

Ed Humpherson  
Director General for Regulation  
Office for Statistics Regulation

24 November 2017

Hello

I'd like to complain about the way that DWP have explained the high sanction rates shown in a recent release of statistics as I believe it is inaccurate.

This is the relevant document:

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/658948/universal-credit-sanctions-statistics-background-information-and-methodology.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/658948/universal-credit-sanctions-statistics-background-information-and-methodology.pdf)

The document states that the high percentage sanctioned for missing WFIs is because:

*"A major difference between sanctions policy for UC compared to JSA is that under UC, where a claimant fails to attend a Work Coach meeting they can be sanctioned. Under JSA, claimants would receive a sanction, or have their claim terminated if they did not make contact within 5 working days of their failure. This is not appropriate for UC as claimants may be in receipt of other parts of UC, such as housing and child care, which would not be subject to a sanction and so they would remain on benefit."*

I believe that this is inaccurate as UC sanctions are for a value equal to the personal allowance rather than being restricted to only the personal allowance as implied by the paragraph above. This means that UC sanctions could potentially affect other elements, such as the housing element.

I have attached my email to the authors of the document. I have not yet received a reply to that email.

Many thanks

Owen Stevens