

# Decision Making Process Part 1

## Award period and reviews

340. The CM decides the period of an award based on all the evidence including the advice from the HP. The CM also decides if a review or 'planned intervention' will apply and when the review date should be set for. This should also be based on all the evidence including the claimant questionnaire, (PIP2) other evidence provided and advice from the HP.

See: Chapter P2 - Assessment for PIP Advice for Decision Makers 'Duration of Award'

341. A review point or 'planned intervention' is an opportunity to look at entitlement at set intervals to ensure the claimant continues to get the right amount of PIP. The review point selected should be based on the claimant's individual circumstances.

342. If the CM decides a planned intervention is appropriate based on the evidence and advice they record the review date in PIPCS when the decision is made. The CM sets the end date of the award for a year after the planned intervention date this is to allow enough time for the intervention to take place.

343. The award period options for the CM to consider and decide are:

- Short fixed term award, (SFT) with or without a planned intervention, these can be for a minimum of 9 months and up to a maximum of two years.
- Longer fixed term award, (LFT) the CM decides the review (planned intervention) point and then sets the end date of the award for 12 months after the review date.
- Ongoing award, where any change is very unlikely and with a planned intervention date no more than 10 years from the award date.

See: ADM Chapter P2 - Assessment for PIP 'Duration of Award'

344. The HP gives their recommendations and justification for the recommended review date in their consultation report. The review questions for the HP are in the report forms and also in the 'Recommendations' screen or page of the PIPCS assessment questionnaire. See: Assessment Provider Process guidance for the CM for more details about what the HP considers. See also **Page 7 - Recommendations** in this guidance for detail in the assessment questionnaire.

## **Questions for the HP about review**

345. The HP answers one of the following two questions in the report about review either giving a review period or stating review isn't required.

**Note:** The same two questions are in PIPCS assessment questionnaire – **See: Page 7 - Recommendations**.

346. The review period question for the AP is:

**'Based on the claimant's likely future circumstances, it would be appropriate to review the claim in':** 'Years and Months' fields

## **Date the HP gives recommended date from**

347. The recommendation year and month given by the HP is taken from the date of the consultation. If the assessment is paper-based this would be from the date the HP completes the assessment report.

348 The review not required option is:

**'I consider there to be no requirement for future reviews of this claim as significant change is unlikely'**

349. If the HP has answered 'Yes' to the review not required question above this indicates an ongoing award may be appropriate. The explanation from the HP should give further detail to support the HP's answer and should be taken into account by the CM when deciding the award period.

350. The consultation report form also contains the further question for the HP:

**'It is likely that the functional restriction identified in this report will be present at the recommended point of review'**

351. For the above question the options for the HP are: Yes, No, Not Applicable (no restriction present) and the HP will, select:

- 'Not applicable', if they consider the claimant either has few or no functional restrictions
- 'No', if they consider the restrictions may not still be present at the time any award made by the CM is likely to end
- 'Yes', if they consider the restrictions will stay the same or deteriorate.

Spare paragraphs 352 – 355

## **Awards reviews and end of award**

### **Short fixed term award**

356. A short fixed term award (SFT) with or without a planned intervention may be appropriate for some claimants. To decide which type of award is appropriate the CM should consider all the available evidence.

**Note** the HP will always provide a review period unless the HP considers the claimant's condition is stable and highly unlikely to improve or deteriorate. The CM may consider an ongoing award in such cases.

357. The CM would consider a short fixed term award without a review may be appropriate if the HP:

- answers No to the question - 'It is likely that the functional restriction identified in this report will be present at the recommended point of review' and
- indicates in the report the claimant's limitations would be expected to improve to such an extent that they are unlikely to have the degree of difficulty in activities that would result in entitlement at the end date of the award

See: 'PIP Assessment Guide' for how the HP makes recommendations.

358. A SFT award without a planned intervention stops when the award ends. If the claimant considers they still have difficulties with daily living and mobility, they will need to make a new claim.

359. A SFT award with a planned intervention would be appropriate where the HP:

- indicates there will be no functional restriction 'at the recommended point of review' and
- recommends a review date of two years or less.

360. The report should give reasons for the HPs recommendations and if the above applies, unless the evidence is contradictory or conflicting a SFT with or without a planned intervention as appropriate should be made.

For example:

#### **Example 1:**

- Claimant assessment consultation on: 07/06/2013
- HP recommends review in one year

- HP answers No to question 'It is likely that the functional restriction identified in this report will be present at the recommended point of review'
- Report clearly indicates that in 9 months to a year the claimant will have improved to the extent that they will have either no functional limitations or very low level.
- The CM makes a SFT award for a year from date of consultation.
- The end date of the award will be recorded as 06/06/2014

### **Example 2**

- Claimant assessment consultation on: 07/06/2013
- HP recommends review in one year
- HP answers Yes to question 'It is likely that the functional restriction identified in this report will be present at the recommended point of review'
- Report clearly indicates that the claimant's condition may improve to some extent but there may or may not be any effect on their functional limitations.
- The CM makes a SFT award with a planned intervention date set for a year after the consultation. That is they set the review (PI) date for one year and add 12 months on to this.
- This gives an planned intervention date of 06/06/2014 and end date of award as 06/06/2015

361. If there are any issues with the report or evidence the CM should try to resolve them via the QAM with the HP **See: Contacting the AP.**

### **Longer fixed term award**

362. Longer fixed awards with planned interventions are appropriate if it is likely the claimant's level of restriction in daily living and mobility activities may change at a later stage. That is the claimant may have some improvement or deterioration that could result in a change in the rate of PIP entitlement.

363. For any decision on period of award, the CM should decide as to whether a longer fixed term award (LFT) is appropriate based on all the evidence, including the claimant questionnaire, any other evidence provided and the HP recommendations and advice.

364. A LFT award would be appropriate where the HP:

- indicates the functional restrictions are likely to be present at the recommended point of review and

- also recommends a review date of more than 12 months from the date of the consultation.

365. The HP report should include reasons for the HPs recommendations.

366 The CM should take appropriate action to clarify anything in the HPs recommendation or other evidence that is unclear, or if there has been any relevant evidence received at DWP the HP may not have seen - **See:**

**Contacting the AP.**

Spare paragraphs 367- 369

### **Ongoing award**

370. Ongoing awards are appropriate where the claimant's restrictions on daily living and or mobility are unlikely to change significantly. If the HP considers no significant change is likely and no requirement for future review it indicates an ongoing award may be appropriate.

371. If the HP considers the claimant's restrictions will continue but are likely to deteriorate they would usually advise on an appropriate review period rather than no review - See: 'PIP Assessment Guide' – 'Prognosis' section.

372. If the CM considers all the evidence and advice and decides an ongoing award applies, they don't record an end date in PIPCS.

373. The planned intervention date will depend on the particular circumstances of the case and the CM will decide the most appropriate date based on the evidence and the advice from the HP. A date may be set for less than 10 years but in any case the planned intervention date should be no longer than 10 years -

**See: Completing the assessment questionnaire in PIPCS**, the **See: 'PIP Assessment Guide'**, and **Assessment Provider Process** and **'Planned Interventions'** guidance.

### **End of Award**

374. PIPCS automatically issues an 'end of award' notification to the claimant (or appointee if appropriate) 14 weeks before the end of award.

375. This advises the claimant their award is ending. It is issued for all cases reaching the end of an award whether or not the award has had a planned intervention or any type of review at any point.

376. The end of award notification advises the claimant how to claim if the claimant considers their needs have continued and it also advises of other benefits.

377. For exportability cases, that is, those identified in PIPCS with a 'Competent State' marker there is a tailored notification - See: 'Residence and Presence' including 'Exportability' guidance in PIPUG.

Spare paragraphs 378 – 380