

Langton
[various) @whatdotheyknow.com

19 December 2018

FOI 2018/02420
FOI 2018/04464
FOI 2018/04488
FOI 2018/04727
FOI 2018/04876
FOI 2018/06401
FOI 2018/07320
FOI 2018/07295
FOI 2018/09010
FOI 2018/09022
FOI 2018/09014
FOI 2018/09018
FOI 2018/10157
FOI 2018/10158
FOI 2018/10172
FOI 2018/11226
FOI 2018/11478
FOI 2018/12314

Dear Ms Langton,

Thank you for your Freedom of Information requests received on various dates between 26 August 2018 and 2 December 2018. You asked:-

FOI2018/02420	<p>You have said that the Department retention period specifically for customer data relating to direct mailing is 2 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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?• Please could you send me the document that you have used to make this statement, i.e. the DWP Retention rule procedure outlining this retention Period? <p>From a FOI Request your Ref: Fol 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:</p>
---------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does “at the time” mean? • 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? <p>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?</p> <p>Please send me the details which you have on record.</p> <p>The Department wrote to all those directly affected to inform them of the changes, using the address recorded by HMRC at the time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 2018/04464	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). • 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). • 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

	<p>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).</p>
FOI 2018/04488	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 2018/04727	<p>From my recent Freedom of Information Request FOI2018/0105 Date: 21 August 2018... 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?</p> <p>The DWP Response was: Please see enclosed a copy of the template letter, as requested. There were no leaflets issued with this letter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Please could you forward me the written everdence that the DWP had used to make the statement that The DWP has said there were no leaflets issued with this letter. • Please could you forward me the written everdence 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. • 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 2018/04876	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? • 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 Foi VTR 3235 and VTR3730 had different words and information have the DWP replied back to the foi with different letters to the same group of people ? <p>From a Freedom of Information request Ref: VTR3732 DATE: 18 September 2015 In which the below person ask the questions set out below: "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." 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."</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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 confirmed 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
--	--

	<p>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 receive letters that informed them on the 2011 Pension Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 2018/07295	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the letter of the 17 October 2018 followed the DWP-wide Working Letter(2) guidance to ensure accuracy of content and communication. • Did the letter of the 3 March 2017 followed the DWP-wide Working Letter(2) guidance to ensure accuracy of content and communication. • 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. • I am very concern 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?? • 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 2018/09010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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..

- 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.
- 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".

- 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?

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

Statement B

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".

- 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

	<p>Statement B was added.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 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. 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. Which figure is correct on the letters that were sent to people to inform them of the 2011 Pension Act ad 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. <p>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-</p>

	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you supply me the details which were on the DWP link https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/181462/pension_s-bill-2011-ia-annexa.pdf
FOI 2018/09014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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 2018/09018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 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.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 2018/10157	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

	<p>(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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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 2018/10158	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 2018/10172	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the above Briefing Paper Number CBP-7405, 16 November 2018 House of Commons Library the DWP had

	<p>said This involved mailing more than 5 million letters with an accompanying leaflet to those affected, between January 2012 and November 2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? • 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 2018/11226	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 quaintly of 207000 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? • 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 646000 but the FoI number VTR 3902 DATE: 5 October 2015 said it was a quaintly of 485000 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? • 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 375000 but the FoI number VTR 3902 DATE: 5 October 2015 said it was a quaintly of 376000 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? • 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 4475000 but the FoI number VTR 3902 DATE: 5 October 2015 said it was a quaintly of 4600000 a difference of 125000 of people. Why is this difference who is telling the Truth the DWP or the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and

	<p>Pensions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 5771000 why did the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Work and Pensions give 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? • 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 • 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. • 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?
FOI2018/11478	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? <p>Mr Duncan Smith said: With respect, I have just said that there</p>

	<p>are certain elements that would not be legal. That is all that I am saying.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the certain elements that would not be legal, that Mr Duncan had said in the above please send me the details. <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Mr Duncan Smith had said , it is seven years away for women. There is some warning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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?
FOI 2018/12314	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>On the DWP website it state:</p> <p>Pensions Bill 2011 received Royal Assent on 3 November 2011 and became law under the Pensions Act 2011</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why was their 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

	<p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>State Retirement Pensions: Females:Written question – 190376 Answered on: 20 November 2018</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>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:</p> <p>The volumes recorded in the second table have been rounded to the</p>
--	---

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>From the Department for Work and Pensions Communication Capability Review Date: February 2013 Item 2.8 the DWP had said:</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 of 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. <p>When she left in January 2011 an interim was put in place until the</p>
--	---

	<p>current Director joined in November 2011.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who was the interim who was put in place until the current Director joined in November 2011.
--	---

DWP Response

Under section 14(1) of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), public authorities are not obliged to comply with requests which are vexatious.

A request may be treated as vexatious for a number of reasons, for example if compliance would create a significant burden in terms of expense and distraction, if a request is designed to cause disruption or annoyance, if a request can otherwise fairly be characterised as obsessive or manifestly unreasonable, or if the request does not have any serious purpose or value.

By way of clarification it is the request which is treated as vexatious not the person making the request. An individual can make multiple requests and each will be considered on its own merits.

Whether a request is vexatious is assessed with reference to all the circumstances of an individual case. In this case, the Department is treating the following requests as vexatious:

FOI 2018/02420
 FOI 2018/04464
 FOI 2018/04488
 FOI 2018/04727
 FOI 2018/04876
 FOI 2018/06401
 FOI 2018/07320
 FOI 2018/07295
 FOI 2018/09010
 FOI 2018/09022
 FOI 2018/09014
 FOI 2018/09018
 FOI 2018/10157
 FOI 2018/10158
 FOI 2018/10172
 FOI 2018/11226
 FOI 2018/11478
 FOI 2018/12314

Whilst we accept that the requests relate to some issues in which the general public has a legitimate interest, the Government's position in relation to changes to state pension age has already been the subject of considerable public and Parliamentary scrutiny.

For example, Parliament has published several comprehensive briefing papers and select committee Inquiry reports and there has been an independent inquiry into the subject, many parliamentary debates to which government Ministers have responded, ministerial statements as well as responses to written and oral parliamentary questions, all of which are available in the public domain. We have included some helpful links here to relevant documents:

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201516/cmselect/cmworpen/899/899.pdf>
<http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN06546/SN06546.pdf>
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/611460/independent-review-of-the-state-pension-age-smoothing-the-transition.pdf
<http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-7405/CBP-7405.pdf>
<http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN06546/SN06546.pdf>
<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2018-02-08/debates/5DB1E4AA-31EF-443C-9557-E5ED4968B8DC/StatePensionAge>
<https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2017-11-29/debates/721D593D-7E54-4E69-ADCB-CBCA73618FCD/StatePensionAgeWomen>
<http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN02234/SN02234.pdf>
<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2016-11-30/debates/6D16B51A-12D7-4614-89AA-6A016F71600A/StatePensionAgeWomen>
<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201516/cmselect/cmworpen/899/89902.htm>
<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2016-11-15/debates/DFB796DF-B853-47C8-AFEE-BA4EDC037EF7/StatePensionAgeWomen>
[https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2016-01-07/debates/16010722000001/StatePensionAge\(Women\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2016-01-07/debates/16010722000001/StatePensionAge(Women))
<https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2015-12-02/debates/15120250000001/StatePensionAgeEqualisation>
<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2016-02-01/debates/16020126000001/TransitionalStatePensionArrangementsForWomen>

This represents only a sample of the virtually unprecedented level of public scrutiny to which the Government's policies on state pension age has already been exposed. The Department has received 44 FOI requests from you on the subject since January 2018. The list of FOIs we have responded to since January 2018 is included in Document A. In Document B is the full version of each FOI we are detailing in this letter.

DWP accepts that meeting our commitment to transparency and openness involves absorbing a certain level of disruption and an administrative burden. However, the number and frequency of your requests, as well as the "scattergun" nature of them, the lack of clarity in terms of what recorded information they are trying to obtain, the fact that they often overlap - requesting information already in the public domain as well as information we have already provided, and also that each response only seems to result in further requests, suggests to the Department that there is no clear objective to them.

Subsequently, regardless of intention, it is undoubtedly the case that each of the requests causes a disproportionate and unjustified level of disruption to departmental officials who are responsible for responding to them, placing an unreasonable burden on the Department for no obvious purpose.

For the reasons summarised above, the Department has decided that Section 14(1) of the FOIA applies on this occasion to the requests listed above. Accordingly we will not be complying with your requests.

It may be of assistance to you to consider the Information Commissioner's comprehensive guidance on section 14(1) of FOIA, which can be found here: <https://ico.org.uk/media/for-organisations/documents/1198/dealing-with-vexatious-requests.pdf>

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

Yours sincerely,

DWP Freedom of Information Requests

Your right to complain under the Freedom of Information Act

If you are not happy with this response you may request an internal review by e-mailing freedom-of-information-request@dwpgsi.gov.uk or by writing to DWP, Central Fol Team, Caxton House, Tothill Street, SW1H 9NA. Any review request should be submitted within two months of the date of this letter.

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner's Office for a decision. Generally the Commissioner cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted our own complaints procedure. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at: The Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow Cheshire SK9 5AF
www.ico.org.uk/Global/contact_us or telephone 0303 123 1113 or 01625 545745