

Complaint no.	Complaint summary	Outcome
1	This complaint was about Jobcentre Plus and ICE, in relation to the financial redress offered by Jobcentre Plus for the impact of incorrect benefits advice and ICE's investigation of the complaint resulting from that.	This complaint was upheld. We found that Jobcentre Plus gave incorrect benefit advice which resulted in financial loss and did not offer adequate compensation. We also found that ICE's decision not to uphold the subsequent complaint was unsound and caused further delays to the complainant receiving the appropriate remedy. We recommended that within eight weeks, Jobcentre Plus should make a special payment to the complainant equivalent to the benefit they would have received (plus interest) had they not lost their entitlement to benefits (circa £11,000).
2	This complaint was about Jobcentre Plus and ICE, in relation to disallowed benefits, advice and service provided, and the subsequent investigation carried out by ICE.	This complaint was partly upheld. We found that not all aspects of the complaint had been dealt with appropriately by Jobcentre Plus and, then, by ICE. We recommended that Jobcentre Plus apologised to the complainant and issued a payment of £500. We asked that ICE provide evidence that they had learned from one failing identified in the report.
3	This complaint was about the Debt Management Unit and the way they dealt with an individual's personal data and complaint, as well as the way ICE handled the subsequent complaint.	This complaint was partly upheld. We found that ICE failed to appropriately consider one aspect of the complaint and found that the Debt Management Unit failed to act fairly or proportionately in relation to the original complaint. We recommended that the Debt Management Unit make an additional consolatory payment of £1000 for poor complaint handling and the effects of that.
4	This was a complaint about Jobcentre Plus providing misleading advice in relation to benefits and handling benefit claims, as well as the way ICE handled the subsequent complaint.	The complaint was partly upheld. We found that ICE made an incomplete finding as part of their investigation and recommended they apologise. We also recommended Jobcentre Plus to apologise and issue a consolatory payment of £200.
5	This was a complaint about the Child Support Agency, in relation to their complaint handling, as well as the way ICE handled the subsequent complaint.	The complaint was partly upheld. We found failings in the complaint handling of both the Agency and ICE. We recommended the Agency to apologise, waive outstanding legal costs and make a consolatory payment of £375. We also recommended that ICE apologise and make a consolatory payment of £125.
6	This complaint was about Jobcentre Plus	This complaint was upheld. We found that

	and ICE, in relation to delays in service provided by Jobcentre Plus, as well as their complaint handling and the subsequent handling of the complaint by ICE.	Jobcentre Plus had provided a poor service which had serious impacts on the individual concerned. We recommended Jobcentre Plus apologise, provide compensation of £575 and make changes to ensure similar errors did not recur. While we found that ICE had thoroughly investigated the complaint, we did not agree with them on the level of compensation they thought adequate to remedy the complaint. We recommended that ICE apologise for this.
7	This complaint was about Jobcentre Plus and ICE, in relation to the behaviour of a member of Jobcentre Plus staff and the complaints handling carried out by Jobcentre Plus and ICE following that.	This complaint was partly upheld. We were largely satisfied with the way ICE investigated the complaint and with their conclusions. However, we disagreed that Jobcentre Plus had responded to the complaint in accordance with its procedures and found that Jobcentre Plus had not addressed all of the matters raised. We recommended that both Jobcentre Plus and ICE issue apologies.