that enables targeted, consistent, and prioritised support and communication for customers with similar needs or circumstances. Ofwat will conduct this review as part of its wider assessment of how water companies are implementing their vulnerability strategies.

4.3 Ofcom disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

4.4 Ofcom expects providers to take an inclusive approach to who is potentially vulnerable. Ofcom's rules provide some examples of circumstances that could indicate that a customer is vulnerable and we discuss this further in our good practice guide for providers. Ofcom will provide this information directly to the Committee.

4.5 Ofgem disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

4.6 Ofgem recognises that consumers should receive consistent and effective support when they are in vulnerable circumstances and recognises the benefits of greater alignment across regulated sectors where this improves consumer outcomes.

4.7 However, Ofgem does not consider that a single definition of vulnerability across all sectors will necessarily deliver the best outcomes for consumers. Different sectors face different risks and consumer harms, and support arrangements must reflect these differences. In the energy sector, Ofgem's framework is focused on identifying and responding to consumers' needs and circumstances, rather than relying solely on fixed categories of vulnerability. This approach underpins requirements on suppliers to identify and support consumers in vulnerable situations and promote access to the Priority Services Register (PSR).

4.8 Ofgem nevertheless recognises that greater consistency can reduce complexity for consumers, particularly where support is delivered across multiple sectors. Ofgem is already working with government, industry and other regulators on initiatives to improve cross-sector data sharing and develop more joined-up approaches to identifying and supporting consumers who may require additional assistance. The ongoing review of the Priority Services Register is also considering how support can be better aligned with consumer needs and improve outcomes.

4.9 Alongside Ofcom and Ofwat, Ofgem will write to the Committee within six months setting out where greater consistency between sectors could improve consumer outcomes, the barriers to full alignment, and the actions being taken to support more joined-up identification and support for consumers in vulnerable circumstances.

4b. PAC recommendation: Ofwat and Ofcom should work with their sponsor departments to consult on changes that would align social tariff eligibility criteria within their sectors. Drawing on the responses they receive, they should issue guidance to companies to align eligibility criteria within their sectors, and in line with their own definition of financial vulnerability.

4.10 Ofwat agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: Summer 2027

4.11 As a first step, Ofwat will conduct a review of water companies' social tariff eligibility criteria to consider the current levels of consistency. Ofwat will share the findings of this review with their sponsor departments, Defra and the Welsh Government, who are responsible for setting the policy on social tariffs to consider appropriate next steps.

4.12 Ofcom disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

4.13 Eligibility criteria for broadband and mobile social tariffs are already well aligned around the five main means-tested benefits. Ofcom will provide this information to the Committee.

4c. PAC recommendation: BIST should work with regulators to assess the feasibility of using the PSR to identify those who may be eligible for social tariffs, with the aim that providers use this information to proactively inform and provide support to eligible customers.

4.14 The government disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

4.15 Priority Services Registers are primarily intended to identify customers who may require non-financial additional support because of their characteristics or circumstances. This is distinct from eligibility for financial support, and the extent of any overlap with social-tariff eligibility has not been established.

4.16 As work on a potential multi-sector approach develops, BIST will engage regulators and relevant departments on the appropriate scope of that work, retaining its initial focus on non-financial support.

4.17 The government will consider these issues in light of the development of the core non-financial proposition. The government will also support regulators in ensuring that consumers are aware of potential financial support schemes where they are eligible, through existing sectoral arrangements.

5. PAC conclusion: Despite energy debt rising, and bills increasing, the regulators do not have a comprehensive view of the debt owed by an individual across the three sectors.

5a. PAC recommendation: Within 6 months, Ofcom, Ofgem and Ofwat should each create a plan with DWP to help companies in their sectors identify financially vulnerable circumstances proactively, as a first step to making social tariffs a 'default' for the most financially vulnerable.

5.1 Ofwat agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: Autumn 2027

5.2 Ofwat will continue to work with DWP and water companies to enhance data sharing to support auto-enrolment of customers on social tariffs. In the longer term, Ofwat will seek to work with DWP to explore further ways for companies to spread the cost of data matching and collation using third-party interfaces.

5.3 Ofcom disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

5.4 DWP already provides an API free of charge to any broadband provider that requests it, to make it easier for them to assess and check eligibility for social tariffs. Ofcom understands from DWP that including income data in the API would require co-operation from HMRC and that there would also be potential data sharing implications.

5.5 Ofgem disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

5.6 While Ofgem has visibility of debt and arrears within the energy sector, information is not routinely shared across energy, water and telecommunications. This can limit the ability to identify consumers experiencing financial hardship and provide coordinated support. Ofgem also recognises that improving the identification of consumers in financially vulnerable circumstances is important and can help ensure consumers receive appropriate support more quickly and consistently.

5.7 Energy suppliers are already required to identify and support consumers in vulnerable situations and proactively engage with customers who may be struggling to pay. Ofgem has supported initiatives to improve data sharing and reduce reliance on self-disclosure, recognising that some consumers may not seek support until financial difficulties have become severe. Ofgem is also working with government, regulators and industry to develop more joined-up approaches to identifying and supporting consumers in vulnerable circumstances. The ongoing review of the Priority Services Register is considering identification and support arrangements.

5.8 However, Ofgem does not consider that improved identification of financial vulnerability should automatically lead to social tariffs becoming the default form of support. Financial support for consumers is already available through the Warm Home Discount scheme, which provides £150 off energy bills to around 6 million households each winter. In England and Wales, households may be eligible if the billpayer or their partner are named on the bill and receive a qualifying means-tested benefit (e.g. Universal Credit). Decisions on the role and design of social tariffs involve wider government policy considerations, including eligibility, funding, distributional impacts and data-sharing arrangements.

5.9 Ofgem's focus remains on ensuring consumers receive targeted and effective support through affordability support, debt assistance, payment flexibility and vulnerability protections. There are also challenges with wider sharing of government-held data. Ofgem continues to work with government and stakeholders to identify ways of facilitating this data sharing.

5.10 Alongside Ofcom and Ofwat, Ofgem will write to the Committee within six months setting out current activity, opportunities for further collaboration and barriers to greater data sharing and proactive identification of consumers who may need support.

5b. PAC recommendation: Within 12 months, BIST should assess the feasibility of developing a single central register of customer debt across the three sectors, allowing financial data to be shared between companies across sectors to identify those in need of support.

5.11 The government disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

5.12 The government supports the objective of making it easier for consumers experiencing debt or financial vulnerability to access appropriate support across essential-service sectors. However, it does not consider that a single central register of customer debt should be adopted as a preferred solution without further evidence.

5.13 The current work aimed at developing a multi-sector, 'tell us once' approach is initially focused on non-financial support.

5.14 Relevant departments and regulators will consider how the Committee's underlying objective relates to existing sector arrangements and wider financial-support initiatives, and whether any further cross-sector work is justified.

5c. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) should discuss with Ofwat how it will work with water companies to increase the number of customers on debt repayment plans towards levels in other utilities.

5.15 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: December 2026

5.16 The government will discuss with Ofwat how it will work with water companies to increase the number of customers on debt repayment plans towards levels seen in other utilities.

5.17 The government recognises that well-designed repayment plans can be an effective tool for engaging customers who may be experiencing financial difficulties, enabling companies to provide proactive support before debt becomes unmanageable. As water debt is implicitly absorbed across all bill payers in England and Wales, reducing the national debt figure through appropriate repayment plans will have the

added benefit of reducing the financial burden on all households. Through discussions with Ofwat, the government will explore how water companies can support more customers to access affordable repayment arrangements alongside existing affordability schemes, helping vulnerable households to repay debt sustainably.

6. PAC Conclusion: There are gaps in the broader consumer protection landscape in water and broadband.

6a. PAC recommendation: Defra should set out its current position on the introduction of an independent ombudsman in the water sector, and a timeline for its introduction.

6.1 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: July 2027

6.2 The department cannot yet commit to an implementation date for the Water Ombudsman but will write to the Committee by July 2027, setting out progress made and any emerging timelines.

6.3 Work to establish the Ombudsman is underway following the recommendation in the Independent Water Commission. Implementation of the Water Ombudsman will depend on parliamentary timelines and detailed implementation arrangements. The government will confirm a precise target implementation date in due course.

6.4 The government is aiming to make it mandatory for licensed water suppliers to be members of a redress scheme approved by Ofwat, via a Ministerial Order, ensuring all customers have access to free, impartial and binding dispute resolution. The Ombudsman will be strengthened through the Water Bill and will form part of wider reforms to strengthen the consumer protection framework in the water sector. The government is continuing to work with Ofwat on the detailed design and implementation approach.

6b. PAC recommendation: DCMS should write to the Committee setting out its position on the introduction of a statutory consumer advocate in the telecoms sector

6.5 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: November 2026

6.6 The government recognises the importance of ensuring that telecoms consumers, particularly those in vulnerable circumstances, can access effective advice and representation. In 2019, the government consulted on options to strengthen consumer advocacy in telecoms. Since then, the consumer protection and advocacy landscape has evolved. Ofcom, the Communications Consumer Panel, Citizens Advice and other consumer organisations each provide advice, research or representation for telecoms consumers. The government continues to monitor current arrangements and whether they sufficiently meet consumers' needs. DCMS will set this out in its letter to the Committee.

Fifteenth Report of Session 2026-27

Department for Business, Innovation, Science and Trade

Government's intervention in British Steel Ltd

Introduction from the Committee

Steel is used in industries including construction, defence, manufacturing and transportation but has faced decades of decline due to factors such as high energy costs and global excess supply. The department has monitored these challenges and has taken steps to support the industry. Four of the UK's six largest steelmakers are currently receiving direct financial support from the government.

Following years of discussions that ended without a deal between the department and British Steel's owner, in March 2025 the department acted on concerns that the blast furnaces were at imminent risk of disorderly closure. On 12 April 2025, Parliament was recalled from Easter recess to pass emergency legislation—the Steel Industry (Special Measures) Act 2025—allowing the department to issue instructions to the company to prevent it from ceasing operations. As at March 2026, spending was expected to reach £642 million by 30 June 2026, including adviser costs. By 18 June 2026, the department had provided £555 million in funding for working capital, including payments for raw materials and workers' salaries. The department has also spent £15 million on advisers from 12 April 2025 to 31 January 2026, to help it manage the intervention.

There has been less production than anticipated because there have been outages interrupting production partly due to health and safety concerns because the previous owner has not maintained the plant properly.

Based on a report by the National Audit Office, the Committee took evidence on 22 June 2026 from the Department for Business, Innovation, Science and Trade. The Committee published its report on 18 September 2026. This is the government's response to the Committee's report.

Relevant reports

- NAO report: Investigation into the government's intervention in British Steel's Scunthorpe Site – Session 2024-26 (HC 1736)
- PAC report: Government's Intervention in British Steel Ltd – Session 2026-27 (HC 101)

Government response to the Committee

1. PAC conclusion: The department has not yet set out a credible plan for the future of British Steel, including how the company will become financially sustainable.

1. PAC recommendation: The department should publish the plan for the whole of British Steel. We expect this to include options and analysis for the intended future production model and the role of British Steel in the UK economy; the preferred decarbonisation pathway; how the company will become financially sustainable; and the expected costs, funding sources and timetable.

1.1 The government disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

1.2 Following British Steel's transfer into public ownership on 16 July 2026, the department appointed a new board and Chair with experience across steel, manufacturing, energy, infrastructure and with past experience of leading transformational change. The Secretary of State for Business, Innovation, Science and Trade has set the board clear objectives to stabilise the business and control costs, develop a plan to transform British Steel into a commercially and environmentally sustainable steelmaking enterprise and carefully manage the transition. The company is working to develop an investable proposition and the potential for private sector investment is being explored. Once the board has developed a transformation plan, government will assess whether it would deliver a sustainable business over the long term and determine the appropriate level of public funding, taking account of value for money for taxpayers and affordability, as well as British Steel's contribution to the government's Steel Strategy.

1.3 The department, working with British Steel, will seek to regularly update Parliament on the objectives outlined. Information regarding the transformation plan is also expected to be published once it is agreed. The department will work with the company to determine what information should be published at the appropriate time.

1.4 Both Ministers and the company are cognisant of the need to provide as much transparency as possible in relation to future plans for the company, given the use of significant public funds. At the same time, these plans are still in development, contain commercially sensitive information and British Steel will need to work carefully with employees, suppliers and its customers to deliver a successful transformation.

2. PAC conclusion: The department does not know how much the intervention will cost the taxpayer.

2. PAC recommendation: The department should write to the Committee, alongside its Treasury Minute response to this report, setting out an estimate of total costs (other than compensation costs if any), including: a breakdown of funding to date and forecast future expenditure (operations, advisers, investment and transformation costs), sensitivity analysis under different options; and an assessment of the likelihood of recovering any of these amounts

2.1 The government disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

2.2 As set out in the answer to recommendation 1, the government is not in a position to set out this detail in the Treasury minute at this stage but is committed to doing so in the future.

2.3 The department recognises the desire for transparency around how much the intervention has cost to date and how much it is likely to cost the taxpayer overall. The majority of British Steel's spend (approximately 70%) is offset by company sales, but the remainder comes from government funding. This funding is crucial to enable the company to stabilise operations and conduct considered exploration into options to transform the company into a sustainable and profitable company that contributes to the UK's economy and strategic priorities.

2.4 The department agrees with the Committee that a breakdown of funding to date should be provided and the department has shared this alongside this response. As of 5 November, the government has spent £751 million on British Steel.

2.5 As highlighted in the response to recommendation 1 the company (supported by the department) will publish information regarding the agreed plan in due course.

2.6 In relation to adviser costs, the department has reduced reliance on external support as the company and governance arrangements have become established and will continue to keep this expenditure under review. However, it is likely that British Steel, and to a lesser extent the department, will need the support of external advisers for the foreseeable future, to ensure the appropriate expertise is in place to develop and assess a robust transformation plan. Such costs are continuously monitored, and the department will continue to take steps to keep costs to a minimum.

2.7 In order to transform British Steel into a commercially and environmentally sustainable enterprise, significant investment will be required, including consideration of possible private sector investment. In the long term, the department wants to see a profitable business that contributes to the UK economy and supports the government's strategic priorities. Given future business planning is at an early stage, it would be premature to consider how public funding may ultimately be recovered.

3. PAC conclusion: The department has not set out a clear or timely pathway for how long it will continue to support the company for, increasing the risk that costs and uncertainty will continue to grow.

3. PAC recommendation: As part of its plans for British Steel, the department should clearly set out:

a. how it will establish governance (including Board arrangements), reduce reliance on advisers and build internal capability;

b. how it will work with the Board and stakeholders (for example unions, local leaders) to set the direction for the future and ensure a managed transition; and

c. provide assurance on how it will retain involvement with the company, given the importance for national and economic security

3.1 The government agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation implemented

3.2 While the government is not in a position to publish a plan for British Steel (as highlighted in the response to recommendation 1), it has sought to provide the requested information below.

3.3 As previously highlighted, in July 2026, Ministers appointed a new board of directors. This was later followed by the appointment of Alan Lovell as Chair in September. The department has ensured a clear financial delegation framework is in place to monitor financial and operational performance closely. The department will also set the strategic objectives for British Steel, and it is the board who have responsibility and accountability for ensuring those objectives are delivered.

3.4 The governance arrangements the department has put in place reflect the standard operating model for commercial companies owned by the government (for example Post Office Ltd, and Sheffield Forgemasters). British Steel has been classified as a non-financial public corporation and, as such, should operate at arms-length from government. Arms-length bodies seek to recruit expert, experienced leadership in their field to maximise their chance of delivering successfully for government. The department, as sole shareholder and provider of significant funding, is also able to exercise its authority appropriately to ensure British Steel delivers on policy objectives and that public money is spent effectively – with the department having a built-in line of

sight into the company via its role on the board and the monitoring arrangements in place.

3.5 These arrangements and how the relationship between government and British Steel will work in practice are set out in the British Steel Framework Document, as per standard practice for government-owned companies.

3.6 As these arrangements become more established, the company and department have begun to reduce reliance on external advisers and continue to strengthen internal capability, as highlighted in the response to recommendation 2. Internal capability at British Steel is being actively built and strengthened following nationalisation. The board are reviewing capability and capacity in management and leadership to ensure the company is positioned to deliver on its objectives going forward. The British Steel Board has now established five board committees: Nominations, People and Pay; Audit, Risk & Assurance; Health, Safety & Environment; Capital Projects; and Transformation. Delivering the required capability build will take time and the company will continue to update the department on its progress.

3.7 It is British Steel's responsibility to engage with unions and local authorities, and the department supports them in doing so. The Chair (supported by British Steel management) will conduct these activities as part of transformation option development. Government have commissioned the British Steel board to design and share their engagement plan to this purpose. Government is engaging with the relevant Mayoral Strategic Authorities (MSAs), local authorities and regional partners to ensure affected areas are closely involved in discussions on economic resilience, regeneration and growth opportunities. Officials are working with MSAs and No.10 North to finalise arrangements for structured mayoral engagement and knowledge-sharing.

3.8 Once the board has developed a transformation plan, government will assess how long government support is necessary, taking account of value for money for taxpayers and affordability, and potential private sector involvement in accordance with the Steel Strategy.

4. PAC conclusion: The department engaged effectively with the local Council and trade unions at the start of the intervention, but it is not clear how it will involve them in shaping the future of the company and the steel sector.

4. PAC recommendation: The department's plans for British Steel should also make clear:

a. how it will ensure formal and ongoing involvement of workers, unions and local stakeholders in decisions about the future of British Steel and the UK steel sector, including formal consultation mechanisms, and options for representation in governance structures, including the new Board.

b. How it will work with North Lincolnshire Council and other stakeholders to develop an assessment of options for the future of the Scunthorpe site.

4.1 The government agrees with this recommendation.

Recommendation implemented

4.2 While the government is not in a position to publish a plan for British Steel (as highlighted in the response to recommendation 1), it has sought to provide the requested information below.

4.3 As the planning work detailed in the response to recommendation 1 progresses, government will work closely with British Steel to ensure they carefully assess the implications of all options under consideration, including for the workforce and local community. The engagement will be led by British Steel and will include early engagement with trade unions and employees, both on the development of transformation proposals and to ensure any transition from blast furnaces to electric arc furnaces is carefully managed. British Steel is currently developing its plans to formally engage the trade unions, as well as other stakeholders including the relevant Mayoral Combined Authorities and Local Authorities.

4.4 The government has already begun engagement with regional governance structures including local councils and Mayoral Combined Authorities, to support economic growth and regeneration in the wider region. Further engagement will be centred on understanding local priorities, shaping both workforce support and regeneration interventions, and ensuring that local expertise informs government decision making from an early stage. In North Lincolnshire and the Humber, government will use established forums, including the Humber Economic board and engagement with the Greater Lincolnshire Combined County Authority, to align transformation planning with local growth strategies and regeneration ambitions. This will be complemented by regular ministerial and official engagement, with local partners playing a central role in the design and delivery of any response to workforce impacts and longer-term economic transformation.

5. PAC conclusion: The department has not set out a detailed implementation plan for funding and delivering its steel strategy.

5a. PAC recommendation: Once the new spending review period has been completed, the department should write to the Committee to set out:

an implementation plan for the steel strategy, including target dates and volumes for domestic steel production, how allocation of the overall £2.5bn funding commitment will be spent on each initiative, the indicative milestones and delivery timelines, and arrangements for monitoring progress

5.1 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: December 2027

5.2 The government agrees with the principle of ensuring there is a robust approach to delivering and monitoring the Steel Strategy. The department has taken a Theory of Change approach regarding how the actions in the Strategy map to a range of outcomes, in order to achieve the Strategy's ambitions. This includes the 40-50% domestic market share objective of the Steel Strategy, which sets a clear aspiration to help inform the scale of intervention in the sector, as opposed to being fixed to a specific timescale given that it is determined by complex market dynamics.

5.3 The department is working with the Steel Council to develop a set of Key Performance Indicators to monitor progress and delivery. The department will provide this monitoring information to the Committee at the end of the spending review period. This will include further information on funding, within the context that the government has committed to funding up to £2.5 billion (in addition to the £500 million investment with Tata) through various means. This includes through the National Wealth Fund, in accordance with the principles underpinning that Fund.

5b. PAC recommendation: Once the new spending review period has been completed, the department should write to the Committee to set out:

how it will coordinate delivery of the steel strategy to ensure policy coherence across government (for example, the Department for Energy Security & Net Zero on energy policy and decarbonisation and the Department for Education on skills)

5.4 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: December 2027

5.5 The department works closely with other government departments on policies to improve the business environment for the UK steel sector. In addition to those listed, this includes the Cabinet Office on procurement policy, HM Treasury on the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism, and the Ministry of Defence on opportunities for the UK steel sector in defence.

5c. PAC recommendation: Once the new spending review period has been completed, the department should write to the Committee to set out:

a plan for scrap metal which would be required for new electric furnaces and an assessment of the economic viability of establishing a hydrogen-powered DRI plant in the UK. This should highlight the costs and benefits of ensuring access to a secure supply of iron in the UK.

5.6 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: December 2027

5.7 Through the Metals Circularity Group (MCG), the government is working with industry and other stakeholders to identify barriers to greater metals circularity and assess the conditions needed to support investment, domestic processing capacity and resilient scrap supply chains. This evidence-gathering process will inform future policy development and recommendations to Ministers, and the department will update the Committee on progress at the end of 2027.

5.8 On securing the adequate supply of iron for UK steelmakers, as part of the evidence base for the steel strategy, the department commissioned the Materials Processing Institute to carry out a Primary Steelmaking Review. This concluded that, in the short term, iron needs can be met from offshore supplies and that economic viability for hydrogen-powered DRI production in the UK was heavily dependent on electricity and hydrogen costs. It is also the case that the UK does not have appropriate natural resources of iron ore, so the supply chains for iron will always have a requirement for imports.

5.9 The department continues to monitor developments in hydrogen DRI and is engaging with innovators developing new methods of transforming iron ore into the iron required for steelmaking. We will consider a further assessment of the viability of iron reduction capability in the UK if there are substantive developments in key competitiveness factors, related technologies or demand for iron. Through the Steel Council, an industry working group on Research, Development and Innovation has also been established to align RD&I activities to the needs of industry with the aim of enhancing sector competitiveness. The group will look at both near- and long-term opportunities for innovation, in line with the ambitions of the steel strategy.

5d. PAC recommendation: Once the new spending review period has been completed, the department should write to the Committee to set out:

what plans it has to involve private sector investment.

5.10 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Target implementation date: December 2027

5.11 The department is working to support market engagement and assess private sector interest in the UK steel sector and can update the Committee on this activity. The department is clear that a healthy steel sector needs private investment.

6. PAC conclusion: The department has not addressed the concerns of businesses who are affected adversely by the new tariff regime that started on 1 July 2026.

6a. PAC recommendation: The department should urgently establish a formal route for businesses to raise concerns about the new tariff regime.

6.1 The government agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Recommendation implemented

6.2 The department has provided formal routes for businesses to raise concerns throughout the design and operation of the steel trade measure. The department engaged extensively with business throughout the policy making process, including through the Steel Trade Measure: Call for Evidence, published on 4 July 2025, and multiple roundtables at official and ministerial level. These engagements informed a 21% uplift to the final quota volumes compared to the provisional quota volumes published in April.

6.3 The department continues to closely monitor the implementation of the measure and engage with businesses across the supply chain, including via a Ministerial roundtable in November with industry stakeholders. It has set up a dedicated mailbox for businesses to provide evidence and feedback directly to policy officials at steeltrade@businessandtrade.gov.uk.

6.4 The department therefore disagrees with the Committee's conclusion that the department has not addressed the concerns of businesses.

6b. PAC recommendation: Within six months, the department should work with industry to develop a more detailed product classification system and set out how it will monitor and mitigate unintended impacts on UK manufacturers.

6.5 The government disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

6.6 The department is engaging with industry to assess the impact of the steel trade measure, but it cannot commit to a more detailed product classification system at this stage or agree to implement one within six months.

6.7 The department has committed to review the measure after 12 months to ensure a predictable and consistent operating environment for businesses. This timeframe will also allow adequate time for import flows and business behaviour to stabilise so that the measure's effectiveness can be assessed accurately. As a part of the 12-month review process we will continue to engage with industry.

6.8 The department notes that, to allow UK businesses to import and export efficiently, any classification system adopted will align with the Combined Nomenclature (CN codes) of European Communities, and more widely, to the Harmonised Commodity Description and Coding System (HS codes) of the World Customs Organisation.

Treasury Minutes Archive[1]

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

Session 2026-27

Committee Recommendations: 117
Recommendations agreed: 105 (90%)
Recommendations disagreed: 12

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
July 2026	Government response to PAC reports 2-3 [76-79 Session 24-26]	CP 1649
August 2026	Government response to PAC reports 1,4-8	CP 1668
September 2026	Government response to PAC reports 9-11	CP 1681
November 2026	Government response to PAC reports 12,13 and 15	CP 1720

Session 2024-26

Committee Recommendations: 661
Recommendations agreed: 615 (93%)
Recommendations disagreed: 46

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
April 2025	Government response to PAC reports 1-4, 6-9	CP 1306
May 2025	Government response to PAC reports 5,10-17	CP 1328
June 2025	Government response to PAC reports 18-22	CP 1341
July 2025	Government response to PAC reports 23-26	CP 1367
August 2025	Government response to PAC reports 27-34	CP 1382
September 2025	Government response to PAC reports 35-42	CP 1404
December 2025	Government response to PAC reports 43-46 48 and 49	CP 1469
January 2026	Government response to PAC reports 50-55 (and 56 BBC)	CP 1488
March 2026	Government response to PAC reports 57-61	CP 1533
April 2026	Government response to PAC reports 62-67	CP 1522
May 2026	Government response to PAC reports 68-75	CP 1587
July 2026	Government response to PAC reports 76-79 [2-3 Session 26-27]	CP 1649

Session 2023-24

Committee Recommendations: 271
Recommendations agreed: 252 (93%)
Recommendations disagreed: 19

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
February 2024	Government response to PAC reports 1-6 [80 Session 22-23]	CP 1029
March 2024	Government response to PAC reports 7-11	CP 1057
April 2024	Government response to PAC reports 12-18	CP 1070
May 2024	Government response to PAC reports 19-24	CP 1085
September 2024	Government response to PAC reports 26-29, 31, 33-38	CP 1151
October 2024	Government response to PAC reports 25, 26, 30 and 32	CP 1174

[1] List of Treasury Minutes responses for Sessions 2010-15 are annexed in the government's response to PAC Report 52

Session 2022-23

Committee Recommendations: 551
Recommendations agreed: 489 (89%)
Recommendations disagreed: 62

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
July 2022	Government response to PAC reports 1, 3 & 10	CP 722
August 2022	Government response to PAC reports 2, 4-8	CP 708
September 2022	Government response to PAC reports 9, 13-16	CP 745
November 2022	Government response to PAC reports 11, 12, 17	CP 755
December 2022	Government response to PAC reports 18-22	CP 774
January 2023	Government response to PAC reports 23-26	CP 781
February 2023	Government response to PAC reports 27-31	CP 802
March 2023	Government response to PAC reports 32-36	CP 828
May 2023	Government response to PAC reports 37-41	CP 845
June 2023	Government response to PAC reports 42-47	CP 847
July 2023	Government response to PAC reports 48-54	CP 902
August 2023	Government response to PAC reports 55-60	CP 921
September 2023	Government response to PAC reports 62-67	CP 941
November 2023	Government response to PAC reports 68-71	CP 968
January 2024	Government response to PAC reports 72-79	CP 1000
February 2024	Government response to PAC reports 80 [1-6 Session 23-24]	CP 1029

Session 2021-22

Committee Recommendations: 362
Recommendations agreed: 333 (92%)
Recommendations disagreed: 29

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
August 2021	Government response to PAC reports 1-6	CP 510
September 2021	Government response to PAC reports 8-11	CP 520
November 2021	Government response to PAC reports 7,13-16 (and TM2 BBC)	CP 550
December 2021	Government response to PAC reports 12, 17-21	CP 583
January 2022	Government response to PAC reports 22-26	CP 603
February 2022	Government response to PAC reports 27-31	CP 631
April 2022	Government response to PAC reports 32-35	CP 649
April 2022	Government response to PAC reports 36-42	CP 667
July 2022	Government response to PAC reports 49-52	CP 722

Session 2019-21

Committee Recommendations: 233
Recommendations agreed: 208 (89%)
Recommendations disagreed: 25

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
July 2020	Government responses to PAC reports 1-6	CP 270
September 2020	Government responses to PAC reports 7-13	CP 291
November 2020	Government responses to PAC reports 14-17 and 19	CP 316
January 2021	Government responses to PAC reports 18, 20-24	CP 363

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
February 2021	Government responses to PAC reports 25-29	CP 376
February 2021	Government responses to PAC reports 30-34	CP 389
March 2021	Government responses to PAC reports 35-39	CP 409
April 2021	Government responses to PAC reports 40- 44	CP 420
May 2021	Government responses to PAC reports 45-51	CP 434
June 2021	Government responses to PAC reports 52-56	CP 456

Session 2019

Committee Recommendations: 11
Recommendations agreed: 11 (100%)
Recommendations disagreed: 0

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
January 2020	Government response to PAC report [112-119] 1 and 2	CP 210

Session 2017-19

Committee Recommendations: 747
Recommendations agreed: 675 (90%)
Recommendations disagreed: 72 (10%)

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
December 2017	Government response to PAC report 1	Cm 9549
January 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 2 and 3	Cm 9565
March 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 4-11	Cm 9575
March 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 12-19	Cm 9596
May 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 20-30	Cm 9618
June 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 31-37	Cm 9643
July 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 38-42	Cm 9667
October 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 43-58	Cm 9702
December 2018	Government responses to PAC reports 59-63	Cm 9740
January 2019	Government responses to PAC reports 64-68	CP 18
March 2019	Government responses to PAC reports 69-71	CP 56
April 2019	Government responses to PAC reports 72-77	CP 79
May 2019	Government responses to PAC reports 78-81 and 83-85	CP 97
June 2019	Government responses to PAC reports 82, 86-92	CP 113
July 2019	Government responses to PAC reports 93-94 and 96-98	CP 151
October 2019	Government responses to PAC reports 95, 99-111	CP 176
January 2020	Government response to PAC reports 112-119 [1 and 2]	CP 210

Session 2016-17

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

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
November 2016	Government responses to PAC reports 1-13	Cm 9351
December 2016	Government responses to PAC reports 14-21	Cm 9389
February 2017	Government responses to PAC reports 22-25 and 28	Cm 9413

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
March 2017	Government responses to PAC reports 26-27 and 29-34	Cm 9429
March 2017	Government responses to PAC reports 35-41	Cm 9433
October 2017	Government responses to PAC reports 42-44 and 46-64	Cm 9505

Session 2015-16

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

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

Treasury Minutes Progress Reports Archive

Treasury Minute Progress Reports provide government updates on progress towards the implementation of recommendations from the Committee of Public Accounts. These reports are Command Papers laid in Parliament.

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
June 2026	Session 2017-19: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2019-21: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2021-22: updates on 3 PAC reports Session 2022-23: updates on 12 PAC reports Session 2023-24: updates on 19 PAC reports Session 2024-26: updates to 50 PAC reports	CP 1593
December 2025	Session 2017-19: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2019-21: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2021-22: updates on 5 PAC reports Session 2022-23: updates on 24 PAC reports Session 2023-24: updates on 30 PAC reports Session 2024-26: updates to 25 PAC reports	CP 1453
March 2025	Session 2017-19: updates on 3 PAC reports Session 2019-21: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2021-22: updates on 9 PAC reports Session 2022-23: updates on 41 PAC reports Session 2023-24: updates on 36 PAC reports	CP 1284
May 2024	Session 2017-19: updates on 5 PAC reports Session 2019-21: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2021-22: updates on 10 PAC reports Session 2022-23: updates on 53 PAC reports Session 2023-24: updates on 6 PAC reports	CP 1102
December 2023	Session 2017-19: updates on 9 PAC reports Session 2019-21: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2021-22: updates on 18 PAC reports Session 2022-23: updates on 48 PAC reports	CP 987
June 2023	Session 2013-14: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2017-19: updates on 11 PAC reports Session 2019-21: updates on 5 PAC reports Session 2021-22: updates on 29 PAC reports Session 2022-23: updates on 27 PAC reports	CP 847
December 2022	Session 2013-14: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2017-19: updates on 16 PAC reports Session 2019-21: updates on 14 PAC reports Session 2021-22: updates on 38 PAC reports Session 2022-23: updates on 8 PAC reports	CP 765
June 2022	Session 2013-14: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2017-19: updates on 27 PAC reports Session 2019-21: updates on 34 PAC reports Session 2021-22: updates on 30 PAC reports	CP 691
November 2021	Session 2013-14: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2016-17: updates on 3 PAC reports Session 2017-19: updates on 33 PAC reports Session 2019: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2019-21: updates on 47 PAC reports Session 2021-22: updates on 5 PAC reports	CP 549

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
May 2021	Session 2010-12: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2013-14: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2016-17: updates on 4 PAC reports Session 2017-19: updates on 47 PAC reports Session 2019: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2019-21: updates on 28 PAC reports	CP 424
November 2020	Session 2010-12: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2013-14: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2016-17: updates on 7 PAC reports Session 2017-19: updates on 73 PAC reports Session 2019: updates on 2 reports	CP 313
February 2020	Session 2010-12: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2015-16: updates on 3 PAC reports Session 2016-17: updates on 14 PAC reports Session 2017-19: updates on 71 PAC reports	CP 221
March 2019	Session 2010-12: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 4 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 7 PAC reports Session 2016-17: updates on 22 PAC reports Session 2017-19: updates on 46 PAC reports	CP 70
July 2018	Session 2010-12: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 4 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 9 PAC reports Session 2016-17: updates on 38 PAC reports Session 2017-19: updates on 17 PAC reports	Cm 9668
January 2018	Session 2010-12: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 5 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 4 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 14 PAC reports Session 2016-17: updates on 52 PAC reports	Cm 9566
October 2017	Session 2010-12: updates on 3 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 7 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 12 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 26 PAC reports Session 2016-17: updates on 39 PAC reports	Cm 9506
January 2017	Session 2010-12: updates on 1 PAC report Session 2013-14: updates on 5 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 7 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 18 PAC reports	Cm 9407
July 2016	Session 2010-12: updates on 6 PAC reports Session 2012-13: updates on 2 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 15 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 22 PAC reports Session 2015-16: updates on 6 PAC reports	Cm 9320
February 2016	Session 2010-12: updates on 8 PAC reports Session 2012-13: updates on 7 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 22 PAC reports Session 2014-15: updates on 27 PAC reports	Cm 9202

Publication Date	PAC Reports	Ref Number
March 2015	Session 2010-12: updates on 26 PAC reports Session 2012-13: updates on 17 PAC reports Session 2013-14: updates on 43 PAC reports	Cm 9034
July 2014	Session 2010-12: updates on 60 PAC reports Session 2012-13: updates on 37 PAC reports	Cm 8899
February 2013	Session 2010-12: updates on 31 PAC reports	Cm 8539

978-1-5286-6922-1
E03731551