



House of Commons
Committee of Public Accounts

Military Homes

**One Hundred and Second Report of
Session 2017–19**

*Report, together with formal minutes relating
to the report*

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 12 June 2019*

The Committee of Public Accounts

The Committee of Public Accounts is appointed by the House of Commons to examine “the accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by Parliament to meet the public expenditure, and of such other accounts laid before Parliament as the committee may think fit” (Standing Order No. 148).

Current membership

[Meg Hillier MP](#) (*Labour (Co-op), Hackney South and Shoreditch*) (Chair)

[Douglas Chapman MP](#) (*Scottish National Party, Dunfermline and West Fife*)

[Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown MP](#) (*Conservative, The Cotswolds*)

[Chris Davies MP](#) (*Conservative, Brecon and Radnorshire*)

[Chris Evans MP](#) (*Labour (Co-op), Islwyn*)

[Caroline Flint MP](#) (*Labour, Don Valley*)

[Robert Jenrick MP](#) (*Conservative, Newark*)

[Shabana Mahmood MP](#) (*Labour, Birmingham, Ladywood*)

[Nigel Mills MP](#) (*Conservative, Amber Valley*)

[Layla Moran MP](#) (*Liberal Democrat, Oxford West and Abingdon*)

[Stephen Morgan MP](#) (*Labour, Portsmouth South*)

[Anne Marie Morris MP](#) (*Conservative, Newton Abbot*)

[Bridget Phillipson MP](#) (*Labour, Houghton and Sunderland South*)

[Lee Rowley MP](#) (*Conservative, North East Derbyshire*)

[Gareth Snell MP](#) (*Labour (Co-op), Stoke-on-Trent Central*)

[Anne-Marie Trevelyan MP](#) (*Conservative, Berwick-upon-Tweed*)

Powers

Powers of the Committee of Public Accounts are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No. 148. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

© Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2019. This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament Licence, which is published at www.parliament.uk/copyright/.

Committee reports are published on the [Committee’s website](#) and in print by Order of the House.

Evidence relating to this report is published on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee’s website.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Richard Cooke (Clerk), Laura-Jane Tiley (Second Clerk), Hannah Wentworth (Chair Liaison), Ameet Chudasama (Senior Committee Assistant), Baris Tufekci (Committee Assistant), Hajera Begum (Committee Support Assistant) and Stephen Luxford (Media Officer).

Contents

Summary	3
Introduction	4
Conclusions and recommendations	5
1 Negotiations with Annington Property Limited	7
Providing subsidised accommodation	7
Rent reviews	7
Handing back empty properties	8
2 Improving military homes	10
Meeting the expectations of service personnel	10
The Department's attitude to service families	11
Modernising the Department's accommodation offer	11
Formal minutes	13
Witnesses	14
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	15

Summary

The Ministry of Defence (the Department) acknowledges the fundamental importance of good quality accommodation in retaining service personnel yet too many personnel find themselves in living quarters where the standard is simply not good enough. Poor accommodation puts a strain on working and family life and is detrimental to morale. It also undermines efforts to recruit and retain armed forces personnel, many of whom have specialist skills which are in short supply. At a time of such financial strain, the Department cannot afford to lose experienced and skilled personnel simply because their homes are not up to standard. A significant proportion of personnel, in some surveys almost half, remain dissatisfied with their accommodation, and the Department is not optimistic that the situation will improve much in the foreseeable future. Planned reforms of the system designed to improve the accommodation options available are unlikely to start to be implemented until 2022 at the earliest, while the existing system has created a mismatch between the traditional model of military housing and the ways in which UK citizens now live. Pilots for the Future Accommodation Model are much-delayed and two out of three will not begin until next year. Meanwhile, the Department is having to manage the renegotiation of rents for service family homes leased from Annington Property Limited—a huge task given the starting point of the disastrous 1996 deal which left the taxpayer between £2.2 and £4.2 billion worse off. It also needs to start afresh with its in-house management of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation, and re-tender its housing maintenance contracts.

Introduction

In 1996, the Department sold 55,000 service family homes, on a 999-year lease, to Annington Property Limited and agreed to rent them back for up to 200 years. Rent review negotiations, with new rents due to take effect from 2021 onwards, may result in a significant increase in rental costs on this estate as, to date, the Department has benefitted from a 58% downwards adjustment of rent. In September 2017, the Department announced that by June 2019 it would terminate five years early its contract with Capita to manage the estate on its behalf, due to poor performance. Contractors providing maintenance for service family homes under the existing contract have failed to meet key performance targets over an extended period, leading to high levels of complaints. In 2018, survey results showed that only 51% of service personnel were satisfied with their accommodation. The new Future Accommodation Model (FAM) is designed to give service personnel more choice of accommodation. Pilots have been delayed and are now only due to start in 2019 and full roll-out will begin, at the earliest, in 2022. The number of empty properties held by the Department was over 10,000 in 2018, roughly the same as 21 years before. We have reported four times in recent years on service family accommodation and will continue to keep a close eye on developments.

Conclusions and recommendations

1. **Difficult negotiations with Annington about future rent levels on the estate lie ahead later in 2019, and will have a critical impact on the Department's whole accommodation strategy.** The Department and Annington both told us that their relationship has become more constructive in the last year, and they are investigating ways to secure additional value from the estate. For example, they have agreed to operate a streamlined approach to the determination of new rents for the 480 sites at the upcoming rent review. The Department tells us that it will 'play its hand skilfully and aggressively' when the process begins in earnest in October, but acknowledges that the sale of the estate in 1996 leaves it at a disadvantage, not least in seeking to maintain the 58% discount in market rent applied since the sale. The Permanent Secretary acknowledged that the previous deal was a poor one which could not have been much worse and so, it is difficult to see how the Department can redress the balance. It will be relying on its property experts and the senior staff recruited following the termination of Capita's contract to manage the Defence Infrastructure Organisation.

Recommendation: *We expect the Department to negotiate hard on behalf of the taxpayer who was badly let down by the terms of the original deal. It should provide us with regular updates on progress with the site review process, as well as agreement on other elements of the negotiations, initially in September 2019.*

2. **Levels of satisfaction with housing among service families remain far too low and are a continuing risk to retention rates among service personnel.** This is unacceptable at a time when the Department's budget is stretched to breaking point. The Department tells us that 95% of its housing now meets the nationally recognised Decent Homes Plus standard. In 2018–19, it spent £135 million refurbishing around 3,500 homes. Despite this, a department survey shows overall satisfaction with housing only rose slightly to 64% last year. The Department has not previously set itself specific targets for service family satisfaction levels. It suggests that roughly 80% is the highest level of satisfaction that is realistically achievable. Since our evidence session, the Department has informed us that it has set a target of 68% overall satisfaction in 2019–20. This is a start. It also told us that complaints about the quality of maintenance have fallen by one third, but satisfaction with this service is only 51%. The Department paid £109,000 in compensation for poor service in 2018–19. It is now preparing to retender its maintenance contracts and will be seeking innovative approaches from bidders to incentivise high performance.

Recommendation: *The Department should continue to set itself stretching targets for continuous improvement in service families' satisfaction with their accommodation, and incorporate demanding service quality targets into new contracts. These targets should be linked to contractor performance and incentives, and should take account of best practice elsewhere.*

3. **The Department has been slow to recognise that the traditional model of military housing, and who is entitled to it, has not kept up with changes in social attitudes and the needs of service personnel.** Since 1 April 2019, all service personnel in what the Department defines as an established long-term relationship, have been 'eligible' for surplus service family accommodation. However, only those who are married or

in a civil partnership (or with dependent children) are ‘entitled’ to accommodation. The Department says this is a temporary distinction while it finalises its plans to update its accommodation model, but it is a telling one. The payment of compensation in retail vouchers rather than cash also seems like a hold-over from an earlier era. The Department acknowledges that it still has more to learn about the nature and preferences of service families through improved communication that circumvents the limitations of the ‘chain of command’.

Recommendation: *The Department must develop a clearer approach to the housing needs of armed forces personnel, based on need, as well as a deeper understanding of the diverse real-life circumstances of service personnel and their families.*

4. **The delivery of a modern and flexible accommodation model is still a distant prospect, over three years after its announcement.** The Department announced its new accommodation model for service personnel in the 2015 Strategic Defence and Security Review. The first Future Accommodation Model pilot has been delayed from 2018 to September 2019, with two more to follow in 2020. The pilots will take three years, and MoD will make its main investment decision in 2022, after evaluating the responses of personnel to the choices on offer. Assuming it opts to proceed, full roll-out will then begin—at least seven years after the initial announcement.

Recommendation: *The Department should provide us with updates on the Future Accommodation Model, initially in Summer 2020, to confirm that the pilots are under way, to explain how they will capture the varied circumstances in which service personnel and their families live.*

5. **The Department is still holding too many empty properties, while there are thousands of people across the country on housing waiting lists.** The Department advised us in November 2018 that it expected to reduce the level of empty properties to 12% by 2022. This fell short of our July 2018 recommendation of 10% by 2021. The Department now tells us that it has a ‘stretch’ target to reduce the level of empty properties to 10% by Autumn 2021. Achieving this is dependent on several factors, including the rate of armed forces recruitment. It is incentivised by the terms of the agreement with Annington to speed up the rent review process. Annington has agreed to waive any dilapidations payments up to £7,000 on the 500 most dilapidated properties surrendered by the Department each year (provided that at least that many are surrendered). Annington previously told us they were developing plans to rent out surplus stock as ‘affordable’ housing. In advance of our evidence session it provided us with a small example of renting surplus stock to a local authority.

Recommendation: *The Department should provide us with an update on progress towards the 10% target for empty properties by 31 July 2020.*

6. **The whole issue of military housing needs to be given far greater priority within senior levels of the MOD.** The Annington Renegotiation must not be allowed to be used as an excuse for making far greater progress on all the other issues listed above. We expect the target dates set out in this report to be met.

1 Negotiations with Annington Property Limited

1. We took evidence from the Ministry of Defence (the Department) and UK Government Investments (UKGI) to provide an update on steps they are taking to resolve ongoing problems with the provision of military homes, which have been the subject of several previous hearings of this Committee. We also received written evidence from Annington Property Limited (Annington).

Providing subsidised accommodation

2. The Department aims to provide its service personnel and their families with subsidised accommodation, reflecting the need for those in the armed forces to be mobile and to work in remote locations. Subsidised accommodation is considered a fundamental part of the overall remuneration package for service personnel, either in the form of allowances or as single or family accommodation. In 1996, the Department sold 55,000 service family homes, on a 999-year lease, to Annington and agreed to rent them back for up to 200 years. It secured a 58% discount compared with open market rents for the first 25 years of the contract. Following negotiations, new rents will be applied to the estate from 2021 and this may result in a significant increase in rental costs for the Department.¹

3. The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) is leading negotiations with Annington, supported by UKGI. DIO was set up in 2011 to manage the Department's estate, reduce running costs and create commercial opportunities. In 2014, DIO let a 10-year contract with Capita, Aecom and PA consulting to provide a 'strategic business partner' relationship, including a new leadership team. In September 2017, however, the Department announced that it would terminate the contract five years early (by June 2019), due to poor performance.² The Department also pays Amey (previously Carillion Amey) to provide maintenance services for military homes and the wider defence estate. This contract is due to expire in October 2019 and the Department is currently looking for new providers.³

Rent reviews

4. We asked the Department to update us on its preparations for negotiations with Annington over the rent levels for service family homes on the Annington estate. The two parties will need to agree new terms for each of the sites that Annington owns. The new rent levels will be applied across the estate between 2021 and 2024, at which point the current rental discount of 58% is due to expire.⁴ The Department reiterated that its 1996 deal was a poor one and that it has a comparatively weak hand in negotiations.⁵ Nevertheless, the Department and Annington informed us they are now working together more constructively, having agreed a streamlined approach to the upcoming rent reviews.⁶

1 C&AG's Report, *The Ministry of Defence's arrangement with Annington Property Limited*, Session 2017–19, HC 762, January 2019, paras 1–2

2 C&AG's Report, para 13

3 C&AG's Memorandum, *Service Family Accommodation update*, January 2017, paras 1 and 2.7

4 Q 21

5 Q 15

6 [Letter from Annington Limited](#), 7 March 2019, para 6; [Letter from Ministry of Defence](#), 28 March 2019, para 1

5. Instead of carrying out 488 separate site reviews, the Department and Annington plan to negotiate rent reviews for a sample of properties within 27 sites, that together are considered to be representative of all the different types of properties found across the estate. As a first stage, 1,200 representative properties are being inspected by the two parties.⁷ The agreed rental levels for these sample properties will then be applied across the estate.⁸ Negotiations will start once site visits are completed during September 2019.⁹ The Department told us that the process would be quicker and fairer, and that the taxpayer would benefit as a result.¹⁰ It also emphasised that the level of accommodation charge levied on service families is determined independently of the rental negotiations.¹¹

6. The Department said it would ‘play its hand as skilfully and aggressively’ as possible to maintain or increase the 58% rental discount which it has enjoyed during the first 25 years of the lease.¹² However, Annington told us last year that it expected rents to increase.¹³ The Department acknowledged that there could be a varied picture across the 27 sites, partly due to different levels of growth in rent across different regions since 1996.¹⁴

7. Last year, we warned that Annington was better placed for negotiations than the Department because of its unbroken knowledge of the estate since the 1990s, in contrast to the Department’s frequent changes in structure and personnel.¹⁵ The early termination of DIO’s contract with Capita as “strategic business partner” means it will have an entirely new leadership team when negotiations with Annington start in September.¹⁶ DIO said it was working hard to make the transition as seamless as possible, and that it has now filled almost all senior posts. We asked how the handover would be achieved and heard that DIO plans to bring in further private sector support, particularly for project and programme management.¹⁷ DIO assured us that its housing and accommodation team would be relatively unaffected by the changes.¹⁸

Handing back empty properties

8. In 2017, the Department was paying rent on over 10,000 empty properties on the Annington estate (approximately 19%), roughly the same number as in 1996.¹⁹ Last year we recommended that the Department reduce this to a more acceptable level of 10% by 2021.²⁰ In its response, the Department stated that it had a plan to reduce the void rate

7 [Letter from Ministry of Defence](#), 17 May 2019, para 8

8 Qq 21, 38, 40, 41–46; [Letter from Ministry of Defence](#), 28 March 2019, para 5

9 Q 42

10 Qq 21

11 Qq 100

12 Qq 23, 38

13 Committee of Public Accounts Report, [Ministry of Defence’s contract with Annington Property Limited](#), Session 2017–19, HC 974, July 2018, para 4

14 Qq 38, 39

15 Committee of Public Accounts Report, [Ministry of Defence’s contract with Annington Property Limited](#), Session 2017–19, HC 974, July 2018, conclusion 4

16 Q 53

17 Q 54

18 Q 55

19 C&AG’s report, [The Ministry of Defence’s arrangement with Annington Property Limited](#), Session 2017–19, HC 762, January 2018, Figure 16

20 Committee of Public Accounts Report, [Ministry of Defence’s contract with Annington Property Limited](#), Session 2017–19, HC 974, July 2018, para 5

to around 12% by 2022.²¹ It now tells us that it has a more ambitious plan to achieve our recommended void rate of 10% by 2022. In addition, it has set a “stretch” target of achieving the 10% rate by autumn 2021. DIO explained that several variables would affect its ability to meet these targets, including: the number of service personnel recruited, the take-up of the Future Accommodation Model pilots, and the changing eligibility rules for service family accommodation.²² Now that Annington has relaxed restrictions on subletting, the Department also hopes to reduce the number of empty properties by renting out some homes.²³

9. Annington and the Department wrote to us to explain that they have agreed measures to incentivise the Department to return empty properties it no longer needs.²⁴ The Department said it hopes this will ensure a programme of at least 3,500 homes is returned to Annington over the next seven years.²⁵ Under the terms of occupation, the Department pays ‘dilapidations’ when surrendering a property to Annington, to cover the cost of restoring the property to the state required by the lease. Provided it hands back at least 500 properties per year, Annington has agreed to waive any dilapidations payments up to £7,000 on the 500 most dilapidated properties (as chosen by the Department) surrendered by the Department each year.²⁶

10. Given the many people across the country in need of affordable housing, last year we asked the Department to come up with a plan and timetable to return more properties to Annington.²⁷ However, out of the 243 properties handed back since then, we heard that only 32 will be set aside for social housing tenants.²⁸ The Department explained that it is not within its power to decide what happens to properties once they are returned to Annington.²⁹ Annington told us that the other properties handed back by the Department since last year were not in a state to be occupied and that it had not yet determined their future use.³⁰

21 [Government response to the Committee of Public Accounts](#) on the Forty Third to the Fifty Eighth reports from Session 2017–19, Cm 9702, October 2018

22 Q 27

23 [Letter from Ministry of Defence](#), 28 March 2019, para 2

24 [Letter from Annington Limited](#), 7 March 2019, para 4, [Letter from Ministry of Defence](#), 28 March 2019, para 2

25 Q 36

26 [Letter from Annington Limited](#), 3 May 2019, para 3; Qq 16–20

27 Committee of Public Accounts Report, [Ministry of Defence’s contract with Annington Property Limited](#), Session 2017–19, HC 974, July 2018, summary

28 Qq 30, 31; [Letter from Annington Limited](#), 3 May 2019, para 2

29 Q 32

30 [Letter from Annington Limited](#), 3 May 2019, para 2

2 Improving military homes

Meeting the expectations of service personnel

11. If the Department does not ensure service families are happy with their accommodation, it risks losing some of its highly-skilled service personnel.³¹ The Department told us it had invested £135 million refurbishing around 3,800 homes last year, such that 95% of available homes are now at the nationally recognised Decent Homes Plus standard.³² The DIO plans to continue with a similar programme of refurbishing 3,500 to 4,500 homes this year, including work on bathrooms, kitchens, windows, external wall insulation and roofs.³³

12. Nevertheless, many service families remain dissatisfied with the accommodation provided, and the Department's internal satisfaction measure of housing satisfaction only increased slightly from 62% to 64% in the past year.³⁴ The DIO said it had not set targets in this area. It suggested that a satisfaction rate of around 80% would indicate a satisfactory balance between a good level of service and cost-efficient use of resources.³⁵ It has since written to say that it has now set a target of 68% for 2019–20, which it considers a 'demanding' one in the context of its contracting and resource constraints.³⁶ The Department admitted it could do more to ensure that messages about accommodation (particularly about how it is responding to problems) get through to service families, rather than relying on communicating via the serving member.³⁷

13. The Department told us it measures separately the level of satisfaction with property maintenance, and that it uses this information to hold its contractor to account. While the number of complaints has reduced by a third over the past year, less than half of personnel surveyed said they would recommend Amey's maintenance services.³⁸ We welcome the introduction of a compensation scheme for maintenance issues, but under it the Department currently pays out even when the contractor is at fault.³⁹ The Department paid £109,000 in compensation during 2018–19, for around 3,000 complaints about missed appointments and for 121 significant defects at move-in.⁴⁰ The Department told us it plans to build better incentives into new maintenance contracts when Amey's contract expires later this year.⁴¹ It intends to divide up the contract into three or four regional contracts to encourage innovation and competition.⁴² It is not clear whether the Department has sought examples of good practice from other large landlords.⁴³

31 Qq 73, 79

32 Qq 61, 62

33 Q 112

34 Q 64

35 Qq 68, 69, 109

36 [Letter from Ministry of Defence](#), 17 May 2019, para 11

37 Qq 116, 122

38 Q 65

39 Qq 129, 130

40 Q 129

41 Qq 129, 137

42 Q 125

43 Qq 141, 142

The Department's attitude to service families

14. The Department acknowledged that it had been slow to recognise that its accommodation offer did not match the way people live today.⁴⁴ Those in long-term relationships have only recently become 'eligible' for surplus family accommodation, while 'entitlement' to accommodation remains the preserve of those who are married or in civil partnerships.⁴⁵ We were told this is a temporary measure while the Future Accommodation Model is finalised and rolled out.⁴⁶

15. We asked why the Department did not know enough about individuals' relationship status to inform decisions about the provision of accommodation.⁴⁷ It told us that it had tried to use next-of-kin information, but that this gave an inaccurate picture. For example, on one RAF base, next-of-kin information suggested that there were five individuals cohabiting, but survey data revealed that there were in fact 50. Rather than surveying every individual in the armed forces, the Department told us it had decided instead to simply widen the eligibility criteria for service family accommodation.⁴⁸ We pointed out that there was currently no reason for individuals to volunteer information about their relationship status (other than established long-term relationships) because there were no benefits in doing so.⁴⁹

16. We also questioned the Department's approach of paying compensation to families for poor performance by its contractors in the form of retail vouchers. The Department claimed it paid vouchers rather than cash compensation in order to maintain financial controls, but it was unclear whether individual vouchers would be useable for service families in all locations.⁵⁰ The Department acknowledged that it could always do more to understand its people and said that there were challenges in dealing with the families of service personnel directly.⁵¹ Nevertheless, it highlighted that it has regular conversations with families via, for example, the accommodation teams, family federations, ministers and commanders. We questioned whether families would feel able to be honest and open when speaking to someone higher up in the chain of command, but the Department claimed that it did not think this was a concern, and that it received sometimes painfully honest feedback from families.⁵²

Modernising the Department's accommodation offer

17. In the 2015 Strategic Defence and Security Review, the Department announced that it would develop a Future Accommodation Model to provide more choice, flexibility and better value for money in the provision of housing for military personnel. The new model would enable service personnel to have access to the wider housing market through subsidising private rented accommodation, or supporting personnel to buy their own home.⁵³

44 Q 79

45 Qq 79–83

46 Q 84

47 Qq 88–94

48 Q 89–91

49 Q 92

50 Qq 130–134

51 Q 116

52 Qq 119–121

53 C&AG's Memorandum, [Service Family Accommodation update](#), January 2017, para 2

18. The Department's plans for piloting the new model have slipped and are still not yet underway. In 2016, it expected to undertake thorough research and costing of options and to roll-out a pilot from 2018.⁵⁴ In early 2019, the Department said the three-year pilots would be underway by mid-2019, but it has now pushed back the start date for the first to September 2019. The other two pilots will only begin in 2020. The Department said it had delayed the pilots to carry out more research and consult with local authorities about how they might help.⁵⁵

19. The Department told us it has chosen three pilot sites with different characteristics to try and ensure the results of the pilots are fair. They are in different geographical locations with different populations covering different services. We heard that each site would also include accommodation of varying quality, a factor that could significantly affect individual decisions where to live.⁵⁶ The Department told us it plans to evaluate the pilots using surveys, interviews and data on take-up and retention.⁵⁷ The Department will then incorporate the results of the pilots into its Main Gate business case for the Model in 2022.⁵⁸

20. We asked how the Department would find out what long-term impact the model has. It said that there would be some rotation of people living on the pilot sites during the three years, which would help it gather information about the decisions service personnel make at different life stages.⁵⁹ It also told us that by the time the business case for the Future Accommodation Model goes forward, the outcome of the rental negotiations with Annington will be known and this will inform decisions about the future speed and direction of change.⁶⁰

54 C&AG's Memorandum, [Service Family Accommodation update](#), January 2017, para 2

55 Qq 29, 70–73

56 Qq 75–77

57 Qq 103, 104

58 Q 74

59 Q 105

60 Q 78

Formal minutes

Wednesday 12 June 2019

Members present:

Meg Hillier, in the Chair

Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown Anne Marie Morris
Caroline Flint

Draft Report (*Military housing*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 20 read and agreed to.

Introduction agreed to.

Conclusions and recommendations agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the one hundred and second of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

[Adjourned till Monday 17 June at 3:30pm]

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Wednesday 8 May 2019

Stephen Lovegrove, Permanent Secretary, **Lt Gen Richard Nugee**, Chief of Defence People, Ministry of Defence, **Graham Dalton**, Chief Executive, Defence Infrastructure Organisation, and **Henry Lloyd**, Director, UK Government Investments

[Q1-142](#)

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website. The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

Session 2017–19

First Report	Tackling online VAT fraud and error	HC 312 (Cm 9549)
Second Report	Brexit and the future of Customs	HC 401 (Cm 9565)
Third Report	Hinkley Point C	HC 393 (Cm 9565)
Fourth Report	Clinical correspondence handling at NHS Shared Business Services	HC 396 (Cm 9575)
Fifth Report	Managing the costs of clinical negligence in hospital trusts	HC 397 (Cm 9575)
Sixth Report	The growing threat of online fraud	HC 399 (Cm 9575)
Seventh Report	Brexit and the UK border	HC 558 (Cm 9575)
Eighth Report	Mental health in prisons	HC 400 (Cm 9575) (Cm 9596)
Ninth Report	Sheffield to Rotherham tram-trains	HC 453 (Cm 9575)
Tenth Report	High Speed 2 Annual Report and Accounts	HC 454 (Cm 9575)
Eleventh Report	Homeless households	HC 462 (Cm 9575) (Cm 9618)
Twelfth Report	HMRC's Performance in 2016–17	HC 456 (Cm 9596)
Thirteenth Report	NHS continuing healthcare funding	HC 455 (Cm 9596)
Fourteenth Report	Delivering Carrier Strike	HC 394 (Cm 9596)
Fifteenth Report	Offender-monitoring tags	HC 458 (Cm 9596)
Sixteenth Report	Government borrowing and the Whole of Government Accounts	HC 463 (Cm 9596)
Seventeenth Report	Retaining and developing the teaching workforce	HC 460 (Cm 9596)
Eighteenth Report	Exiting the European Union	HC 467 (Cm 9596)

Nineteenth Report	Excess Votes 2016–17	HC 806 (Cm 9596)
Twentieth Report	Update on the Thameslink Programme	HC 466 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-First Report	The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority's Magnox	HC 461 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Second Report	The monitoring, inspection and funding of Learndirect Ltd.	HC 875 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Third Report	Alternative Higher Education Providers	HC 736 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Fourth Report	Care Quality Commission: regulating health and social care	HC 468 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Fifth Report	The sale of the Green Investment Bank	HC 468 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Sixth Report	Governance and departmental oversight of the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership	HC 896 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Seventh Report	Government contracts for Community Rehabilitation Companies	HC 897 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Eighth Report	Ministry of Defence: Acquisition and support of defence equipment	HC 724 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Ninth Report	Sustainability and transformation in the NHS	HC 793 (Cm 9618)
Thirtieth Report	Academy schools' finances	HC 760 (Cm 9618)
Thirty-First Report	The future of the National Lottery	HC 898 (Cm 9643)
Thirty-Second Report	Cyber-attack on the NHS	HC 787 (Cm 9643)
Thirty-Third Report	Research and Development funding across government	HC 668 (Cm 9643)
Thirty-Fourth Report	Exiting the European Union: The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	HC 687 (Cm 9643)
Thirty-Fifth Report	Rail franchising in the UK	HC 689 (Cm 9643)
Thirty-Sixth Report	Reducing modern slavery	HC 886 (Cm 9643)
Thirty-Seventh Report	Exiting the European Union: The Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs and the Department for International Trade	HC 699 (Cm 9643)
Thirty-Eighth Report	The adult social care workforce in England	HC 690 (Cm 9667)
Thirty-Ninth Report	The Defence Equipment Plan 2017–2027	HC 880 (Cm 9667)
Fortieth Report	Renewable Heat Incentive in Great Britain	HC 696 (Cm 9667)

Forty-First Report	Government risk assessments relating to Carillion	HC 1045 (Cm 9667)
Forty-Second Report	Modernising the Disclosure and Barring Service	HC 695 (Cm 9667)
Forty-Third Report	Clinical correspondence handling in the NHS	HC 929 (Cm 9702)
Forty-Fourth Report	Reducing emergency admissions	HC 795 (Cm 9702)
Forty-Fifth Report	The higher education market	HC 693 (Cm 9702)
Forty-Sixth Report	Private Finance Initiatives	HC 894 (Cm 9702)
Forty-Seventh Report	Delivering STEM skills for the economy	HC 691 (Cm 9702)
Forty-Eighth Report	Exiting the EU: The financial settlement	HC 973 (Cm 9702)
Forty-Ninth Report	Progress in tackling online VAT fraud	HC 1304 (Cm 9702)
Fiftieth Report	Financial sustainability of local authorities	HC 970 (Cm 9702)
Fifty-First Report	BBC commercial activities	HC 670 (Cm 9702)
Fifty-Second Report	Converting schools to academies	HC 697 (Cm 9702)
Fifty-Third Report	Ministry of Defence's contract with Annington Property Limited	HC 974 (Cm 9702)
Fifty-Fourth Report	Visit to Washington DC	HC 1404 (Cm 9702)
Fifty-Fifth Report	Employment and Support Allowance	HC 975 (Cm 9702)
Fifty-Sixth Report	Transforming courts and tribunals	HC 976 (Cm 9702)
Fifty-Seventh Report	Supporting Primary Care Services: NHS England's contract with Capita	HC 698 (Cm 9702)
Fifty-Eighth Report	Strategic Suppliers	HC 1031 (Cm 9702)
Fifty-Ninth Report	Skill shortages in the Armed Forces	HC 1027 (9740)
Sixtieth Report	Ofsted's inspection of schools	HC1029 (Cm 9740)
Sixty-First Report	Ministry of Defence nuclear programme	HC 1028 (Cm 9740)
Sixty-Second Report	Price increases for generic medications	HC 1184 (Cm 9740)

Sixty-Third Report	Interface between health and social care	HC 1376 (Cm 9740)
Sixty-Fourth Report	Universal Credit	HC 1375 (Cp 18)
Sixty-Fifth Report	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	HC 1375 (Cp 18)
Sixty-Sixth Report	HMRC's performance in 2017–18	HC 1526 (Cp 18)
Sixty-Seventh Report	Financial Sustainability of police forces in England and Wales	HC 1513 (Cp 18)
Sixty-Eighth Report	Defra's progress towards Brexit	HC 1514 (CP 18)
Sixty-Ninth Report	Sale of student loans	HC 1527 (Cp 56)
Seventieth Report	Department for Transport's implementation of Brexit	HC 1657 (Cp 56)
Seventy-First Report	Department for Health and Social Care accounts	HC 1515 (Cp 56)
Seventy-Second Report	Mental health services for children and young people	HC 1593 (Cp 79)
Seventy-Third Report	Academy accounts and performance	HC 1597 (Cp 79)
Seventy-Fourth Report	Whole of Government accounts	HC 464 (Cp 79)
Seventy-Fifth Report	Pre-appointment hearing: preferred candidate for Comptroller and Auditor General	HC 1883 (Cp 79)
Seventy-Sixth Report	Local Government Spending	HC 1775 (Cp 79)
Seventy-Seventh Report	Defence Equipment Plan 2018–28	HC 1519 (Cp 79)
Seventy-Eighth Report	Improving Government planning and spending	HC 1596 (Cp 97)
Seventy-Ninth Report	Excess Votes 2017–18	HC 1931 (Cp 97)
Eightieth Report	Capita's contracts with the Ministry of Defence	HC 1736 (Cp 97)
Eighty-First Report	Rail management and timetabling	HC 1793 (Cp 97)
Eighty-Second Report	Windrush generation and the Home Office	HC 1518 (Cp 113)
Eighty-Third Report	Clinical Commissioning Groups	HC 1740 (Cp 97)
Eighty-Fourth Report	Bank of England's central services	HC 1739 (Cp 97)

Eighty-Fifth Report	Auditing local government	HC 1738 (Cp 97)
Eighty-Sixth Report	Brexit and the UK border: further progress review	HC 1942 (Cp 113)
Eighty-Seventh Report	Renewing the EastEnders set	HC 173 (Cp 113) 7
Eighty-Eighth Report	Transforming children's services	HC 1741 (Cp 113)
Eighty-Ninth Report	Public cost of decommissioning oil and gas infrastructure	HC 1742 (Cp 113)
Ninetieth Report	BBC and personal service companies	HC 1522 (Cp 113)
Ninety-First Report	NHS financial sustainability: progress review	HC 1743 (Cp 113)
Ninety-Second Report	Crossrail: progress review	HC 2004 (Cp 113)
Ninety-Third Report	Disclosure and Barring Service: progress review	HC 2006
Ninety-Fourth Report	Transforming rehabilitation: progress review	HC 1747
Ninety-Fifth Report	Accessing public services through the Government's Verify digital system	HC 1748
Ninety-Sixth Report	Adult health screening	HC 1746
Ninety-Seventh Report	Local Government Governance and Accountability	HC 2077
Ninety-Eighth Report	The apprenticeships programme: progress review	HC 1749
Ninety-Ninth Report	Cyber security in the UK	HC 1745
One Hundredth Report	NHS waiting times for elective and cancer treatment	HC 1750
One Hundred and First Report	Submarine defueling and dismantling	HC 2041
First Special Report	Chair of the Public Accounts Committee's Second Annual Report	HC 347
Second Special Report	Third Annual Report of the Chair of the Committee of Public Accounts	HC 1399