

Strand	Strand Lead	Score Received	Date	Moderated
Commercial				
Policy				
Digital				
Operational				

<b>v7</b>	Sourcing Decision Options Analysis
<b>Programme</b>	UC Targeted Case Review
<b>INSTRUCTIONS</b>	
<b>STEP 1</b>	Agree and ratify the Long List Options
<b>STEP 2</b>	Agree and ratify the Critical Success Factors (CSF) and weighting of importance (refer CSFs Tab)
<b>STEP 3</b>	Refer 'Moderated Scores' Tab. Undertake an appraisal, using the scoring matrix in Cells A20:C25 (e.g. see below 2 Very Likely : -2 Very Unlikely to achieve the CS ). For each of the 7 Options (horizontal), please input your scores in your workstream Policy/Digital/Operations/Comm for each CSF (vertical). Note: The scores will be averaged upon consolidation of all of your scores; this allows us to then come back together as a group to agree a moderated score. The weighting is then applied to the moderated score.
<b>STEP 4</b> <b>(For later</b> <b>Permutations</b> <b>Workshop)</b>	Work through a lower level due diligence on the short listed options. This will include further permutations to inform decision making and design (Note: this tab will be developed at the next step.)

	Contribution to Success Factor	Points awarded
Best ranking	Very likely	2
	Likely	1
	Middle	0
Worst ranking	Unlikely	-1
	Very unlikely	-2

#	Business Options Short-List	Layers Impacted	Consideration
1	DO NOTHING	Across all Layers – Strategic, Decision, Assessment and Clerical	•Stop recruitment once current Business Case levels reached (2800 - December 2023), and handle the requirement through existing DWP BAU resources. All activities transfer to BAU and are subject to standard BAU practices
<b>MOST VIABLE SOLUTIONS</b>			
2	FULLY AGGREGATED – Inhouse	Across all Layers – Strategic, Decision, Assessment and Clerical	•Deliver the full end-to-end service (Decision, Assessment and Clerical) to the business case criteria utilising inhouse resources, capabilities and suitably scoped support services
3	FULLY AGGREGATED – Outsource to a Single Supplier	Across all Layers end-to-end – Decision, Assessment and Clerical	•Deliver the full end-to-end service (Decision, Assessment and Clerical) to the business case criteria through a single third party supplier
4	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Single Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Decision Inhouse, Assessment & Clerical Outsourced	•Retain the Decision capability Inhouse; outsource the Assessment and Clerical layers to a single third party
5	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Single Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Decision & Assessment Inhouse, Clerical Outsourced	•Retain the Decision and Assessment capabilities Inhouse; outsource the Clerical layer to a single third party
<b>OTHER POSSIBLE OPTIONS (LESS VIABLE)</b>			
6	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Multiple Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Decision Inhouse, Assessment & Clerical Outsourced	•Retain the Decision capability Inhouse; outsource the Assessment and Clerical layers to more than one third party
7	FULLY DISAGGREGATED – Outsource each layer to a Different Supplier	For Each Individual Layer – Decision, Assessment and Clerical	•Deliver the full end-to-end service to the business case criteria using different suppliers to deliver each of the layers
8	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Single Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Clerical Inhouse, Decision & Assessment Outsourced	•Retain the Clerical capability Inhouse; outsource the Decision and Assessment layers to a single third party
9	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Single Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Decision & Clerical Inhouse, Assessment Outsourced	•Retain the Decision and Clerical capability Inhouse; outsource the Assessment layer to a single third party

* In the Options above, we have assumed that ALL options have DWP retaining Strategy, Policy, Financial Control, Accountability, Contract Management and Decision
* We have assumed that Outsourcing refers to private sector organisations due to the complexity and size of this (and liabilities / reputational damage associated with
* We have assumed that whichever option is chosen will be compliant with the relevant DWP security / policy / standards and service requirements
We need confirmation whether Decision activities will always remain within DWP and will not be considered for this activity

#	Critical Success Factors to deliver the objective – The options are appraised against these	Weighting %
<b>1</b>	<b>Achieving the UC Targeted Case Review Measures</b>	<b>30%</b>
<i>a</i>	Delivers up to 2.4% (%age to be updated) MVFE (Monetary Value of Fraud and Error) over the scorecard period to FY2027/28	
<i>b</i>	Results in £6.4 billion AME (Annually Managed Expenditure) over the scorecard period to FY2027/28	
<i>c</i>	Achieves a target of c.4m (total TBC) of Cases Reviewed in line with the MVFE and AME targets	
<i>d</i>	Provides the ability to scale to the required capacity in order to achieve the Business Case targets	
<i>e</i>	Ensures data integrity, validation and quality	
<i>f</i>	Identifies learnings and provides feedback to other DWP business areas so that potential cases of fraud and error may be avoided	
<b>2</b>	<b>Preventing Risk to Reputation</b>	<b>20%</b>
<i>a</i>	Minimises the likelihood of incorrect decisions which impact customers adversely and result in negative publicity	
<i>b</i>	Mitigates the risk of negatively affecting customer service levels in other related areas across Universal Credit	
<i>c</i>	Maintains appropriate internal and external controls to manage risks such as loss of data	
<i>d</i>	Ensures alignment of DWP service policies with its legal obligations	
<b>3</b>	<b>Value For Money (Appropriate use of Public Funding)</b>	<b>20%</b>
<i>a</i>	Ensures that the ROI of the solution achieves a minimum of 3:1 return of AME saved from DEL invested	
<b>4</b>	<b>Sustainability of Solution</b>	<b>20%</b>
<i>a</i>	Ensures Flexibility – DWP retains the ability to adapt the size, scope and timeframes of the operation depending on peaks and troughs in activity	
<i>b</i>	Ensures Sustainability – the solution must clear the stock of incorrect cases but also be able to maintain it an acceptable level post the initial period	
<i>c</i>	Minimises any adverse impact to the wider department as a consequence of placing unsustainable pressure on the estate or reducing headcount in other areas	
<b>5</b>	<b>Complexity (of the End to End process and Operational Management)</b>	<b>10%</b>
<i>a</i>	Ensures there is commercial viability and the end to end processes are manageable both to to set up and to administer whilst having minimal inter-dependencies	
<i>b</i>	Ensures any operational overheads in terms of implementation and management are not onerous	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>

#	Business Decision Short-List	Current Approach	Outsourcing
1	DO NOTHING	Across all Layers – Strategic, Decision, Assessment and Clerical	•Stop recruitment and handle the requirement through existing DWP resources
2	FULLY AGGREGATED – Inhouse	Across all Layers – Strategic, Decision, Assessment and Clerical	•Deliver the full end-to-end service (Decision, Assessment and Clerical) to the business case criteria utilising Inhouse resources, capabilities and suitably scoped subcontract services
3(a)	FULLY AGGREGATED – Outsource to a Single Supplier	Across all Layers end-to-end – Strategic, Decision, Assessment and Clerical	•Deliver the full end-to-end service (Decision, Assessment and Clerical) to the business case criteria through a single third party supplier
3(b)	FULLY AGGREGATED – Outsource to Multiple Suppliers	Across all Layers end-to-end – Strategic, Decision, Assessment and Clerical	•Deliver the full end-to-end service (Decision, Assessment and Clerical) to the business case criteria through more than one third party supplier
4	FULLY DISAGGREGATED – Outsource to a Different Supplier	For Each Individual Layer – Assessment and Clerical	•Deliver the full end-to-end service to the business case criteria using different suppliers to deliver each of the layers
5(a)	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Single Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Assessment Inhouse, Decision & Clerical Outsourced	•Retain the Assessment capability Inhouse; outsource the Decision and Clerical layers to a single third party
5(b)	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Multiple Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Assessment Inhouse, Decision & Clerical Outsourced	•Retain the Assessment capability Inhouse; outsource the Decision and Clerical layers to more than one third party
6(a)	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Single Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Clerical Inhouse, Decision & Assessment Outsourced	•Retain the Clerical capability Inhouse; outsource the Decision and Assessment layers to a single third party
6(b)	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Multiple Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Clerical Inhouse, Decision & Assessment Outsourced	•Retain the Clerical capability Inhouse; outsource the Decision and Assessment layers to more than one third party
7(a)	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Single Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Decision & Assessment Inhouse, Clerical Outsourced	•Retain the Decision and Assessment capabilities Inhouse; outsource the Clerical layer to a single third party
7(b)	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Multiple Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Decision & Assessment Inhouse, Clerical Outsourced	•Retain the Decision and Assessment capabilities Inhouse; outsource the Clerical layer to more than one third party
8(a)	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Single Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Decision Inhouse, Assessment & Clerical Outsourced	•Retain the Decision capability Inhouse; outsource the Assessment and Clerical layers to a single third party
8(b)	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Multiple Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Decision Inhouse, Assessment & Clerical Outsourced	•Retain the Decision capability Inhouse; outsource the Assessment and Clerical layers to more than one third party
9(a)	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Single Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Decision & Clerical Inhouse, Assessment Outsourced	•Retain the Decision and Clerical capability Inhouse; outsource the Assessment layer to a single third party
9(b)	HYBRID APPROACH – Combination of Inhouse & Multiple Supplier Outsource	Selected Layers – Decision & Clerical Inhouse, Assessment Outsourced	•Retain the Decision and Clerical capability Inhouse; outsource the Assessment layer to more than one third party

\* In the Options above, we have assumed that ALL options have DWP retaining Strategy, Policy, Financial Control, Accountability, Contract Management and Decision

\* We have assumed that Outsourcing refers to private sector organisations due to the complexity and size of this (and liabilities / reputational damage associated with

\* We have assumed that whichever option is chosen will be compliant with the relevant DWP security / policy / standards and service requirements

We need confirmation whether Decision activities will always remain within DWP and will not be considered for this activity

### Solution Options Decision Analysis

		Option 1													Option 2												
		DO NOTHING													FULLY AGGREGATED – Inhouse												
		Across all Layers – Strategic, Decision, Assessment and Clerical													Across all Layers – Strategic, Decision, Assessment and Clerical												
Critical Success Factor	Weight	Detail	Core Project	Op Model	W&H Ops	Business Strategy	P, C and P (HR)	Finance BP	DMA Policy	Design	Security Risk	MODERATED	Weighted Total	Detail	Core Project	W&H Ops	Business Strategy	P, C and P (HR)	Finance BP	DMA Policy	Design	Security Risk	MODERATED	Weighted Total	Detail		
Achieving the UC Targeted Case Review Measures	30%	Highly unlikely to meet the Business Case KPIs and objectives due to internal constraints and inability to increase the number of cases reviewed at pace	-2	-2	0	-2	-2	-2	-1	-2	-1	-2	-0.6	Direction of travel thus far indicates success. Department constrained by existing capacity development processes, recruiting practices and head count constraints  Comm - recruitment is currently quite difficult. There could be excess headcount once work completed that DWP does not have work for.  A strong plan for 2023, with a great opportunity for staff progression. Strong sense that the plan could work but there remains impacting assessment.	1	0	0	-1	0	1	1	2	1	0.3	Initial onboarding would take time but supplier could flex to meet demand.  Comm- If this was outsourced supplier would be required to meet demand. There would be onboarding times for inhouse. TUPE risks can be mitigated. Revised score from 2 to 1  Lead times of 13 months to outsourcing supplier. Potential risk of TUPE for existing agents.		
Preventing Risk to Reputation	20%	This option will fail to enhance the reputation of the Department; furthermore as a failed initiative that does not address benefit and fraud error, this would be reputationally detrimental.  The reputational impact on DWP of having to seek more funding to meet a higher than expected fraud and error rate would be damaging.	-2	-2	1	-2	-2	-2	-1	0	2	-1	-0.2	All risk lies within the control of DWP. This reduces but does not eliminate risk. Reputational risk of failure still exists and from internal mismanagement and slow progress  Comm - the risk of reputational damage exists regardless where the work done. Admittedly by outsourcing this risk is more visible	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	0.4	Recognised that greater risks lies with controls and services performed outside of DWP direct control - any disruption or failure would be detrimental  Comm - DWP would come under significant scrutiny if Strategy was outsourced and has policy implications		
Value For Money (Appropriate use of Public Funding)	20%	Whilst this has the least cost to the Department this fails to deliver the financial benefit of payment recovery	-2	-2	-1	-2	-2	-2	-1	-2	-1	-0.2	Outsourcing proven to be more than 10% cheaper based on internal benchmarks and prior experience.  Comm - given the EO grading of work in DWP, likely that outsourcing would be cheaper" Comm - based on other contracts cost of outsourcing would be cheaper especially in the long run (ie not having to retain staff before end of contract duration).  No assumption that quality would be impacted. Would be tested through market responses.	-2	0	0	-2	0	-1	1	-2	-0.4	Comm - given the EO grading of work in DWP, likely that outsourcing would be cheaper" Comm - based on other contracts cost of outsourcing would be cheaper especially in the long run (ie not having to retain staff before end of contract duration). This is based on experience of other contracts and the fact at end of contract no residual staffing costs would remain/ redeployment be required.				
Sustainability of Solution	20%	Historic volumes and size of the backlog has shown that this option would not be sustainable Mod -2800 meets the ongoing requirement (no losses of colleagues at the end of the surge period)	-2	-2	1	-2	-2	-2	-1	-1	1	-1	-0.2	Ability to flex hindered by employment practices, Department rules and headcount limitations Internally utilise workforce elsewhere and ability to use FTAs. Comm - contractually supplier could be asked to do more/different work increasing flex. Recent experience of Covid (increased volumes, work coaches) etc. See risks - especially the size and maintenance of the AO community.	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	0	2	-1	-0.2	Ability to flex to meet demand and scale down once process in control. However, DWP could become highly reliant on a single supplier. Comm - This option provides facility to ramp resource up and down at no cost to DWP (if contract written accordingly) See Sustainability Principle		
Complexity (of the End to End process and Operational Management)	10%	Mod - DWP will have agreed processes and the ability to iterate in life. All layers in-house reduces the number of interfaces	-2	0	1	0	0	0	0	-1	2	1	0.1	All processes delivered in-house minimising hand-offs. Continued programme centric continuous improvement will optimise the processes.	2	2	2	2	2	0	1	2	2	0.2	All processes delivered by a single entity thereby minimising hand-offs in most cases. However, certain aspects of decision making may require consultation with DWP. Comm- this option would see Fraud cases and known vulnerable customers being filtered by third party. This adds risk and complexities - around access to Fraud systems etc. If certain aspects of decision making require consultation with DWP then this option isn't "fully aggregated" - this option is not possible due to Strategy and requirement for consultation with DWP.		
100%			-10	-8	2	-8	-8	-8	-4	-6	3	-4	-1.10		4	3	3	0	3	2	3	9	2	0.30			

Contribution to Success Factor	Points awarded
Very likely	2

Consideration	Topic	Detail	Insource/ Outsource	CSC Impacted
1	Reputation	Any decision to outsource will increase public awareness of the TCR activity and also increase scrutiny	Outsource	Preventing Risk to Reputation
2	Reputation	Loss of personal data by a third party impacts DWP's reputation	Outsource	Preventing Risk to Reputation
3	Reputation	Poor decision-making in case management may result in adverse press coverage	Both	Preventing Risk to Reputation
4	Effect	Balance the potential negative publicity of outsource with the deterrent factor	Both	Preventing Risk to Reputation
5	Fraud Prosecution	Ineffective measures are in place preventing a coherent and effective fraud prosecution approach	Outsource	Achieving the UC Targeted Case Review Measures
6	Operational Performance	If TCR capacity is increased by internal transfers from other services, there is a risk that the operational performance of those services will be impacted adversely	Insource	Sustainability of Solution
7	Estates Constraints	Availability of office space in DWP offices	Insource – Definitely Outsource – If co-location solution identified	Sustainability of Solution

Total votes		Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7	Option 8	Option 9
CSF				CSF1 - happy to change to 0 (this was based on the comments)						
		-2 63% (7) (Winner)	0-3	- happy to change to 0 - understanding that the AME comments	-2 0% (0) -1 0% (0) 0 27% (3)	-2 0% (0) -1 0% (0) 0 45% (5)	2 0% (0) 1 18% (2)		-2 88% (8) (Winner) -1 11% (1) 0 0% (0) 1 0% (0) 2 0% (0)	-2 70% (7) (Winner) -1 20% (2) 0 10% (1) 1 0% (0) 2 0% (0)
1		-1 27% (3) 0 9% (1) 1 0% (0) 2 0% (0)	1-7 (winner)	happy to come down to 0	**1 63% (7) (Winner)** 2 9% (1)	1 54% (6) Winner 2 0% (0)	**0 63% (7) (Winner)** -1 18% (2) -2 0% (0)	Moderated as is		
		-2 20% (2)		Moderated score 0						
		**1 60% (6) (Winner) **	Moderated	Votes on		Votes				
2		0 0% (0) 1 10% (1) 2 10% (1) -2 45% (5)		-2 8 -1 1 0 - 0 1 - 0 2 - 0	-2 0% (0) -1 20% (2) **0 50% (5) (Winner)** 1 30% (3) 2 0% (0)	-2 0% (0) -1 18% (2) **0 72% (8)** 1 9% (1) 2 0% (0)	Consensus on -1	Moderated as -	Consensus at -2	-2 10% (1) -1 20% (2) **0 70% (7) (Winner)** 1 0% (0) 2 0% (0)
3		**1 54% (6) (Winner) **	Moderated as -2	Votes	-2 0% (0) -1 0% (0) 0 18% (2)	Votes	-2 0% (0) -1 0% (0) 0 18% (2)	-2 12% (1)	-287% (7) (Winner) -1 12% (1) 0 0% (0) 1 0% (0) 2 0% (0)	-2 0% (0) -1 20% (2) **0 80% (8) (Winner)** 1 0% (0) 2 0% (0)
		0 0% (0) 1 0% (0) 2 0% (0) -2 18% (2)		2 - 9 (winner)	**1 45% (5) (Winner)** 2 36% (4)	**0 54% (6)** 1 45% (5) 2 0% (0)	**1 81% (9) (Winner)** 2 0% (0)			
		**1 45% (5)		1 - 2		Lyndon - 2 =				
4		**1 45% (5) (Winner) **	Moderated at -1	CSF4 - all 2	1 11% (1)	-2 0% (0) -1 0% (0) 0 11% (1) 0 9% (1)	-2 0% (0) -1 0% (0) 0 0% (0)	Consensus at -2	Moderated at -1	**1 90% (10) (Winner)** 2 9% (1)
		0 9% (1) 1 27% (3) 2 0% (0) Original score			**2 77% (7) (Winner)**	**1 81% (9) (winner)** 2 9% (1)				**1 90% (10) (Winner)** 2 9% (1)
		-2 0% (0) -1 0% (0)								
		**0 72% (8) (Winner) **								
		1 27% (3) 2 0% (0)		votes	-2 10% (1)	Votes	-2 0% (0)			
5	Rescore	Moderated as is		-2 = 7 (winner)	-**1 50% (5) (Winner)** 0 30% (3) 1 10% (1) 2 0% (0)	-2 0% (0)	**1 77% (7) (Winner)** 0 22% (2) 1 0% (0) 2 0% (0)	Consensus at -2		-2 88% (8) (Winner) -1 11% (1) 0 0% (0) 1 0% (0) 2 0% (0)
		-2 0% (0) -1 0% (0) 0 10% (1)		-1 = 1 0 = 2 1 = 1	**10 responses**	**18 1% (9)** 0 18% (2) 1 0% (0) 2 0% (0)				-2 90% (9) (Winner) -1 10% (1) 0 0% (0) 1 0% (0) 2 0% (0)
		**1 90% (9) (Winner) **								
		**10 responses**								

Ref	Q	Consideration	Noted by	Action/Outcome
1	1	<p>It was initially understood that this option assumed doing nothing and stopping recruitment. It was then agreed that it should be interpreted as Do Nothing beyond the 2,800 agents already in flight. This is consistent with the overall principle.</p> <p>There is a general consensus that doing nothing will not change what is currently being done in the sense that it would make it more complex, and that it has been said that because the process is fairly new there are things that will naturally be improved, and by Dec. 2023 the process will have been enhanced.</p> <p>It is safer to develop all processes in-house as DWP would be in control and would have less exposure to external risks.</p> <p>It was discussed that an in-house solution would be harder to scale due to constraints in Estate, IT, and the challenges with internal data feeds.</p> <p>The VFM needs updating slightly to reflect the need to differentiate when an option could be the most economical as currently it only takes about 3 to 5 mins.</p> <p>It needs to be recognised that the type of working arrangement will impact the VFM element – for example, working from home would be cheaper than a hybrid or office based arrangement – which could affect any relative to in-house or outsource.</p> <p>It must be noted that having of these decisions, including the Decision layer, although potentially cheaper from an outsourcing perspective as more aspects are outsourced, there would a higher risk of complexity due to potentially having some decisions being made off-site away from the visibility of the whole process.</p> <p>Because the nature of the decisions, decision making impacts on DPL, CPCL, CHA, WU etc. – so feels more complex when the "UCP" bit and subcontract they will require consultation with DWP which is not really truly outsourced and so the scoring has to reflect this.</p> <p>Most of this option was scored in the Tuesday 28 Feb meeting but will need to score this CSF.</p>	██████	Allow people to do the re-score
2	1	<p>There is a general consensus that doing nothing will not change what is currently being done in the sense that it would make it more complex, and that it has been said that because the process is fairly new there are things that will naturally be improved, and by Dec. 2023 the process will have been enhanced.</p>	██████	Re-score option 1
3	2	<p>It is safer to develop all processes in-house as DWP would be in control and would have less exposure to external risks.</p>	██████	
4	1	<p>It was discussed that an in-house solution would be harder to scale due to constraints in Estate, IT, and the challenges with internal data feeds.</p>	██████	Majority voted to go with a score of 1
5	2	<p>The VFM needs updating slightly to reflect the need to differentiate when an option could be the most economical as currently it only takes about 3 to 5 mins.</p>	██████	CSF wording to be updated
6	2	<p>It needs to be recognised that the type of working arrangement will impact the VFM element – for example, working from home would be cheaper than a hybrid or office based arrangement – which could affect any relative to in-house or outsource.</p>	██████	Might need to adjust wording
7	1	<p>It must be noted that having of these decisions, including the Decision layer, although potentially cheaper from an outsourcing perspective as more aspects are outsourced, there would a higher risk of complexity due to potentially having some decisions being made off-site away from the visibility of the whole process.</p>	██████	Look at the CSF and option in isolation as other comments
8	1	<p>Because the nature of the decisions, decision making impacts on DPL, CPCL, CHA, WU etc. – so feels more complex when the "UCP" bit and subcontract they will require consultation with DWP which is not really truly outsourced and so the scoring has to reflect this.</p>	██████	Noted
9	4	<p>Most of this option was scored in the Tuesday 28 Feb meeting but will need to score this CSF.</p>		
10	1	<p>There is some thinking that outsourcing just clerical is good – about the counter argument is that those doing the assessment will not have the required skills to assess, and those making decisions don't have the full picture. A point was made that as the clerical and information gathering is tapered, those assessing will be able to view it.</p>	██████	Consideration
11	1	<p>There is agreement that complexity in Option 5 is minimum.</p> <p>A discussion took place regarding the risk of not achieving the AMS due to the complexity of having more than one supplier. Went to a poll where 7 out of 11 people scored the CSF as 0, 2 people scoring +1 and 1 scored -1.</p> <p>There was consensus score of 1 and a decision was taken by the group there was no need to use the poll.</p> <p>There was an agreement that outsourcing was cheaper than in-house. Views were expressed that multiple suppliers should be as cost effective as a single supplier from a contract perspective. However, managing the contracts and interactions from an internal perspective could be more expensive. This could lead to a reflection in the overall savings when compared to a single supplier.</p> <p>Went to a poll where 9 people scored it +1 and 2 people scored it 0.</p> <p>This option gives the ability to flex resources up and down.</p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding having to TUPE staff if the function was brought back in-house later. Concerns were raised generally about the complexity of the solution. Went to a poll where all 9 people voted +1.</p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding the complexity of this option and having to standardise the working processes of more than one supplier. People said they could make it work but they had concerns regarding the number of handoffs. The group discussed what the option would actually look like, and an example was given where two suppliers could both do the same work, but it was split alphabetically rather than performing different functions. Some in the group said it would have been better if this had been clarified. Examples were given of current problems in DWP with different working practices at different in-house sites and the difficulties in overcoming them.</p> <p>Went to a poll and seven people scored 0 -1 with two at 0.</p> <p>There was already a consensus score of -1.</p> <p>There was one score of -1 and the remainder were -2. They group agreed that -2 was the consensus score.</p> <p>There was a very brief discussion regarding VFM and then the group voted. This resulted in 8 people scoring this CSF -1 and 1 person 0.</p> <p>Everyone agreed to score this -2.</p> <p>Everyone scored this -2.</p> <p>A decision to outsource this would require a change in legislation which people believed made it more unlikely to achieve the CSF. Concerns were raised that by DWP just doing the clerical element of the work they would lose understanding of the process and miss intelligence. The poll resulted 8 people scoring this option -2 and 1 person -1.</p> <p>The group came to a consensus score of -2 without going to a poll.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about the implications of this option and the complexity of it. Comments were made regarding the impact it would have on roles already agreed within DWP and a belief they would have to be replaced. The poll resulted in 8 people scoring -2 and one person -1. As he had to leave to attend another meeting.</p> <p>Everyone scored this -1.</p> <p>CSF (group back to 10 people voting)</p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding the number of handoffs and the department still be responsible for the decision making even though it was outsourced. Mifs and appeals would still have to be done in-house. Concerns were raised that clerical underpins everything and the implications of the number of handovers for this option were enormous.</p> <p>Results of the poll 9 people scored -2 and 1 scored 0 -1.</p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding the outsourcing only the assessment part of the process. People commented that they found it difficult to envisage how this option would work in practice. The poll resulted in 7 people scoring 0 -2, 2 scoring 0 -1 and one person 0.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about the impression the public would have on a supplier correcting fraud and errors on behalf of the department. DWP would lose control of the process.</p> <p>After the discussion 7 people scored this 0, 2 scored it -1 and 1 person scored 0 -2.</p> <p>There were concerns raised regarding the number of handoffs and how they would affect VFM. There was also a belief that starting the work in-house sending it out and then bringing it back in would lead to duplication of work and inefficiencies. The poll results were 7 scored 0, 2 scores -1 and 2 scored -2.</p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding the handoffs and the flexibility that would be needed for this option. The poll resulted 7 people scoring -2, 1 person -1 and 1 person 0.</p> <p>There should be flexibility in the outsourcing model going forward but concerns were also raised that DWP may not have control over that flexibility.</p> <p>This option would result in a high level of complexity leading to multiple handoffs. One person said that when you map this out it is just too difficult.</p> <p>Poll resulted in all 8 scoring -2.</p>	██████	All agreed
12	1	<p>The benefits include the speed of recruitment. People spoke about this option should achieve targets. Outsourced suppliers should deliver the same quality as in-house. One person having decision making in-house was a positive whilst the bulk of the work could be outsourced under this option to create capacity.</p> <p>Discussion of the learning from the assessment stage could be written into the contract. Poll resulted in 7 people scoring +1, 5 scoring 0 and 1 person scoring -1.</p> <p>No one requested to speak so straight to poll. The results were 6 people scoring 0, 2 people -1 and 3 people +1.</p> <p>The discussion was opened with the assumption that based on known facts regarding VFM this would score +1. People were then asked to speak if they wished to put an alternative case. Points were made that getting anything could lead to problems and duplication. One person asked if the outsource models referred to could be compared in complexity to this. The example given was medical assessments being outsourced. No one disagreed with this example. The poll resulted in a very tight vote of 5 people scoring +1, 4 people +2 and 3 people 0. Due to the tight nature of the results the SME was asked to rule on the scoring, and it was decided to go with the majority of +1.</p> <p>Benefits were seen in being able to maintain and flex resources.</p> <p>Although one concern was raised regarding decision makers in DWP may cause some blockages in the process. The poll resulted in 8 people scoring +1, 3 people -1 and 1 person 0.</p>		
13	1	<p>A discussion took place regarding the bid that had gone to the Treasury and the need to achieve the savings identified in that bid. There is a belief that the option would not do that.</p> <p>Others spoke of the positive way 2800 staff could be used by better targeting their efforts. A counter argument was made that the IT was not sufficiently developed at this stage to enable that to effectively happen.</p> <p>Went to a poll where 7 out of 11 people scored the CSF as -2, 3 people scoring -1 and 1 scoring 0.</p> <p>There was a risk that this option wouldn't reach the targets but there would still be 2800 staff so some savings would be made especially if they could be targeted towards the right cases. A comment was made that the public probably wouldn't find out about the shortfall.</p> <p>The poll results were 6 people scored -1, 2 scored -2, 1 scored +1 and 1 scored +2.</p> <p>Historically do nothing or keeping things in-house were not the most cost effective way of doing things. There was a risk that the savings wouldn't be made.</p> <p>Went to a poll where 5 people scored 0 -1 and 5 people scored +2. The decision was to go with the 5 people scoring +2.</p> <p>With 2800 rather than 5800 it is likely to be nearer to the number needed longer term so would be more sustainable going forward. All the problems won't be fixed so it is highly likely staff doing this role will always be needed.</p> <p>Went to a poll where all 5 people scored -1, 2 scored -2, 1 scored 0 and 3 scored +1.</p> <p>Felt in-house does away with handoffs and systems can be developed as they move forward. They can only improve from where they are. Initial poll 8 scored 0 and 3 plus +1. There was then a further conversation where one person stated they couldn't understand why it wasn't higher. With fewer staff they would need fewer locations and there would be not outside supplier to deal with. Others then agreed and a second poll was completed. Those results were 9 people scored 0 -1 and 1 scored 0.</p>		
14	1	<p>No one requested to speak so straight to poll. The results were 5 people scoring -3, 3 people 0, 1 person -2 and 1 person +1.</p>		