

RESTRICTED

Peer Review

Customer: [REDACTED]

Review conducted by:

Name: [REDACTED]

Role: [REDACTED]

Address: Bury St Edmunds Benefit Service Centre

Signed off by: [REDACTED]

Guidance and Notes for Peer Review authors

1. The Peer Review process complies with the Ombudsman's Principles of complaint handling:
 - Getting it right
 - Being customer focused
 - Being open and accountable
 - Acting fairly and proportionally
 - Putting things right
 - Seeking continuous improvement
2. Consider all available evidence and if required ask for additional documents. The commissioning body will supply a detailed chronology.
3. For suicide/alleged suicide cases take into account actions that happened up until the customer's death, actions after that date can be considered but are usually outside of the scope of the investigation. Legal Services advice can be sought if required.
4. Any local recommendations identified by this review will be taken forward by the commissioning body.
5. Recommendations that impact on national Customer Journeys will be handed by Operational Intelligence Division.
6. This Peer Review must be signed off at SCS level, please ensure that this approval has been gained before returning the report to the Peer Review Focal Point.

Peer Review - purpose and methodology

This Peer Review has been commissioned by Wales Group [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

This review focuses on the whole claimant journey rather than the handling of any complaint – looking at both any variances from Customer Journey national standards at the local level and any improvements required to the Customer Journeys. Its purpose is as a continuous improvement tool and not to be used to seek out or apportion blame.

The review has been conducted by examining all available claimant records, relevant evidence and current/appropriate guidance.

Focus of Peer Review

[REDACTED]

Background

[REDACTED]

Summary of Findings/Lessons Learnt

The conclusion of the investigation is that this case could not have been handled any differently that would have made a change to the tragic outcome.

I have case conferenced this case and explored all of the facts of this case both on [REDACTED], gathered hard copies of the [REDACTED] obtained details from the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The decision maker followed guidance and process and the [REDACTED] correct one.

[REDACTED].

I have concluded that the processes followed were correctly, and no change could have been made to prevent the outcome.

Recommendations for Local consideration

Nil

Recommendations for National Customer Journeys

Nil

Timetable of Events

[REDACTED]

Annexes:

Additional papers listed below. [embed as required]

Annex 1	Annex 2	Annex 3	Annex 4
Nil			