

Document B- Vexatious FOIs (in full)

FOI 02420 (26th August 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

Section 7 of the Interpretation Act applies to letters sent by post.

References to service by post.

Where an Act authorises or requires any document to be served by post (whether the expression “serve” or the expression “give” or “send” or any other expression is used) then, unless the contrary intention appears, the service is deemed to be effected by properly addressing, pre-paying and posting a letter containing the document and, unless the contrary is proved, to have been effected at the time at which the letter would be delivered in the ordinary course of post.

My understanding is that letters are assumed to have been received (provided they have been properly addressed etc) “unless the contrary is proved”

January 201 and November 2013

Sou:Department for Work AND Pensions (USP0162)

Following the Pension Act 2011, DWP wrote to all those directly affected by the changes (Born 6th April 1953 to 5th April 1960) to inform them of the changes to their State Pension Age.

This involved mailing more than 5 million letters to those affected.
Using then current address details held by HMRC.

From a Fol FOI2018/01058 Date 21st August 2018 The DWP had responded to some questions:

The Qustion was When did the DWP request the current address details from the HMRC in order to mail the letters to the people (Born 6th April 1953 to 5th April 1960) ie what date was the request and what date did the DWP use it.

The DWP response said due to the time elapsed the Department does not hold recorded information about the transfer and use of customer data in respect of State Pension age direct mailing activity.
Therefore there is no information that can be provided in response to your request.

The DWP did not hold this information on file, the DWP had said also that the Department retention period specifically for customer data relating to direct mailing is 2 months, also due to time elapsed had no records of the direct mail issued into the postal system, they also could not tell me about the production and distribution of the letters.

The DWP does not hold details of the number of letters returned at that time, and did not keep copies of the letters sent to individual customers.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

You have said that the Department retention period specifically for customer data relating to direct mailing is 2 months why is it that you still have a copy of the template letter that you have said that you had sent, what is the retention period of the template letters that you confirm was the basis of the letters that informed Women in respect of State Pension age direct mailing activity.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

You have said that the Department retention period specifically for customer data relating to direct mailing is 2 months please could you send me the document that you have used to make this statement, ie the DWP Retention rule procedure outlining this retention Period.

Communication to those affected by the 2011 Act, the first customers who were sent the letters date of birth 06/04/53 to 05/12/53 the mailing date was Jan 2012, yet the last group were customers date of birth 06/04/55 to 05/04/1960 and this group of people had the mailing date Oct 2012 to Nov 2013.
That's 1 year and ten months until the last mailing date of this group of people.

From a FOI Request your Ref: FoI 3344 DATE: 1 September 2017 The DWP had said:

The Department wrote to all those directly affected to inform them of the changes, using the address recorded by HMRC at the time.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

What does at the time mean ?

Please send me the DWP interpretation which you have on record for this DWP term?

Did the DWP get a list of the address recorded by the HMRC in Jan 2012 in order to send letters to the people date of birth 06/04/53 to 05/12/53 the mailing date was Jan 2012.

Did the DWP get a 2nd list of the address recorded by the HMRC IN Oct 2012 and in Nov 2013 in order to send letters to the people date of birth 06/04/55 to 05/04/1960 and this group of people had the mailing date Oct 2012 to Nov 2013.
Please send me the details which you have on record.

The Department wrote to all those directly affected to inform them of the changes, using the address recorded by HMRC at the time.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Please send me details of how many times and for which period the DWP had been given the updated address recorded by HMRC "at the time" in order to send out

letters between the 13 months between the dates Oct 2012 to Nov 2013 otherwise many changes to people addresses could occur please send me the information which you have on record.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

How many times did the DWP received a list of the address recorded by the HMRC at the time on each of the mailing to the people for the 1995 Act and the 2011 Act, please send me the information which you have on record.

FOI 04464 (24th September 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

I recently had one of my Freedom of Information request answered by the HMRC (FOI I2018/01784 Date 4th September 2018)

Thank you for your request, which was received on 12 August, for the following information:

On of my questions was: When did the HMRC send the address information to the DWP.

The HMRC answered was:

The HM Revenue and Customs said that they have reviewed the records that they hold, and they have established that the HMRC does not hold any records of a transfer of customer address data to the DWP in relation to letters DWP had sent in 1995, nor to the letters DWP sent from 2011-2013.

It had been reported many times by the DWP that:

“The DWP had sent letters to people affected by the 1995 Pensions.

Also the DWP had sent letters to men and women whose State Pension age increased as a result of the Pensions Act 2011.

The Department (DWP) wrote to all those directly affected.

It is clear from the FOI reply from the HMRC that they also had written the functions of DWP and HMRC often depend on a common interest in the same information.

DWP has shared access to some HMRC IT systems, which enables DWP to access some of the data HMRC holds, including customer address data.

From a recent Freedom of information request reference: FOI2018/01058
Date: 21 August 2018

I asked a question which was:

When did the DWP request the current address detail from the HMRC (HM Revenue & Customs) in order to mail the letters to the people born (6 April 1953 to 5 April 1960) ie what date was the request and what date did the DWP use it.

The DWP Response was:

Due to the time elapsed the Department does not hold recorded information about the transfer and use of customer data in respect of State Pension age direct mailing activity.

Therefore there is no information that can be provided in response to your request.

It is very clear that the HMRC have established that the HMRC does not hold any records of a transfer of customer address data to the DWP in relation to letters DWP had sent in 1995, nor to the letters DWP sent from 2011-2013.

This confirms by the HMRC that it was the DWP who must have extracted the customer address data themselves in relation to letters DWP had sent in 1995, and also the letters DWP sent from 2011-2013.

Please do not answer the below FOI requests number 1,2, and 3 with In previously FOI you have said Response – Examples of the letters sent to individuals can be found in the Work and Pensions Select Committee report, the link to which is below;
<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201516/cmselect/cmworpen/899/899.Pdf>

It has been established by the DWP they do not have the original letters sent out but they have the templates of the letters in order to show proof that they have been sent out to the women and men ,my first three FOI requests should be very simple to comply to, I do not have the training or expertise or understanding of which letters templates have been sent to the below request, it has been established that the DWP had said that for individuals with a date of birth 6 Apr 1955 to 5 Apr 1960 these letters were issued between Oct 2012 and Nov 2013.

The Minister of State, Department of Social Security (Mr. Jeff Rooker) (In a House of Commons Briefing Paper reference Number CBP-7405, 15 June 2018

Had Said: The Pensions Act 1995 affects all women born after 5 April 1950.
Between 2010-20 women's state pension age will rise.

I would presume that the letter that the DWP had said they had sent Women born in 1956 would have details and information of the 1995 and the 2011 state pension age increases, because The Minister of State, Department of Social Security (Mr. Jeff Rooker)had said The Pensions Act 1995 affects all women born after 5 April 1950.

Having not had any letters from the DWP that informed me or that of my husband of the State Pension Age rises I look forward to see all three individual template letters that advises on this subject.

You have already given copy template to other people requesting similar requests on other born/birth dates without sending a link that show many sample letters so please just send me the sample letters to the 3 individual FOI requests.

Mr Freedom of information request are:

1. Please send me a copy of the template letter that the DWP had said they had sent to a Man born in May 1956 to inform them of the changes to his State Pension age increase as the result of the 2011 pension Act. (Please could you make sure that it is only this template letter supplied on this request and not any government links that may show other samples of letters) you have said previously that the originals letters sent out are not available).
2. Please send me a copy of the template letter that the DWP had said they had sent to a Woman born in Dec 1956 to inform them of the changes to her State Pension age increase as the result of the 2011 pension Act. (Please could you make sure that it is only this template letter supplied on this request and not any government links that may show other samples of letters) you have said previously that the originals letters sent out are not available).
3. Please send me a copy of the template letter that the DWP had said they had sent to a Woman born in Dec 1956 to inform them of the changes to his State Pension age increase as the result of the 1995 pension Act. (Please could you make sure that it is only this template letter supplied on this request and not any government links that may show other samples of letters) you have said previously that the originals letters sent out are not available).

The Minister of State, Department of Social Security (Mr. Jeff Rooker) (In a House of Commons Briefing Paper reference Number CBP-7405, 15 June 2018

Had Said: The Pensions Act 1995 affects all women born after 5 April 1950.
Between 2010-20 women's state pension age will rise.

I would presume that the letter that the DWP had said they had sent Women born in 1956 would have details and information of the 1995 and the 2011 state pension age increases, because The Minister of State, Department of Social Security (Mr. Jeff Rooker) had said The Pensions Act 1995 affects all women born after 5 April 1950.

FOI 04488 (24th September 2019)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

The DWP have often mentioned The Department for Work and Pensions Research Report No 221 which is the Public awareness of State Pension age equalisation in correspondence to many Freedom of Information request and in responses to DWP complaint letters from the Group of Women born in the 1950's, I have read this report and would like some information with regards to some of the contents.

Department for Work and Pensions Research Report No 221 Public awareness of State Pension age equalisation By Clare Murphy

This was a report of research carried out by the Department for Work and Pensions First Published 2004. ISBN 1 84123 730 2

Claire Murphy at the time was a Research Officer in the Social Research Division of the Department for Work and Pensions, specialising in research on savings and pensions.

She made this statement in a Summary which was:

This report provides findings of new research to establish the extent of knowledge of the forthcoming changes to women's State Pension age (SPA) and how this varies according to age, sex, labour market status, region and private pension provision.

The research will contribute to the design of the Department for Work and Pensions marketing campaign about the future equalisation of SPA.

It will also improve the Department's understanding of when people engage with issues regarding state pensions.

She had reported to the DWP in this report that:

Working status and occupation type were key indicators of awareness levels to the change in SPA among all respondents.

Those in work were significantly more likely to have heard of the increase than those who were economically inactive.

The definition of economically inactive has been explained by the below government and prominent persons as:

Economic inactivity - Office for National Statistics

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/elmr/economic-and...2.../economic-inactivity.pdf>

Has said that economically inactive means:

The economically inactive are defined as people who are not in employment or unemployed.

There are many reasons why an individual may be inactive, for example, they might be studying, looking after family or long-term sick.

From the House of Commons Library

<https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/insights/why-are-people-economically-inactive>

by Aliyah Day Feb 18th 2015 They had said that economically inactive means:

The main economically inactive groups are students, people looking after family and home, long term sick and disabled.

In the Report by the Department for Work and Pensions Research Report No 221 Public awareness of State Pension age equalisation

On Page 22 Awareness of own State Pension age the report had said:

Of the working women who will be affected by the increase, 46 per cent were able to correctly identify their SPA as being 65 years or between 60 and 65 years.

In contrast, only 36 per cent of economically inactive women who will be affected were able to correctly identify their SPA.

The DWP had identified in this report that those in work were significantly more likely to have heard of the increase than those who were economically inactive.

The research will contribute to the design of the Department for Work and Pensions marketing campaign about the future equalisation of SPA.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

How did the DWP inform the economically inactive women on the 2011 Spa Pension act change?

Was anything extra done by the DWP to advised women who were at a disadvantage by being identified as economically inactive women, which is showed by the DWP report as above.

Bearing in mind the research undertaken by the DWP was reported it would design the campaign about the future equalisation of SPA and the report was in 2004 prior to the 2011 Spa Pension act change, and economically inactive women who will be affected were able to correctly identify their SPA again identified by the DWP in this report, this information was reported by the DWP staff prior to the 2011 pension act changes.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

With many women who were on long term sick and disabled, they would have regular communication with the DWP, by means of letters and regular notification on benefits etc, did the DWP advise any of the Women which the DWP had identified as economically inactive (who would have been effective by the 2011 Pension act) in any of the DWP communications other than the letters that were sent between January 2012 and November 2013.

FOI 04727 (27th September 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

It seem that we have a major discrepancy which is incompatible

On what the DWP had reported to me and what the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Work and Pensions Mr Guy Opperman have said the the House of Commons I am completely baffled that both have given contradictory answers to the same period of time and the same group of people.

It leaves you with a lack of trust or confidence in what has been said by the DWP especially when such an important communication method that the DWP had relied

on to be effective in conveying the information to the Women (born 6 April 1953 to 5 April 1960) January 2012 and November 2013.

From my recent Freedom of Information Request FOI2018/01058
Date: 21 August 2018

January 2012 and November 2013 Source: Department for Work and Pensions (USP0162) Following the Pensions Act 2011, DWP wrote to all those directly affected by the changes (born 6 April 1953 to 5 April 1960) to inform them of the change to their State Pension age.

This involved mailing more than 5million letters to those affected.
One of my questions was:

Please could you send me just the copy of the template letter and any leaflets which were sent to women who was born in Dec 1954 that informs them of changes to the state pension?

The DWP Response was:

Please see enclosed a copy of the template letter, as requested.

There were no leaflets issued with this letter.

RF2C was the reference number of the sample template letter that the DWP had attached to my Freedom of Information Request, the date on the letter was January 2012.

If you have any queries about this letter please contact me quoting the reference number above.

Yours sincerely,
DWP Central Fol Team

It is very clear that the DWP had said that DWP wrote to all those directly affected by the changes (born 6 April 1953 to 5 April 1960)January 2012 and November 2013

The DWP has said there were no leaflets issued with this letter.

A clear statement by the DWP "That they were NO LEAFLETS issued with this letter.

Guy Opperman the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Work and Pensions at 1:19 pm, 8th February 2018 said

With permission, Mr Speaker, I will mke a statement following the Opposition day debate on state pension age.

Many Members raised the issue of communications in the November debate. Since 1995, the Government have gone to significant lengths to communicate these changes.

People were notified with leaflets, an advertising campaign was carried out and later individual letters were posted out.

Those affected by the 1995 Act changes were sent letters informing them of the change to their state pension age between 2009 and 2011, with letters sent to 1.2 million women.

Those affected by the Pensions Act 2011 changes were sent letters between January 2012 and November 2013, which involved sending over 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet.

A clear statement by Mr Guy Opperman the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Work and Pensions "That they were LEAFLETS issued with this letter.

Very misleading statements by the DWP and the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, one saying they were and one saying they were not leaflets.

The DWP response was on the 21st August 2018

The Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Work and Pensions Mr Guy Opperman made his statement on the 8th February 2018

With only 7 Months between both statements it is very clear that both cannot be right ?

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Has the DWP in the FOI given the wrong information or is it that the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Work and Pensions Mr Guy Opperman has given the wrong information to the House of Commons.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Please could you forward me the written evidence that the DWP had used to make the statement that The DWP has said there were no leaflets issued with this letter.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Please could you forward me the written evidence that the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Work and Pensions Mr Guy Opperman had used to make the statement to House of Commons that The DWP has said there were no leaflets issued with this letter.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

When the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Work and Pensions Mr Guy Opperman speaks on facts with regards to State Pension communications who would normally supply him with information ?

FOI 04876 (30th September 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

From a Freedom of Information request Ref: VTR 3902 DATE: 5 October 2015

The number of women affected by the 1995 Act the 1995 Act impacts on all women born from 6th April 1950 to 5th April 1953.

Those born after this date fall under subsequent State Pension age legislation. Details of the numbers affected can be found via the ONS website:

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/npp/national-population-projections/2012-based-projections/rfttable-a3-1-principal-projection---uk-population-single-year-of-age.xls>

Letter 2a: 6/4/53 – 5/12/53

Letter 2b: 6/12/53 – 5/10/54

Letter 2c: 6/10/54 – 5/4/55

Letter 3: 6/4/55 – 5/4/1960

Letter V1 06/10/52 – 05/04/53

Letter 3 6/4/55 – 5/4/1960 (men and women affected) Mailing Date Oct 2012 – Nov 2013 Approx. Volumes 4.6m

This letter gives you some important information about changes to your State Pension age.

Please read it carefully.

Under the Pensions Act 2011, women's State Pension age will now be 65 by November 2018.

After this the State Pension age, for both men and women, will gradually increase to reach 66 by October 2020. Your State pension age will now be your 66th birthday.

The below is a Freedom of Information request Ref: VTR 3235 Date 13/08/2015

Dear D Smulders,

Thank you for your Freedom of Information (Fol) request received on 02/08/2015. You asked:

Will you please send me a copy of the letter which was sent out to women born between 6th April 1950 and 5th April 1960 notifying them of the increase to their StatePension Age - in accordance with the Freedom of Information Request I submittedtoday (2 August 2015) entitled "Notification of increases to the State Pension Age -1995 Pensions Act

Please find a copy of a letter attached.

Which says on the start of the letter?

This letter gives you some important information about changes to the State Pension age for women and how these changes affect you – please read it carefully.

On average, people are living longer and the role of women in the workplace has changed significantly over recent years. As a result, we are increasing the State Pension age for women from 60 to 65, so that it will be the same as for men. We are introducing this change gradually between 2010 and 2020 and it affects all women who were born on or after 6 April 1950.

MY FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST are:

Why is there different message especially of the wording on the start of the letters which I have copied to the same group of people Letter 3 6/4/55 – 5/4/1960 (men and women affected) Mailing Date Oct 2012 – Nov 2013 Approx. Volumes 4.6m both copies of the letters set by the DWP foi Ref: VTR 3235 Date 13/08/2015 and foi Ref: VTR 3902 DATE: 5 October 2015

The DWP had replied to the same question but have replied to both foi with different sample of the letter sent to this group of people does this mean that wrong letters went out to this group of people 6/4/55 – 5/4/1960 ?

In the Pensions Act 1995 SCHEDULE 4 rule 4 says A woman born after 5th April 1955 attains pensionable age when she attains the age of 65. please could you point out in the letter sent out to men and women who were born between 6/4/55 – 5/4/1960 (men and women affected) Mailing Date Oct 2012 – Nov 2013 Approx. Volumes 4.6m where in the letter the DWP had advised of the 1995 Pension Act?

Continue from the Freedom of Information Ref: VTR 3902 DATE: 5 October 2015

Letter 2c 6/10/54 – 5/4/55 (men and women affected) Mailing Date Feb 2012
Approx. Volumes 376000

This letter gives you some important information about changes to the State Pension age for men and women. It explains how these changes affect you.
Please read it carefully.

You may be aware that the law has changed. State Pension age is increasing and will be 66 from October 2020. This affects men and women born on or after 6 October 1954.

Your new State pension age will now fall on your 66th birthday.

Letter 2b 6/12/53 – 5/10/54 (men and women affected) Mailing Date Feb 2012
Approx. Volumes 485000

This letter gives you some important information about changes to the State Pension age for men and women.

It explains how these changes affect you.

Please read it carefully.

You may be aware that the law has changed. State Pension age is increasing from 65 to 66. This affects men and women born on or after 6 December 1953.

Letter 2a 6/4/53 – 5/12/53 Mailing Date Jan 2012 Approx Volumes 207000

This letter gives you some important information about changes to the State Pension age for men and women. It explains how these changes affect you.

Please read it carefully.

You may be aware that the law has changed. State Pension age for women is increasing to 65. This means that it will be the same as for men by November 2018. It affects women born on or after 6 April 1953.

Letter V1 06/10/52 – 05/04/53 Mailing Date Mar 2011 Approx Volumes 191665

This letter gives you some important information about changes to the State Pension age for women and how these changes affect you – please read it carefully.

You may be aware that the law was changed in 1995 to gradually increase the State Pension age for women from

60 to 65 so that it will be the same as for men. This will affect all women born on or after 6 April 1950.

The below is from a Freedom of Information request reference Ref: VTR3730 30 September 2015

The request question was Can you please send me a dated copy of the letter issued by the DWP advising of the increase to State Pension Age of women to age 62 and 63. Please clarify when and to which group(s) of women this letter was sent out to.

The DWP had also listed the birth dates of women of 6.10.52 – 5.4.53 and also have showed that the Date of mailing was Oct 2010

The DWP had replied

A copy of the letter used during this phase of the direct mail campaign is attached.

I have copied the first part of this letter which was written:

This letter gives you some important information about changes to the State Pension age for women and how these changes affect you – please read it carefully.

On average, people are living longer and the role of women in the workplace has changed significantly over recent years. As a result, we are increasing the State Pension age for women from 60 to 65, so that it will be the same as for men. We are introducing this change gradually between 2010 and 2020 and it affects all women who were born on or after 6 April 1950.

MY FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST IS:

In the VTR3730 30 September 2015 freedom of information the DWP had said that the birth dates of women of 6.10.52 – 5.4.53 showed that the Date of mailing was Oct 2010 when it was reported in the Freedom of Information Request VTR 3235 Date 13/08/2015 was Letter 2c 6/10/54 – 5/4/55 (men and women affected) Mailing Date Feb 2012 which is correct information?

The start of both the copy letters that the DWP had sent to F01 VTR 3235 and VTR3730 had different words and information have the DWP replied back to the F01 with different letters to the same group of people ?

From a Freedom of Information request Ref: VTR3732

DATE: 18 September 2015

In which the below person ask the questions set out below

Dear D Smulders,

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 03/09/2015. You asked:
In a recent Freedom of Information Request you state that "Between April 2009 and March 2011, the Department mailed all women born between 6th April 1950 and 5th April 1953, informing them of their State Pension age under the 1995 Pensions Act.".

My question is why were these letters only sent to this group of women and not those women born after 5 April 1953?

The DWP had replied back as:

The mailing campaign based on Pensions Act 1995 was stopped in March 2011 to allow for the outcome of Pensions Act 2011.

Pensions Act 2011 changed the timetable for equalisation; mailing based on Pensions Act 1995 was therefore halted in March 2011.

If you have any queries about this letter please contact me quoting the reference number above.

Yours sincerely,
DWP Strategy F01 Team

MY FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST IS:

Were different letters sent out to men and women when informing both sexes of changes to the Pension Act?

Men were not affected by the 1995 Pension Act and only were affected by the 2011 Pension Act, therefore a different message would have to be given to both sexes please could you send me what differential messages were sent to inform men and women on the 1995 and the 2011 Pension Acts to both men and women Born between 6/4/55 – 5/4/1960

FOI 2018/06401 (17th October 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

I have sent a similar FOI on the subject below however it is different because of conflicting answers from the DWP and now from research briefings files from parliament.

From my recent Freedom of Information Request FOI2018/01058
Date: 21 August 2018

January 2012 and November 2013 Source: Department for Work and Pensions (USP0162) Following the Pensions Act 2011, DWP wrote to all those directly affected by the changes (born 6 April 1953 to 5 April 1960) to inform them of the change to their State Pension age.

This involved mailing more than 5million letters to those affected.
One of my questions was:

Please could you send me just the copy of the template letter and any leaflets which were sent to women who was born in Dec 1954 that informs them of changes to the state pension?

The DWP Response was:

Please see enclosed a copy of the template letter, as requested.
There were no leaflets issued with this letter.

RF2C was the reference number of the sample template letter that the DWP had attached to my Freedom of Information Request, the date on the letter was January 2012.

If you have any queries about this letter please contact me quoting the reference number above.

Yours sincerely,
DWP Central Fol Team

BRIEFING PAPER

Number CBP-7405, 16 October 2018

State Pension age increases for women born in the 1950s Number CBP-7405, 15 October 2018 22 On Page 22 see internet Research
briefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-7405/CBP-7405.pdf

A summary of who was written to when was given in answer to a PQ in January 2018:

The Government sent letters to women affected by the 1995 Act changes between April 2009 and March 2011 using the address details held by HMRC at that time. The timetable for equalising State Pension age for women and men to 65 and the subsequent increase to 66 was accelerated by the Pensions Act 2011 following sharp increases in life expectancy projections.

A concession was made prior to the passing of the 2011 Act which reduced the maximum delay that anyone would experience in claiming their State Pension, relative to the previous timetable, to 18 months compared to the original proposal.

Following the Pensions Act 2011 the Government wrote to all those directly affected to inform them of the changes to their State Pension age between January 2012 and November 2013.

Background to direct mail outs:

- Apr 09 – Mar11: All those affected by the 1995 Act changes alone (those born between 6 April 1950 and 5 April 1953) were sent letters informing them of the change to their State Pension age. Letters went to approximately 1.2 million women between 2009 and 2011.

- Jan 12 – Nov 13: All those affected by the 2011 Act changes(those born between 6 April 1953 and 5 April 1960) were sent letters informing them of the change to their State Pension age.

This involved mailing more than 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet to those affected, between January 2012 and November 2013

My Freedom of Information request are:

The DWP had made forceful statement of fact There were no leaflets issued with this letter, yet Number CBP-7405, 16 October 2018 parliament was told in answer to a PQ in January 2018 that the letters had a accompanying leaflet to those affected, between January 2012 and November 2013 who is telling the truth and who is telling lies.

My Freedom of Information request are:

Are Djuna Thurley: Richard Keen who's name is on this House of Commons Briefing Paper work for the DWP and where did they obtain this wrong information, unless the DWP has not told the truth.

My Freedom of Information request are:

Has the DWP supplied the wrong information and who in the DWP gave this summary of who was written to when was given in answer to a PQ in January 2018:

FOI 2018/07320 (28^h October 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

From a Freedom of Information Request
Ref: Fol 4590 Date: 22nd November 2017

The DWP had said Please also see the below table, which indicates which year letters were sent out and how many.

The DWP had listed 1,160,769 Women who were sent letters and affected by the 1995 Pension Act between the dates April 2009 to Mar 2011

The DWP had also said:

Note 1: Please note that these figures have been rounded to the nearest 1,000 and relate to letters sent to people affected by the 2011 Pensions Act. Previous letters were sent to people affected by the 1995 Pensions Act.

However from the House of Commons Hansard At 1.19 pm 08 February 2018 Volume 635 The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) said:

Many Members raised the issue of communications in the November debate. Since 1995, the Government have gone to significant lengths to communicate these changes.

People were notified with leaflets, an advertising campaign was carried out and later individual letters were posted out.

Those affected by the 1995 Act changes were sent letters informing them of the change to their state pension age between 2009 and 2011, with letters sent to 1.2 million women.

This total is wrong as it should be 1,160,769 Women who were sent letters informing them of the change to their state pension age between 2009 and 2011 according to the FOI 4590 Date: 22nd November 2017, the figure that The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) gave the House of Commons a over estimated total of the letters by 39,237 that were sent out to women.

Also The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) said to the House of Commons Hansard At 1.19 pm 08 February 2018 Volume 635 that:

Those affected by the Pensions Act 2011 changes were sent letters between January 2012 and November 2013, which involved sending over 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet.

However in the Freedom of Information Request

Ref: FOI 4590 Date: 22nd November it has written that those people some women who were affected by the Pensions Act 2011 changes between January 2012 and November 2013 were a total of 5,771,000.

It also has in Note 1: Please note that these figures have been rounded to the nearest 1,000 and relate to letters sent to people affected by the 2011 Pensions Act.

This is a discrepancy of 771,000 of People some Woman according to The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) who did not have any letters sent out to them as the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) only said that those affected by the

Pensions Act 2011 changes were sent letters between January 2012 and November 2013, which involved sending over 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Which is telling the truth is it The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) who said:

Those affected by the Pensions Act 2011 changes were sent letters between January 2012 and November 2013, which involved sending over 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet.

Or is it the DWP who had given the details in the Freedom of Information Request Ref: Fol 4590 Date: 22nd November 2017 Which when you add up those women who were affected by the Pensions Act 2011 changes were sent letters between January 2012 and November 2013 adds up to 5,771,000, please could you supply Mr Guy Opperman Briefing Notes etc.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Does this mean that 771,000 people did not get sent a Letter by the DWP to inform them of the 2011 Pension Act if what The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) said was true and not misleading to the general public and of the House of Commons?

My Freedom of Information Request are:

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) had said Those affected by the 1995 Act changes were sent letters informing them of the change to their state pension age between 2009 and 2011, with letters sent to 1.2 million women.

This total is wrong as it should be 1,160,769 Women who were sent letters informing them of the change to their state pension age between 2009 and 2011 according to the FOI 4590 Date: 22nd November 2017

Why did The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) over estimated this figure and not report the correct total as the DWP had done.

What was the document used by the The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) in order to not have the correct details which he gave to the House of Commons, please could you supply Mr Guy Opperman Briefing Notes etc.

Guy Opperman said in the House of Commons Hansard 21 November 2017 Volume 631 said:

I am still finishing this point. Following the Pensions Act 2011, the Department wrote 5.77 million letters to the people directly affected, to inform them of changes to their state pension age.

Yet From House of Commons Hansard At 1.19 pm 08 February 2018 Volume 635 The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy

Opperman) said:

Those affected by the Pensions Act 2011 changes were sent letters between January 2012 and November 2013, which involved sending over 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Why November 2017 did The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) said , the Department wrote 5.77 million letters to the people directly affected, to inform them of changes to their state pension age.

And at 1.19 pm 08 February 2018 Volume 635 The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) said: changes were sent letters between January 2012 and November 2013, which involved sending over 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet.

Why after 4 month gap did The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) in his statement which is recorded From House of Commons Hansard At 1.19 pm 08 February 2018 Volume 635 was a reduce total of people by 771,000 that were sent letters by the DWP between January 2012 and November 2013 against his total of 5.77 million letters 4 months before?

Does this mean that the DWP had found out that some people including women out of this 771,000 people that was reported short, did not have any letters sent out to them at all? the figure was comfirmend by The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) as set out above, if you cannot trust the man in charge who can you trust?

Please send me the brief or documents that The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) he used for both statements as above, I would like to know which documents he used to make the two contrasting amounts that he had used, and what details he has seen that made such a drastic shortfall of People who did not receie letters that informed them on the 2011 Pension Act.

Please could you give me the split on men and women who were the ones from the 771,000 that Guy Opperman had reported on.

FOI 07295 (29th October 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

I received a letter dated 17 October 2018 from J Barrett DWP Complaints & Correspondence Acting Senior Team Manager, this letter was sent in connection to

a Freedom of Information Request FOI2018/01917 as the FOI team could include personal information as some of my request fell under section 40(1) of the FOI Act.

My understanding is that under section 40 Personal information.
the section has no associated Explanatory Notes.

(1) Any information to which a request for information relates is exempt information if it constitutes personal data of which the applicant is the data subject.

I do not know why the original FOI could not have been answered as my questions did not relate directly to just my original letter of complaint but it included many other Women born in the 1950's who were sent misleading and incorrect information.

From the FT Adviser date: June 29, 2018 an article had reported on Complaints by Women with regards to the Pension Charges to the DWP:

The Department for Work & Pensions (DWP) received and investigated 7,835 complaints from people affected by an increase to the women's state pension age.

Guy Opperman, minister for pensions and financial inclusion, said this week (26 June) in a written answer to Parliament that these complaints occurred between August 2016 and May 2018.

That's a 23 month duration, the amount of complaints were 7835 divided by 23 months = 340.65 women who had complained less the month of APR and MAY = 681.30 the average amount of Women who would have received the misleading and incorrect information would be approx 7835 takeaway 681.30 = 7154 on average.

From the above information from Guy Opperman minister for pensions you could say that the letter that was sent out prior to 5 April 2018 had the misleading and incorrect information the average total Women who had the letter prior to Apr 5 2018 was approx 7154 Women.

I did ask the DWP via a FOI and due to the cost could not provide the total of Women who were sent the misleading and incorrect information via the Standard complaint letter prior to April 5 2018.

This Misinformation was both deliberately promoted and accidentally shared via the old template letter prior to 5 April 2018, I did inform the DWP of the the misleading and incorrect information on the letter they had sent to me which was the Standard complaint letter prior to April 5 2018, it had taken the DWP a long time to correct it, from my original letter of the 3 March 2017 it had taken 1 year and 5 days to amend the template letter.

Mr J Barrett DWP Complaints & Correspondence Acting Senior Team Manager did not include my original letter of the 3 March 2017 only the corrected template letter which were sent after April 5 2018, it was my letter of the 3 March 2017 that had the misleading information.

I have notice recently that you (Independent Case Examiner) have asked for the DWP to apologise on recent complaints that has been investigated by ICE and upheld and ordered the DWP to pay a consolatory payment and apology, I feel that the DWP has committed maladministration with regards to the above This Misinformation was both deliberately promoted and accidentally shared via the old template letter prior to 5 April 2018 because:

1. The actions result in a customer experiencing a service which does not match our aims or the commitments we have given, by not providing the correct information in my compalint letter of the 3 March 2017.
2. The DWP made the original misleading mistakes in the compalint letter of the 3 March 2017 that was sent to me.
3. The long delay in responding to me telling the DWP of the mistake in my letter of the 3 March 2017, which could have resulted in passing on the misleading information to approx 7154 (on my own estimates) to other Women who also made a complaint to the DWP

The conclusion that can be drawn as it is explicitly stated in the above information can and should apply to the other Women who had responses from the DWP who had the same misleading complaint letter prior to 5 April 2018, this may include cases that the ICE had allredy past judgment on?

From the DWP Website:

What is maladministration?

Unfortunately, we don't always get things right first time.

The term 'maladministration' is not defined, but is sometimes used to describe when our actions or inactions result in a customer experiencing a service which does not match our aims or the commitments we have given.

It applies to situations in which we have not acted properly or provided a poor service.

For example: wrong advice, discourtesy, mistakes and delays.

The template letter according to J Barret was changed on 5 April 2018 to reflect some of the changing issues and requirements which were now being raised by new customers.

This amended template letter was not issued to previous customers who had already received a response on the old template letter, prior to 5 April 20187.

The letter which was sent by J Barrett DWP Complaints & Correspondence Acting Senior Team Manager does not seem to have read or even checked his own response letter to me as he had written the date as 5 April 20187, it again shows the lack of the competence or skill expected of a professional of a DWP employee (Acting Senior Team Manager)

Mr J Barrett (Acting Senior Team Manager) had written a response letter to me in connection to my FOI 2018/01917 in this letter dated the 17 October 2018 in his response he had made a statement "This amended template letter was not issued to any previous customer who had already received a response on the old template letter, prior to 5 April 2018"

I have issues with this statement as it implies that prior to the 5 April 2018 was also in 2018 and 2017. This conflicts with both template letters.

The mistake on such an important letter from (Acting Senior Team Manager) it seems to be inaccurate and you cannot blame it was a template letter this time.

The House of Commons Work and Pensions Minutes of Evidence, which states that automatically system-generated letters issued by The Pension Service undergo a rigorous governance process to ensure accuracy of content and communication.

Also it states that all letters follow the DWP-wide Working Letters(2) guidance, this guidance was developed as part of a project to improve the quality of letters to customers.

A clear case of maladministration it applies to situations in which the DWP have not acted properly or provided a poor service and again have made mistakes, also it seems that both the letter of the 3 March 2017 and also the letter of the 17 October 2018 has not followed the DWP-wide Working Letter(2) guidance to ensure accuracy of content and communication.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Did the letter of the 17 October 2018 followed the DWP-wide Working Letter(2) guidance to ensure accuracy of content and communication.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Did the letter of the 3 March 2017 followed the DWP-wide Working Letter(2) guidance to ensure accuracy of content and communication.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Why did it take the DWP a long time to correct the information on the new template letter from my original letter of the 3 March 2017 it had taken 1 year and 5 days to amend the template letter which had misleading information.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

I am very concerned that J Barrett DWP Complaints & Correspondence Acting Senior Team Manager had given conflicting information in his letter to me 17 October 2018, he had written "This amended template letter was not issued to any previous customer who had already received a response on the old template letter, prior to 5 April 2018", he had indicated that Women had this letter sent prior to 5 April 2018 as well prior 5 April 2017, how can this happen ?? is this correct or again has the DWP made a misleading mistake, in reply to a letter that had corrected the original mistake??

2018 is an indication over both periods??

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Guy Opperman had made this statement between August 2016 and May 2018, The Department for Work & Pensions (DWP) received and investigated 7,835 complaints from people affected by an increase to the women's state pension age.

Please could you tell me how many did the DWP had complaints from Women of the 1950's group which you had called the Waspi Women in previously FOI up to the change of the template response prior to 5 April 2018.

FOI 09010 (10th November 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

From a Freedom of Information review request number IR2018/04494 In which the DWP had replied to my review request that they had received on the 24 September 2018.

Firstly the DWP had taken 44 days to respond to my review request if you take out Sundays and Saturdays the period is 33 days for my FOI review request to be sent to me, Section 10 of the FOI Act specifies that a public authority must comply promptly, and no later than 20 working days after the date of receipt of the request, on this occasion it seems to miss this set target, and the DWP did not keep me updated of the progress of my request.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Did The DWP failed to follow Section 10 of the FOI Act specifies that a public authority must comply promptly, and no later than 20 working days after the date of receipt of the request, or is this review outside the FOI Act period, also did the DWP not keep me updated of the progress of my request..

On the Freedom of Information review request number IR2018/04494 date 7 November 2018 it does not have any person name on the letter it only has DWP Operations Freedom of Information Team, normally in an FOI review the DWP would make a statement such as:

(I am of a senior grade to the person who dealt with your request; I was not involved previously, and can confirm that I have carried out an internal review. I am now in a position to respond to you)

If you read the IR2018/04494 date 7 November 2018 it has no statement of who or what senior person had reviewed this review request, it could be the same person who was the original person who had responded to the original requests, which I feel is not a professional response and possible against DWP procedure ?

I cannot ensure the review was done by someone who did not deal with the original request, where possible, and preferably by a more senior member of staff would be appropriate.

The Code of Practice states that the review should be undertaken by someone senior to the person who took the original decision, where this is reasonably practicable.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Did The DWP failed to follow the Code of Practice Freedom of Information Act 2000, with regards to not informing me of the person who had reviewed request number IR2018/04494 and by not advising me the review was done by someone who did not deal with the original request., and with a more senior member of staff not used to review the request.

In the DWP response the DWP had said:

In relation to your remaining question, "How many complaints had the DWP had in connection to not receive adequate notice of changes to the State Pension Age (Spa) I notice that ICE had place this group of Women as (Waspi)", if you wish to receive this information, please make a new request for our consideration.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Please could you advise me how many complaints had the DWP had in connection to not receiving adequate notice of changes to the State Pension Age (Spa) which you the DWP had notice that ICE had place this group of Women as (Waspi).

Also in the review request number IR2018/04494 the DWP had said that:

Statement A

The change made involved updating dates and volumes to make the information current. The information remains the same as your version except for the following: "Between April 2000 and the end of 2017, DWP has issued more than 20 million personalised State pension statements to people who requested them".

The DWP also said:

Statement B

We also clarified how we contacted those affected by the 2011 Act change by advising: Following the Pension Act 2011, DWP wrote to those directly affected to inform them of the change to their State Pension age, using the address details held by HMRC at that time".

The DWP had said The information remains the same as your version except for the following: see above Statement A

This statement is not correct as my original version had the incorrect / misleading information of the wrong year when the pension age was on a government web site 2017, and did not have the change made involved updating dates and volumes to make the information current as outlined above.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

I was however sent a template letter which was enclosed with your letter linked to FOI2018/01917 date 17 October 2018 in which did have the additional information as outline in Statement A, does the DWP mean when they say The information remains the same as your version, this template was sent as a sample and is not address or even my name on the template, my version is my original which version do the DWP mean?

The DWP had said:

We also clarified how we contacted those affected by the 2011 Act change by advising: Following the Pension Act 2011, DWP wrote to those directly affected to inform them of the change to their State Pension age, using the address details held by HMRC at that time".

In my original version the Statement B is not written in my letter, also on the template letter linked to FOI2018/01917 date 17 October 2018 the Statement B is also not in this Template Letter,

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Which Version did the DWP added Statement B to as it was not in my original letter or that in the template letter which the DWP had said they sent out to Women after 5 April 2018.

Do the DWP have a third version letter in which this Statement B was added.

Women have sent complaints to the DWP with regards to not receiving any communication with regards to the Pension Acts in which the DWP had said they had.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Will the DWP be sending out updated letters to Women who have already received response letters from the DWP on complaints, which would include statement A and Statement B because they were omitted from the original letters sent out by the DWP prior to 5 April 2018 the information added by the DWP after this period is of great importance, and only confirms that the DWP had made mistake again in not communication to a group of Women who should had received such information, the DWP in statement B said we also clarified how we contacted those affected by the 2011 Act, well you have not given the same clarity to the Women prior to 5 April 2018, if not longer as the Statement B is not in the template version sent to me date 17 October 2018.

FOI 2018/09022 11th November 2018

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

The below is an extract that the DWP had written under Summary of Impacts Enactment state produced 21 November 2011 Royal Assent gained 3 November 2011

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/.../pensions-bill-2011-summary-of-impacts.pdf>

The DWP had written with regards to the 2011 Pension act under item 18.3

This change to the timetable for increasing State Pension age will affect approximately 5 million men and women in Great Britain, of whom approximately 4.5 million will have an increase in their State Pension age, against the legislated timetable, of a year or less.

The measure will deliver significant net savings to Government. Some women will see their State Pension age rise by more than a year; however, women will still, on average, claim State Pension for longer than men.

The DWP also had said under item 18.4

A full Impact Assessment of the amendment to the timetable for increasing State Pension age is at Annex A.

From a Freedom of Information request Ref: VTR 3902 date 5 October 2015 the DWP had replied with a list of dates and quantity of men and women in which the DWP had given Communication to those affected by the 2011 Act, this total came to 5668000 men and women who the DWP had said were written to who were affected by the 2011 Pension Act.

This is a discrepancy to the Summary of Impacts which said:

This change to the timetable for increasing State Pension age will affect approximately 5 million men and women in Great Britain

The difference is 668000 people who were not within the Summary of Impacts Enactment state produced 21 November 2011 Royal Assent gained 3 November 2011.

My Freedom of Information request is:

Where did the DWP obtain the figure of 5 million men and women when producing the above PENSIONS ACT 2011 - Impact Assessments Summary, please could you show me the documents which were used to get to the 5 million people?

My Freedom of Information request is:

Where did the DWP obtain the figure of 5668000 men and women who the DWP had said were written to who were affected by the 2011 Pension Act, which is showed in the Freedom of Information request Ref: VTR 3902 date 5 October 2015, please show me the documents in which the DWP had used to obtain the people figure.

From a Freedom of Information request reference: FOI2018/01058 date 21 August 2018

The DWP had replied with the details of people and dates they had sent out the letters to those who were affected by the 2011 Pension Act they had said The table below shows the dates the direct mailing was issued, the total of people added up to 5771000

My Freedom of Information request is:

Were did the DWP obtain this figure of 5771000 people who were affected by the 2011 Pension Act and was sent letters by the DWP, this is a vast difference to what the Impact Summary had said approximately 5 million men and women ad difference of 771000 people, and against the FOI VTR 3902 date 5 October 2015 which gave the figure of 5668000 men

and women, this is a difference of 103000 shortfall against the FOI FOI2018/01058 date 21 August 2018.

My Freedom of Information request is:

Which figure is correct on the letters that were sent to people to inform them of the 2011 Pension Act and all three statements were supplied by the DWP is it the DWP impact Summary or the two FOI requests that the DWP had responded to. I would like to see where all three obtain the vast different of people reported who letters were sent by the DWP.

In the Freedom of Information request Ref: VTR 3902 date 5 October 2015

The DWP had also said:

The number of women affected by the 2011 Act This information is publicly available. See page 9 of Annex A of the Impact Assessment.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/181462/pensions-bill-2011-ia-annexa.pdf

This also includes details of the men affected by the faster rise to 66.

The above link that the DWP had given is not on the internet, but after reading the <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/.../pensions-bill-2011-summary-of-impacts.pdf> which shows the Summary of Impacts Enactment state produced 21 November 2011 Royal Assent gained 3 November 2011, it is the approximately 5 million men and women.

My Freedom of Information request is:

Can you supply me the details which were on the DWP link https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/181462/pensions-bill-2011-ia-annexa.pdf

FOI 09014 (11th November 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) had said at 1.19 pm on the 08 February 2018 which is listed in House of Commons Hansard Volume 635

Many Members raised the issue of communications in the November debate. Since 1995, the Government have gone to significant lengths to communicate these changes.

People were notified with leaflets, an advertising campaign was carried out and later individual letters were posted out.

Those affected by the 1995 Act changes were sent letters informing them of the change to their state pension age between 2009 and 2011, with letters sent to 1.2 million women.

Those affected by the Pensions Act 2011 changes were sent letters between January 2012 and November 2013, which involved sending over 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Please could you send me the copy of the accompany leaflet that The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Guy Opperman) had said that the DWP sent out to those affected by the Pensions Act 2011 changes were sent letters between January 2012 and November 2013, which he said it involved sending over 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Was this leaflet given to Women only or was this leaflet given to men as well, what was the message in this leaflet would it have information of the 1995 Pension Act? Which only affected Women.

FOI 09018 (11th November 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

The DWP had 15 years to inform women of the significant changes introduced by the 1995 Pensions Act, which legislated that women's state pension age would increase by up to 5 years after 2010.

From a Freedom of Information number Fol 3166 16th August 2017 If advised of the dates when Women and of Men had letters sent out to them by the DWP to inform them of the Changes to SPA via the 1995 and the 2011 Pension Act.

The DWP had written:

The dates on which the women and men were notified, and the number of women and men notified, are in the tables below. The Department wrote to all those directly affected to inform them of the changes, using the address recorded by HMRC at the time.

Note 1: Please note that these figures have been rounded to the nearest 1,000 and relate to letters sent to people affected by the 2011 Pensions Act. Previous letters were sent to people affected by the 1995 Pensions Act.

It shows that from date of birth 6 Apr 1950 to 5 Apr 1953 women were not affected by the 2011 Pension Act but only by the 1995 Pension Act.

It shows that from date of birth 6 Apr 1953 to 5 Apr 1960 men and women were affected by the 2011 Pension Act.

It does not state that Women from date of birth 6 Apr 1953 to 5 Apr 1960 were also affected by the 2011 Pension Act as well.

It has group men with the Women from date of birth 6 Apr 1953 to 5 Apr 1960 who were not affected by the 1995 Pension Act, but were affected by the 2011 Pension Act.

In this statement the DWP have said. "Previous letters were sent to people affected by the 1995 Pensions Act".

Women who were born from date of birth 6 Apr 1953 to 5 Apr 1960 were also affected by the 1995 Pension act, to imply that. "Previous letters were sent to people affected by the 1995 Pensions Act" and not also women between these dates has given a false statement, and should have showed Women as a separate mail from that of the men.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

As the original personal copies of Letters that the DWP had sent to inform People of the changes to Pension Acts are not available please could you SHOW ME the Template letter that was sent to the Women were born from date of birth 6 Apr 1953 to 5 Apr 1960 that informed them of the Changes to SPA from the 1995 Pension Act which had a direct 5 year increase to their SPA date.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

As the original personal copies of Letters that the DWP had sent to inform People of the changes to Pension Acts are not available please could you SHOW ME the Template letter that was sent to the Women were born from date of birth 6 Apr 1953 to 5 Apr 1960 that informed them of the Changes to SPA from the 2011 Pension Act.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

As the original personal copies of Letters that the DWP had sent to inform People of the changes to Pension Acts are not available please could YOU POINT OUT TO ME in the Template letter that was sent to the Women were born from date of birth 6 Apr 1953 to 5 Apr 1960 that informed them of the Changes to the 2011 Pension Act which had a direct 1 year increase to their SPA date WHICH PART OF THAT LETTER gave details or mentioned the 1995 Pension Act that added 5 years to the Women's Pension retirement date which is a total of 6 years added to SPA from both the 1995 and the 2011 Pension Act.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

What notice did the DWP gave in written direct communication to Women were born from date of birth 6 Apr 1953 to 5 Apr 1960 of the 1995 Pension Act that their SPA was to increase by 5 years.

In the Freedom of Information number Fol 3166 16th August 2017 The DWP had written:

The dates on which the women and men were notified, and the number of women and men notified, are in the tables below.

The Department wrote to all those directly affected to inform them of the changes, using the address recorded by HMRC at the time.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

The Department wrote to all those directly affected to inform them of the changes, using the address recorded by HMRC at the time, It is abundantly clear that Women born from date of birth 6 Apr 1953 to 5 Apr 1960 who were affected by the 1995 Pension Act

My simple request is SHOW ME the letter or template letter that the DWP had written to inform Women born from date of birth 6 Apr 1953 to 5 Apr 1960 who were affected by the 1995 Pension Act that directly informed them of the 1995 Pension Act.

From a Freedom of Information Request reference: FoI 1927 & IR254
Date: 27 July 2018

The DWP had said:

The Department commenced direct mailing activity to those affected by the Pensions Act 1995 in April 2009.

Following the announcement of the Government's Call for Evidence in June 2010 into when the State Pension age should increase to 66,

We did not want to advise women of their individual State Pension age under previous legislation until we knew whether they were affected by this subsequent review.

Further changes to State Pension age were subsequently introduced in the Pensions Act 2011, and affected those born between 6 April 1953 and 5 April 1960.

We sent letters to the men and women affected by these changes between January 2012 and November 2013.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

The DWP had said we sent letters to the men and women affected by these changes, the DWP had also said we did not want to advise women of their individual State Pension age under previous legislation until we knew whether they were affected by this subsequent review, We sent letters to the men and women affected by these changes, the DWP had clearly made a statement that they had said they had sent letters to women affected by these changes I would like to see such letters that included both 1995 and the 2011 Pension.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

The DWP had said "We did not want to advise women of their individual State Pension age under previous legislation until ", I would like to see what the DWP advise the women who were born from date of birth 6 Apr 1953 to 5 Apr 1960 of their individual State Pension age under previous legislation, what direct response did the DWP undertake after holding back the letters prior to the changes to the 2011 Pension Act, with regards to inform of the previous legislation in which the DWP did they supply any information with regards to the 1995 Pension Act when they wrote to the Women on the 2011 Pension Act what details did they send?

FOI 10157 (17th November 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

From the Department for Work and Pensions Research Report No 221

Public awareness of State Pension age equalisation

In section 1.2 State Pension age the DWP Report had written:

The UK State Pension age (SPA) is currently 60 for women and 65 for men.

Due to the EC directive 79/7/EEC dealing with the principle of equal treatment between men and women, legislation (the Pensions Act 1995) provides for SPAs to be equalised at 65 from 6 April 2020.

To give women, employers and companies running pension schemes time to prepare for this major change, the increase will be phased in over a ten-year period from 2010 to 2020.

This means that women born on or before 5 April 1950 will not be affected by this change – they will continue to be entitled to receive their State Pension at age 60.

Women born on or after 6 April 1955 will be eligible to receive their State Pension at age 65.

Those born between these two dates (an estimated 1.8 million women) will be eligible for their State Pension between the ages of 60 and 65. Appendix C shows the changes in women's SPAs according to their date of birth.

Naturally, the increase in women's SPA will impact on women's financial circumstances in retirement and it is important that women are aware of the changes so that they can plan accordingly.

My Freedom of information request is:

In this report the DWP had said Women born on or after 6 April 1955 will be eligible to receive their State Pension at age 65, and that it is important that women are aware of the changes so that they can plan accordingly, please could you send me the copy of any direct communication especially by letter that the DWP had sent to Women who were born after 6 April 1955 that directly advised them of the 1995 Pension Act that increased the age for retirement by the 5 years from the 1995 Pension Act as the legislation (the Pensions Act 1995) provides for SPAs to be equalised at 65 from 6 April 2020, I am interested in how you told Women born on or after 6 April 1955 of the SPA increasing by 5 years.

My Freedom of information request is:

In this report the DWP had said that it is important that women are aware of the changes so that they can plan accordingly, how did the DWP make aware Women who were born after 6 April 1955 on the affect of the 1995 Pension Act change which increase the SPA by 5 years the DWP had said that it was important so please give me the fact on what was done, in other words how did you make direct contact with them.

My Freedom of information request is:

In this report the DWP had said Naturally, the increase in women's SPA will impact on women's financial circumstances in retirement and it is important that women are aware of the changes so that they can plan accordingly, please could you supply what actions did the DWP undertake to make aware Women who were born after 6 April 1955 on the effect of the 1995 Pension Act change which increase the SPA by 5 years in order that the Women affected that they can plan accordingly.

My Freedom of information request is:

In this report the DWP had said To give women, employers and companies running pension schemes time to prepare for this major change, the increase will be phased in over a ten-year period from 2010 to 2020, how did the DWP inform employers and companies running pension schemes time to prepare for this major change, what action did the DWP perform in order that they can plan accordingly.

FOI 10158 (17th November 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

Below is a DWP documents called:

A sustainable State Pension: when the State Pension age will increase to 66

Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions by Command of Her Majesty November 2010 reference Cm 7956.

21. It would have been possible to increase the State Pension age to 66 in 2016, but the Government concluded that this would not give sufficient notice of changes in State Pension age to those affected. However, rapid increases in life expectancy mean it will not be possible to give a notice period similar to those given for previous increases in State Pension age.

If we were to give 15 years' notice of changes, such as was given for equalisation of women's State Pension age, this would mean not changing the State Pension age until 2025 – when it would already have begun rising to 66 under the legislated timetable.

The DWP had said in this document "If we were to give 15 years' notice of changes, such as was given for equalisation of women's State Pension age"

The Pensions Act 1995 received Royal Assent on 19 July 1995.

Therefore according to the DWP up to the 19th July 2010 would be the end period in which the DWP had given 15 years' notice of changes, such as was given for equalisation of women's State Pension age"

According to records of the DWP they have said The Department commenced direct mailing activity to those affected by the Pensions Act 1995 in April 2009.

The direct mailing activity was then temporarily suspended in June 2010 following the announcement of the Government's Call for Evidence.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Why did the DWP stop giving the 15 years notice to Women that was affected by the Pensions Act 1995 in June 2010 two months early than the recorded 15 year notice as set out above?

Why were not all Women who were affected by changes, in the equalisation of women's State Pension age not given the 15 years notice as the DWP had described in the above document.

What Documentation/letter did the DWP send to a Women who was born in 1956 that was clearly affected by the equalisation of women's State Pension age, and why was they not given 15 years notice?

FOI 10172 (18th November 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

From a Briefing Paper Number CBP-7405, 16 November 2018 House of Commons Library

Page 21 State Pension age increases for women born in the 1950s A summary of who was written to when was given in answer to a PQ in January 2018:

The Government sent letters to women affected by the 1995 Act changes between April 2009 and March 2011 using the address details held by HMRC at that time. The timetable for equalising State Pension age for women and men to 65 and the subsequent increase to 66 was accelerated by the Pensions Act 2011 following sharp increases in life expectancy projections.

A concession was made prior to the passing of the 2011 Act which reduced the maximum delay that anyone would experience in claiming their State Pension, relative to the previous timetable, to 18 months compared to the original proposal. Following the Pensions Act 2011 the Government wrote to all those directly affected to inform them of the changes to their State Pension age between January 2012 and November 2013.

Background to direct mail outs:

- Apr 09 – Mar11: All those affected by the 1995 Act changes alone (those born between 6 April 1950 and 5 April 1953) were sent letters informing them of the change to their State Pension age. Letters went to approximately 1.2 million women between 2009 and 2011.

- Jan 12 – Nov 13: All those affected by the 2011 Act changes (those born between 6 April 1953 and 5 April 1960) were sent letters informing them of the change to their State Pension age.

This involved mailing more than 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet to those affected, between January 2012 and November 2013.

From my recent Freedom of Information Request FOI2018/01058 Date: 21 August 2018
January 2012 and November 2013 Source: Department for Work and Pensions (USP0162)
Following the Pensions Act 2011, DWP wrote to all those directly affected by the changes (born 6 April 1953 to 5 April 1960) to inform them of the change to their State Pension age.

This involved mailing more than 5million letters to those affected.
The DWP had said that there were no leaflets issued with this letter.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

In the above Briefing Paper Number CBP-7405, 16 November 2018 House of Commons Library the DWP had said This involved mailing more than 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet to those affected, between January 2012 and November 2013.

Please could you send me the copy of this leaflet because the DWP had said In a FOI FOI2018/01058 Date: 21 August 2018 none was sent?

My Freedom of Information Request is:

In the Briefing Paper Number CBP-7405, 16 November 2018 House of Commons Library where was this said and who supplied the information and who said it that a leaflet was sent to Women (born 6 April 1953 to 5 April 1960) to inform them of the change to their State Pension age, between January 2012 and November 2013.

FOI 11226 (25th November 2018)

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

From a recent Backbench meeting called State Pension: Women born in the 1950s — [Mr Peter Bone in the Chair]

Backbench Business – in Westminster Hall at 1:30 pm on 22nd November 2018.

Guy Opperman the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions. Had said:

She asked me the question—let me finish. The Government have gone to significant lengths to communicate the changes to ensure that those affected were fully aware of their rights. That has been done using a range of formats, communication methods and styles—as I have explained, it has been gone through in a multitude of ways by the Work and Pensions Committee—including communication campaigns, information online, and individual letters posted to approximately 1.2 million women who were directly affected by the 1995 Act changes.

A further 5 million letters were sent later to those affected by the 2011 Act changes between January 2012 and November 2013.

Between April 2000 and the end of September 2018, the Department for Work and Pensions provided more than 24 million personalised state pension statements, and we continue to encourage individuals to request a personalised state pension statement.

From a Freedom of Information Request Ref: VTR 3902
Date: 5 October 2015

The DWP had sent the below information with regards to Communication to those affected by the 2011 Act Letters were sent out in the following waves.

Jan 2012 207000
Feb 2012 485000
Feb 2012 376000
Oct 2012 – Nov 2013 Approx. 4.6m

The total of people according to the DWP Foi VTR 3902 adds up to 5481700

From a Freedom of Information Request Ref: Fol 3344 DATE: 1 September 2017 The DWP had also supplied the above same information which was:

Jan 2012 275001
Feb 2012 646001
Feb 2012 375001
Oct 2012 – Nov 2013 4475001

The total of people according to the DWP Fol 3344 adds up to 5771004

The difference between letters that the DWP had said was sent out to men and women with regards to the 2011 act that informed them on this Act on FOI Fol 3344 and that of VTR 3902 was 289304 people.

Guy Opperman the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions had reported to the Backbench meeting called State Pension: Women born in the 1950s when he said that
5 million letters were sent later to those affected by the 2011 Act changes between January 2012 and November 2013

The Difference between the Foi 3344 for this same amount of letters the DWP had said was sent out against what Guy Opperman said was 771004 people differential.

Guy Opperman the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions had reported to the Backbench meeting called State Pension: Women born in the 1950s when he said that
5 million letters were sent later to those affected by the 2011 Act changes between January 2012 and November 2013

The Difference between the foi VTR 3902 for this same amount of letters the DWP had said was sent out against what Guy Opperman said was 481700 people differential.

From a receipt State Retirement Pensions: Females Department for Work and Pensions written question – answered on 20th November 2018 the answer from Guy Opperman the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions.
Said:

Communication to those affected by the 2011 Act, I have placed it in order as Customer's date of birth, Mailing Date, Number of letters sent

06/04/53 – 05/12/53 Jan 2012 275,000

06/12/53 – 05/10/54 Feb 2012 646,000

06/10/54 – 05/04/55 Feb 2012 375,000

06/04/55 – 05/04/60 Oct 2012 – Nov 2013 4,475,000

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Guy Opperman the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions had said that between 06/04/53 – 05/12/53 mailing date Jan 2012 number of Letters Sent was 275,000 but the FoI number VTR 3902 DATE: 5 October 2015 said it was a quantity of 207,000 a difference of 68,000 of people.

Why is this difference who is telling the Truth the DWP or the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions?

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Guy Opperman the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions had said that between 06/12/53 – 05/02/54 mailing date Feb 2012 number of Letters Sent was 646,000 but the FoI number VTR 3902 DATE: 5 October 2015 said it was a quantity of 485,000 a difference of 161,000 of people.

Why is this difference who is telling the Truth the DWP or the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions?

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Guy Opperman the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions had said that between 06/10/54 – 05/04/55 mailing date Feb 2012 number of Letters Sent was 375,000 but the FoI number VTR 3902 DATE: 5 October 2015 said it was a quantity of 376,000 a difference of 1,000 of people.

Why is this difference who is telling the Truth the DWP or the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions?

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Guy Opperman the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions had said that between 06/04/55 – 05/04/60 mailing date Oct 2012 to Nov 2013 number of Letters Sent was 4,475,000 but the FoI number VTR 3902 DATE: 5 October 2015 said it was a quantity of 4,600,000 a difference of 125,000 of people.

Why is this difference who is telling the Truth the DWP or the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions?

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Guy Opperman the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions had said in Westminster Hall at 1:30 pm on 22nd November 2018.

A further 5 million letters were sent later to those affected by the 2011 Act changes between January 2012 and November 2013.

He gave a different total to Department for Work and Pensions written question – answered on 20th November 2018, which came to the total of 5,771,000 why did the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions give two different totals to letters he said the DWP had sent out between January 2012 and November 2013 ?

Why is this difference who is telling the Truth the DWP or the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions?

My Freedom of Information Request is:

To those affected by the 2011 Act changes between January 2012 and November 2013 the DWP had said they had sent out letters to men and women to inform them of the 2011 Pension Act, why is there a difference of 289304 people on the below DWP FoI requests. The total of people according to the DWP FoI VTR 3902 adds up to 5481700

The total of people according to the DWP FoI 3344 adds up to 5771004

My Freedom of Information Request is:

The DWP had replied to two FOI one in 2015 and in 2017 in relation to the 2011 Pension Act, does this mean that the DWP had not sent out letters informing of the 2011 Pension Act to 289304 people bearing in mind the numbers were supplied by the DWP.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Freedom of Information Request Ref: VTR 3902

Date: 5 October 2015 and the FoI 3344 DATE: 1 September 2017

Where did the DWP obtain the information on the numbers of the Letters that were sent out to people on the 2011 Pension Act on the above Freedom of Information Requests as they have different totals? Which is correct and which has misled?

FOI 2018/11478 26th November 2018

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

From a Pensions Bill [Lords] 20 Jun 2011 4.27 pm The Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Mr Iain Duncan Smith): I beg to move, That the Bill be now read a Second time.

Fiona Mactaggart (Slough) (Lab): Which of the facts that the Secretary of State has cited was he unaware of 12 and a half months ago, when in the coalition agreement the Government signed up to not introducing these changes before 2020?

Mr Duncan Smith: As a coalition, we are, and continue to be, bound by the agreement. [Interruption.] The hon. Lady can shout at me in a second, but let me try to explain.

There is a slight problem with that element of the coalition agreement. It was done in that way at the time, and that is fair enough, but we have since looked at it carefully and taken legal advice. The agreement talks about men's pension age being accelerated to 66, which would breach our legal commitment to equalisation and then not to separating the ages again. There are reasons for needing to revisit that, and we have done so and made changes.

20 Jun 2011 : Column 49

Rachel Reeves (Leeds West) (Lab): The coalition agreement states that the parties agree to "hold a review to set the date at which the state pension age starts to rise to 66, although it will not be sooner than 2016 for men and 2020 for women."

The Secretary of State's provisions clearly breach the coalition agreement, so what has changed?

Mr Duncan Smith: With respect, I have just said that there are certain elements that would not be legal. That is all that I am saying. The hon. Lady can go on about this point as much as she likes, but I have answered her. She might not like my answer, but that is the one I have decided to give. The fact that the women who will be affected will remain on the same

level of retirement but will be in retirement for two and a half years longer than men is an important feature. I stand by the need to equalise women's state pension age in 2018.

Rachel Reeves: Is the Secretary of State honestly saying that the policy has been changed because of legal advice? If that is the case, will he publish that legal advice today before the winding-up speeches and before we vote? Will he also confirm that this is a breach of the coalition agreement?

Mr Duncan Smith: I do not publish legal advice, but if the hon. Lady reads the coalition agreement, she will see the reasons. I ask her to study it carefully.

Fiona Mactaggart: I heard the Secretary of State refer in his speech today to legal advice that said that the Government could not keep to their original proposals in the coalition agreement. He did not make the House aware of why the Government cannot legally do what they originally intended, so has he made my right hon. Friend aware of why that is?

Mr Byrne: My hon. Friend makes an extremely good point, because I think that that was news to the House. We would certainly expect that legal guidance to be published before we get to the Minister's winding-up speech. That guidance is a material point in a debate that is important to many people, as well as many right hon. and hon. Members, because this Bill has such a poor effect on women in this country—the people we represent.

Rachel Reeves: said

Is the Secretary of State honestly saying that the policy has been changed because of legal advice? If that is the case, will he publish that legal advice today before the winding-up speeches and before we vote?

Will he also confirm that this is a breach of the coalition agreement?

My Freedom of information request is:

Mr Duncan Smith had said There is a slight problem with that element of the coalition agreement. It was done in that way at the time, and that is fair enough, but we have since looked at it carefully and taken legal advice.

What Legal advice did Mr Duncan Smith obtain that changed the policy as set out in the above, please forward me a copy of that legal advice.

The Secretary of State's provisions clearly breach the coalition agreement, so what has changed?

Mr Duncan Smith said:

With respect, I have just said that there are certain elements that would not be legal. That is all that I am saying.

My Freedom of information request is:

What was the certain elements that would not be legal, that Mr Duncan had said in the above please send me the details.

Mr Duncan Smith said:

I do not publish legal advice, but if the hon. Lady reads the coalition agreement, she will see the reasons. I ask her to study it carefully.

My Freedom of information request is:

Did Mr Duncan Smith make this Legal advice available to MP before the debates on the Pensions Bill was it available to the public could you give me the details to which this legal advice was published.

Nic Dakin (Scunthorpe) (Lab): I welcome the Secretary of State's comments about his willingness to consider transitional arrangements. My constituents, the class that left Foxhills comprehensive school in 1970, who were all born in 1953-54, have written to me to ask why the pensions goalposts should be moved twice so close to their retirement. What would he say to those women?

Mr Duncan Smith: The only answer is that, so far, it is seven years away for women. I recognise the concerns, but I have had letters from the public stirred up by a number of people, and the facts have been simply incorrect. I am trying to set out the facts as we see them. The hon. Gentleman may disagree with us, but often people fear that something is going to happen overnight. There is some warning.

My Freedom of information request is:

Mr Duncan Smith had said , it is seven years away for women. There is some warning. What is the notice period in what he had said There is some warnings, what are the warnings that Mr Duncan Smith had remarked upon?

The Minister and the Secretary of State did not spell out to the House what the legal problems were. Some Members have speculated that they relate to matters of European law. I hope that when the Pensions Minister

20 Jun 2011 : Column 106

winds up the debate, he can outline the legal issues. They certainly were not outlined to the country when the coalition agreement was signed, or during the press conference

FOI 2018/12314 2nd December 2018

Dear Department for Work and Pensions,

From the Department for Work and Pensions Communication Capability Review Date: February 2013

Item 2.8 the DWP had said:

There have also been significant changes in DWP's Strategic communications directorate.

Since March 2010, DWP has reduced its communications staff headcount by 46%, and consolidated the Department's communications expertise within a smaller, more efficient Directorate.

The previous leader held the post of Director General of Marketing, Communication and Customer strategy.

When she left in January 2011 an interim was put in place until the current Director joined in November 2011.

From a Freedom of Information Request Ref: VTR3732

DATE: 18 September 2015

Dear D Smulders,

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 03/09/2015. You asked:

In a recent Freedom of Information Request you state that "Between April 2009 and March 2011, the Department mailed all women born between 6th April 1950 and 5th April 1953, informing them of their State Pension age under the 1995 Pensions Act."

My question is why were these letters only sent to this group of women and not those women born after 5 April 1953?

The mailing campaign based on Pensions Act 1995 was stopped in March 2011 to allow for the outcome of Pensions Act 2011.

Pensions Act 2011 changed the timetable for equalisation; mailing based on Pensions Act 1995 was therefore halted in March 2011.

If you have any queries about this letter please contact me quoting the reference number above.

Yours sincerely,

DWP Strategy FOI Team

The DWP had said the mailing campaign based on Pensions Act 1995 was stopped in March 2011, and mailing based on Pensions Act 1995 was therefore halted in March 2011.

The DWP had said for individuals with a date of birth 6 Apr 1955 to 5 Apr 1960 letters were issued between Oct 2012 and Nov 2013 to Men and Women who are affected by the 2011 Pension Act, this is showed in the table shown in FOI response 3166 of 2017.

That's a 1Year and 7 Months Period delay from when the DWP halted the mailing in March 2011 to when the DWP started writing to Women who date of birth was from the 6 Apr 1955 to 5 Apr 1960 with regards to the 2011 Pension Act.

When this delay was purposely halted by the DWP it stopped informing 4,475,000 People who were born from the 6 Apr 1955 to 5 Apr 1960 of the 1995 Pension Act which effected and did increase the SPA date on this group of Women by a 5 Year increase.

During the Delay Period of 1 Year and 7 Months which was the result of the DWP halting sending letters out in March 2011 and up to Oct 2012 what Communications did the DWP undertake to inform Women who date of birth was from the 6 Apr 1955 to 5 Apr 1960 of the effect of the 1995 Pension Act which would increase SPA by 5 years.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

What letters were sent to inform Women who date of birth was from the 6 Apr 1955 to 5 Apr 1960 on the changes of the 1995 Pension Act which indisputable had an effect upon them?

What direct communication during the above Delay Period of 1 Year and 7 Months (from March 2011 and up to Oct 2012) did the DWP undertake to inform Women who birth was from the 6 Apr 1955 to 5 Apr 1960 of any Pension changes to their State Pension Age. On the DWP website it state:

Pensions Bill 2011 received Royal Assent on 3 November 2011 and became law under the Pensions Act 2011

The DWP had said for individuals with a date of birth 6 Apr 1955 to 5 Apr 1960 letters were issued between Oct 2012 and Nov 2013 to Men and Women who are affected by the 2011 Pension Act, this is showed in the table shown in FOI response 3166 of 2017.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

The Pensions Bill 2011 received Royal Assent on 3 November 2011, and the DWP said it sent letters, The DWP had said for individuals with a date of birth 6 Apr 1955 to 5 Apr 1960 letters were issued between Oct 2012 and Nov 2013 with regards to the 2011 Pension Act.

Why was there a delay of 11 Months from the The Pensions Bill 2011 received that received the Royal Assent on 3 November 2011, to when the DWP had said they had started communicating to Women between birth 6 Apr 1955 to 5 Apr 1960.

What Direct Communication did the DWP undertake during the delay of the 11 Months from Royal Assent 3 November 2011 to Oct 2012 to inform Women between births 6 Apr 1955 to 5 Apr 1960?

In the DWP document called Pension and later life: communication tracking research Date March 2011 Research report 5 December 2011 On Page 6 under 1.1 Communication strategy.

The DWP had said the role of communications in contributing towards these aims is to: Meet "duty of care" requirements to inform individuals about State Pension reform and other changes which materially affect them;

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Please could you send me the documentation that the DWP has on record on the DWP duty of care" requirements to inform individuals about State Pension reform and other changes which materially affect them; Please could you confirm when this duty of care" requirements to inform individuals about State Pension reform and other changes which materially affect them; came into effect and where it is written into the DWP procedures and who in the DWP has to follow this requirement.

State Retirement Pensions: Females:Written question – 190376 Answered on: 20 November 2018

Mr Guy Opperman Parliamentary Under-Secretary (Department for Work and Pensions) in a written answer to Parliament published 20 November 2018 the minister for Pensions said there were more than 600 mentions of state pension age equalisation in the national broadsheet and tabloid press between 1993 and 2006.

My Freedom of Information Request are:

Please could you send me the evidence of the 600 mentions of state pension age equalisation in the national broadsheet and tabloid press between 1993 and 2006, that Mr Guy Opperman Parliamentary Under-Secretary (Department for Work and Pensions) must have seen or viewed in order to make such an unequivocally statement.

Please send me audited conformation that Mr Guy Opperman Parliamentary Under-Secretary (Department for Work and Pensions) must had seen or indeed have this confirmed by a Government Department that 600 mentions of state pension age equalisation in the national broadsheet and tabloid press between 1993 and 2006 existed?

Please supply me a copy of that Mr Guy Opperman Parliamentary Under-Secretary (Department for Work and Pensions) briefing paper in which he answered these questions. Mr Guy Opperman Parliamentary Under-Secretary (Department for Work and Pensions) was asked a question called State Retirement Pensions: Females: Written question – 190377 he said:

The volumes recorded in the second table have been rounded to the nearest 1000 and include mailings undertaken as part of a communications research project, and those sent to men who were also affected by the 2011 Act.

It is not possible to provide the volumes sent to women only in relation to the 2011 Act, as we do not hold the information split by gender.

It had listed date of birth 06/04/55 – 05/04/60 mailing date Oct 2012 – Nov 2013 the total of Number of letters sent out was 4,475,000 This is a stark difference to a freedom of Information Request Ref: VTR 3902 Date: 5 October 2015 where the Customer's date of birth 06/04/55 – 05/04/60 had the quantity as 5668000.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Why is such a difference of 1193000 people who was reported in 2015 against what Mr Guy Opperman Parliamentary Under-Secretary (Department for Work and Pensions) had reported to Parliament?

Does this mean that an under reporting has occurred by the DWP, when supplying this information to parliament, you would think that in 2015 the DWP would have a more updated recorded due to being only under two years when this supposed mailing was performed, please supply me the documentation from 2015 and of 2018 in which the DWP had obtained this information.

Have the DWP undertaken a full investigation on this reported vast difference to official DWP reporting if so please forward me the conclusion of such investigation, can the DWP give me the correct information to which is the correct volume of letters that were sent to people from date of birth 06/04/55 – 05/04/60 mailing date Oct 2012 – Nov 2013.

From the Department for Work and Pensions Communication Capability Review Date: February 2013 Item 2.8 the DWP had said:

Since March 2010, DWP has reduced its communications staff headcount by 46%, and consolidated the Department's communications expertise within a smaller, more efficient Directorate.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

With a 46% reduced headcount to the DWP communication staff since March 2010 what effect had in communication to Women with regards to the 1995 and the 2011 Pension act, did the DWP complete a review on what effect it had on the DWP communications. With a 46% reduced headcount to the DWP communications staff since March 2010 did the DWP outsource the sending out the Letters to the Women that were effected by the 1995 and the 2011 Pension act, or did the DWP themselves carry out this task, what The previous leader held the post of Director General of Marketing, Communication and Customer strategy.

When she left in January 2011 an interim was put in place until the current Director joined in November 2011.

My Freedom of Information Request is:

Who was the interim who was put in place until the current Director joined in November 2011.