

# **Independent Expert Panel**

## **Annual Report: 2022**

Presented to the House of Commons  
pursuant to House of Commons Standing Order No 150A

Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 23 February 2023

HC 1173  
Published on 23 February 2023  
by authority of the House of Commons



## The Independent Expert Panel

The Independent Expert Panel was established by resolution of the House of Commons on 23 June 2020. The Panel:

- Hears appeals against decisions made by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards (the Commissioner), and considers referrals from the Commissioner and determines sanctions in cases involving an allegation against an MP of a breach of Parliament's Sexual Misconduct Policy or the Bullying and Harassment policy, under the Independent Complaints and Grievance Scheme; and
- Hears appeals against decisions by the Committee on Standards in cases involving an allegation against an MP of a breach of the Code of Conduct for Members of Parliament.

### Current membership

Mrs Lisa Ball  
Ms Monica Daley  
Mrs Johanna Higgins  
Rt Hon Sir Stephen Irwin (Chair)  
Professor Clare McGlynn KC (Hon)  
Miss Dale Simon  
Sir Peter Thornton KC  
Dr Matthew Vickers

### Powers

The Panel's powers are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders Nos 150A to 150D. These are available on the internet via [www.parliament.uk](http://www.parliament.uk).

### Publication

© Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2023. This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament Licence, which is published at [www.parliament.uk/site-information/copyright-parliament/](http://www.parliament.uk/site-information/copyright-parliament/). Independent Expert Panel reports are published on the Panel's website at [www.parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/standards-and-financial-interests/independent-expert-panel/](http://www.parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/standards-and-financial-interests/independent-expert-panel/) and in print by order of the House.

Accessible versions of this report are available on request. Please email [independentexpertpanel@parliament.uk](mailto:independentexpertpanel@parliament.uk)

### Panel staff

The Secretary to the Panel is Peter Stam. Ian Bradshaw was Secretary during 2022.

### Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Secretary to the Panel. The Panel's email address is [independentexpertpanel@parliament.uk](mailto:independentexpertpanel@parliament.uk).

# Contents

Foreword by the Chair of the Panel .....	3
Panel members .....	5
The development of the IEP: Remit, Procedures and Practice .....	9
Cases decided in 2022 .....	13
Wider issues arising from decided cases.....	15
Panel members' fees and expenses.....	19

## Foreword by the Chair of the Panel

The work of the Independent Expert Panel has continued successfully this year. In our second year since appointment, we have sought to demonstrate that our approach is independent, rigorous and fair, as Parliament would expect. As our reported cases demonstrate, each case is examined purely on merit, irrespective of how well known or powerful a figure may be involved, and irrespective of whether the proper outcome of an appeal favours one side or the other.

As I address below, confidentiality in ICGS cases is of great importance, and there are concerns on that count. The Panel goes to great lengths to maintain confidentiality. Regrettably, there have been a number of instances where confidentiality has been breached by other parties, with the respondent MP being named in the press, and sometimes an account of the allegations given. I am fully satisfied that this has never been the result of any leak from the Panel. It is important to stress that, save in the *Bercow* case where particular factors arose, and save where the complainant has sought publicity, no complainant and no witness has been identified in public.

I should also mention that in a number of cases problems have arisen with the quality of investigations. More than once, the outgoing Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards Kathryn Stone has been driven to cause an investigation to be repeated. She should not have been placed in that position. This is very undesirable, and with others I have sought to encourage a more universally rigorous approach. There will be ongoing work on this front.

I wish to give thanks to the Director of the ICGS, Jo Willows, for her courtesy and support, and for all her work. She is due to move on from her post in the near future, and we all wish her well.

I also wish to thank Kathryn Stone, whose term finished at the end of 2022. She has been an exemplary Commissioner: straightforward, perceptive, applied and courageous. She has been a pleasure to work with, even at those limited times when we have differed from her decisions. Again, we wish her very well as she takes up different but still onerous responsibilities. I extend our warm welcome and best wishes to her successor, Daniel Greenberg.

I would like to give great thanks to the staff who supported the Panel in 2022, Ian Bradshaw and Miguel Boo Fraga. They have both been willing and generous, and of essential assistance to us, even though we represent such a novel part of the workings of the House of Commons.

Finally, I would wish to give my personal thanks to my fellow members of the Panel for their work this year. We have become a good team, building strong cooperation across our membership. I have tried to ensure, so far as possible, that each member has sat with a wide range of colleagues, indeed, if possible, with all other members of the Panel. I suggest it is a strong marker of their quality that, within around 18 months of our formation, we were entrusted with the expansion of our remit to include appeals from the House of Commons Committee on Standards.

**Rt Hon Sir Stephen Irwin**

**23 February 2023**

## Panel members

### **Mrs Lisa Ball**



Lisa has over two decades' experience of adjudication determining complaints of bullying, sexual harassment, and discrimination as well as disciplinary matters. In 2008 she was appointed as one of the first independent members of the Armed Forces Service Complaints Panel and since 2009 she has been the independent member of the King's Counsel Complaints Committee. Additionally, Lisa has previously served in a wide range of independent and lay roles including the Solicitors Regulations Authority; the Independent Healthcare Advisory Services; a Police Authority; the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors; the PHSO and the NHS.

### **Ms Monica Daley**

Monica is a barrister of 25 years' standing. She has acted in a judicial capacity since 2006, first as a Fee-Paid Property Judge of the Residential Property Tribunal and also, more recently, as a fee-paid judge for both the Health and Social Care Tribunal and the Special Education and Disability Tribunal dealing with appeals in cases involving sensitive and confidential issues. In 2015 she was appointed as one of the first cohorts of independent legal Chairs of the Police Misconduct committee for East England. In 2016, Monica was also appointed as a Legal Assessor for fitness to practice committees of the Nursing and Midwifery Council.



### **Mrs Johanna Higgins**



Johanna is currently the Northern Ireland Commissioner for the Criminal Cases Review Commission, a panel member for the Centre for Effective Dispute Resolution, and a panel member for the Civil Legal Services Appeal Panel, Northern Ireland.

Johanna is a barrister of 27 years call, a Bencher of the Inner Temple and has worked as a senior public prosecutor in Northern Ireland. She has extensive experience of criminal casework, criminal appeals, judicial review, historic cases, adjudication and community care law. She is also an elected member of the Royal Historical Society.

## **Rt Hon Sir Stephen Irwin**



Sir Stephen was appointed Lord Justice of Appeal in 2016 and acted as the supervising justice for extradition and national security cases until his retirement in October 2020. He is a member of the Privy Council and continues to sit part-time as a deputy Lord Justice of Appeal.

He is the Chair of the Slynn Foundation, which offers support and training to judges and lawyers in jurisdictions where they may be under pressure, or facing major change.

From July 2021 to early 2022, he facilitated discussions which have led to the establishment of a process of alternative dispute resolution for the bereaved, survivors and relatives of the Grenfell fire tragedy.

Stephen was a High Court judge from 2006 to 2016. Between 2013 and 2016 he was Chairman of the Special Immigration Appeals Commission (SIAC) and from 2011 to 2018 he was Chairman of the Judicial Security Committee responsible for judges' safety. He spent seven years as a tutor on the Judicial College leadership course.

Prior to his judicial career Stephen had extensive experience as a barrister, was appointed Queen's Counsel in 1997, and in 2004 took on the high-profile role of Chairman of the Bar for England and Wales.

## **Professor Clare McGlynn KC (Hon)**

Clare is a Professor of Law at Durham University, with particular expertise in criminal law. A qualified solicitor, she was appointed KC (Hon) in 2020 in recognition of the influence of her research on law and policy reform, particularly image-based sexual abuse and extreme pornography. Clare was a member of Durham University's Sexual Violence Taskforce, undertakes sexual violence and misconduct investigations within the university and



is a member of the University's Discipline Committee. As well as supporting other institutions regarding their sexual misconduct policies, she also has experience of adjudicating claims of bullying and harassment. Clare has held several leadership roles at Durham including as Deputy Head of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Health, and member of the University's governing body, the University Council.

### **Miss Dale Simon**



Dale is a qualified barrister who had an extensive career with the CPS where she was the Director for Public Accountability and Inclusion and had corporate responsibility for hate crime and violence against women and girls. She spent three years as Head of the Office for Judicial Complaints handling serious and sensitive judicial investigations and was also a Non-Executive Director at the Parole Board for 6 years where she was a member of the Management Committee and the Chair of the Standards Committee. Dale currently sits as an independent panel member for public appointments for the Ministry of Justice and as a lay chair of Fitness to Practice Hearings for the Nursing and Midwifery Council. She is also a member of the National Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel. Dale was an advocate consultant for Phase II of The Young Review with responsibility for liaising with statutory and voluntary organisations, taking forward the recommendations of the Young Review to reduce the disproportionality negative outcomes for young Black Asian and Minority Ethnic and/or Muslim men in the criminal justice system. In 2013 Dale was awarded a CBE for services to equality and diversity.

### **Sir Peter Thornton KC**

Sir Peter Thornton is a former judge. He was a Senior Circuit Judge between 2007 and 2016 sitting at the Central Criminal Court, hearing cases involving murder, terrorism and serious sexual offences. He also sat as an appellate judge in the Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) and in the High Court on inquest appeals. Sir Peter was the first person to hold the post of Chief Coroner of



England and Wales, between 2012 and 2016. Having chaired five different disciplinary panels, including misconduct panels for academic staff at University College London and fitness to practise appeals for medical students, Peter is at present Chair of the UCL Discipline Review Body. He is currently a Visiting Professor in the Law School at King's College London and trains judges and coroners in the UK and abroad. He is Patron of the National Network of Child Death Review Panels.



### **Dr Matthew Vickers**



Matthew Vickers is Chief Ombudsman and Chief Executive of Ombudsman Services, which is the UK's energy and telecommunications ombudsman. He is responsible for procedural and administrative justice, ensuring that investigations are carried out with empathy and balance and that decisions are consistent and well-reasoned. Matthew was previously CEO of the Scottish Legal Complaints Commission (SLCC) which is responsible for the investigation of complaints about the legal profession in Scotland. In that role he was responsible for establishing the SLCC's credibility and legitimacy with the public and legal profession. Matthew has also worked for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and in various commercial and not-for-profit organisations. Matthew is also a trustee and Chair Designate of the charity Human Rights at Sea.

# The development of the IEP: Remit, Procedures and Practice

## Code of Conduct appeals

- 1.1 The House of Commons agreed on 18 October 2022 that the Independent Expert Panel's (the Panel) remit would expand to include deciding appeals against decisions by the Committee on Standards (the Committee) that a MP had breached the Code of Conduct for MPs and or appeals against sanctions imposed or recommended by the Committee.<sup>1</sup> This followed a recommendation, endorsed by the Committee, by Sir Ernest Ryder in his review of "fairness and natural justice in the House's standards system".<sup>2</sup>

### *Procedure*

- 1.2 The House has agreed, following a recommendation by Sir Ernest, a "Procedural Protocol" that sets out at a high-level the procedures to be followed by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards (the Commissioner), the Committee and Panel in relation to complaints.<sup>3</sup> The provisions in relation to appeals were designed in consultation with the Panel to mirror, as far as possible, the Panel's existing procedures for Independent Complaints and Grievance Scheme (ICGS) cases.
- 1.3 Appeals are a review of the Committee's decisions, not re-hearings. Appeals can only be made on specified grounds of appeal, and a sub-panel can refuse permission to appeal if a MP does not raise substantive grounds. Appeals are also, normally, decided via written submissions, since the facts have been reduced to writing. Appeals are carried out in private, although unlike in ICGS cases there is a presumption that submissions and evidence will be published at the conclusion of an appeal unless there is good reason not to.

---

<sup>1</sup> Votes and Proceedings 18 October 2022, item 10 this implemented the relevant recommendations of the First Report of the Committee on Standards of Session 2022-23, New Code of Conduct and Guide to the Rules: Promoting appropriate values, attitudes and behaviours in Parliament (HC 227), published 24 May 2022.

<sup>2</sup> Sixth Report of the Committee on Standards of Session 2021-22, Review of fairness and natural justice in the House's standards system, (HC 1183), published 4 March 2022.

<sup>3</sup> House of Commons, Procedural Protocol in respect of the Code of Conduct, (HC 875), published 10 November 2022.

- 1.4 The Panel has published more detailed guidance for appellants in Code of Conduct cases on its website, fleshing out the procedures it will normally follow.<sup>4</sup> As far as possible, this replicates the existing guidance to the parties in ICGS cases. That guidance has been re-named and re-issued to reflect the Panel's expanded remit.<sup>5</sup>

### *Revised guiding principles*

- 1.5 The Panel has revised its guiding principles to reflect its expanded remit (see box below).

#### **Guiding principles**

The Panel is guided by the principles of natural justice, fairness for all parties, transparency and proportionality.

We are rigorously independent, impartial and objective, acting without any political input or influence.

We understand:

a) the seriousness of, and the harm caused by, bullying, harassment and sexual misconduct, within the Parliamentary Community which the ICGS seeks to tackle.

b) the importance of the Code of Conduct in; building a common understanding of what behaviour and attitudes the House wishes to promote or considers unacceptable; upholding the openness and accountability essential to the proper functioning of a representative democracy; ensuring all Members can and do speak and act without fear or favour; and protecting and enhancing the reputation of the House of Commons so that the public can have justifiable confidence in it.

Our aims are to:

a) help embed positive steps directed at improving the culture and behaviour of Members, staff and the wider Parliamentary community.

<sup>4</sup> Independent Expert Panel, *Guidance to appellants in Code of Conduct Cases*, November 2022

<sup>5</sup> Independent Expert Panel, *Guidance for the parties on appeals, referrals and sanctions under the ICGS*, November 2022

b) support the commitments made by the House of Commons to the Independent Complaints and Grievance Scheme (ICGS), and to uphold the behaviour and standards that underpin the Code of Conduct for MPs.

To this end in all our work we:

a) adopt policies and procedures that are as understandable, accessible and straightforward as they can be while being consistent with natural justice;

b) act in accordance with the principles of equality and diversity, being mindful of intersecting inequalities, the well-being of the parties and the need to protect potentially vulnerable people;

c) ensure that the parties are able to make their case;

d) determine cases flexibly, recognising the unique circumstances of each case;

e) are guided by the need for timeliness and proportionality in our procedures and decisions;

f) protect the confidentiality of proceedings, handling data appropriately, while being open about the outcome of cases;

g) publish timely information about how we work, engaging with the Parliamentary community and others to promote understanding, listen and learn;

h) abide by the Seven Principles of Public Life (the Nolan Principles).

In ICGS cases we also:

a) recognise that the ICGS is a workplace complaints and grievance scheme, not an adversarial process; and

b) protect the confidentiality of complainants and witnesses, except when waived.

### *Compliance with ICGS decisions*

1.6 Previously, the failure of a MP to comply with the Panel’s decision in an ICGS case was dealt with as a breach of the Code of Conduct, with the Committee on Standards as the decision-making body.<sup>6</sup> As part of the package of reforms agreed by the House on 18 October 2022 the Panel itself will now be responsible for addressing any such breach, to avoid the circularity of a complaint by the Panel to the Committee, from which an appeal would lie to the Panel.<sup>7</sup> Part F of its revised guidance for the parties to ICGS cases sets out the procedure.<sup>8</sup> This makes clear that the Panel will treat “a respondent taking any step which has the effect of undermining or minimising the significance of the sanction(s) or the Panel’s decision” as a failure to comply with the Panel’s decision and that may result in a further sanction being imposed.

---

<sup>6</sup> See for example Fifth Report of the Committee on Standards of Session 2021-22, *Daniel Kawczynski*, (HC 1036), published 13 January 2022.

<sup>7</sup> Under Standing Order No. 150A (3)(f) as amended

<sup>8</sup> *Guidance for the parties on appeals, referrals and sanctions under the ICGS*, Part F.

## Cases decided in 2022

- 2.1 The Panel published reports on five ICGS cases during 2022, covering seven complaints. It published one report on a Code of Conduct case. The published reports are summarised in Table 1 and are available in full on the Panel’s website.<sup>9</sup> The Panel did not make any decisions on cases in 2022 that were not the subject of a published report.
- 2.2 As of 31 December 2022, the Panel was considering two ICGS complaints covering one respondent.

**Table 1: reports published by the Panel in 2022**

Report	Date	Remit	Outcome	Sanction determined by IEP (if any)
<u>Mr John Bercow</u>	8 March 2022	ICGS: Bullying & Harassment	Complaint upheld following appeal	Reprimand by Panel, withdrawal of right to former members pass, recommendation would have been expulsion if a sitting MP
<u>Mr Liam Byrne MP</u>	28 April 2022	ICGS: Bullying & Harassment	Complaint Upheld, not appealed.	Two sitting day suspension, written apology to complainant, undergo training
<u>Mr Patrick Grady MP</u>	14 June 2022	ICGS: Sexual misconduct	Complaint Upheld, not appealed.	Two sitting day suspension, apology to the House via personal statement

<sup>9</sup> [www.parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/standards-and-financial-interests/independent-expert-panel/reports/](http://www.parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/standards-and-financial-interests/independent-expert-panel/reports/)

<b>Report</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Remit</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Sanction determined by IEP (if any)</b>
<u>Ms Patricia Gibson</u>	23 June 2022	ICGS: Sexual misconduct	Complaint not upheld following appeal.	N/A
<u>Mr Christian Matheson MP</u>	21 October 2022	ICGS: Sexual misconduct	Complaint upheld, not appealed.	Four-week suspension <sup>10</sup>
<u>Mr Andrew Bridgen MP</u>	20 December 2022	Code of Conduct	Appeal dismissed	N/A

---

<sup>10</sup> Mr Matheson resigned from the House before it could consider the Panel's Report.

## Wider issues arising from decided cases

- 3.1 One of the Panel's aims is "to help embed positive steps directed at improving the culture and behaviour of Members, staff and the wider Parliamentary community". Its main means of doing so is via the decisions it makes on individual cases, through the promulgation of case reports and the consistent principles which can be identified from the cases. The circumstances of each case are unique, but the principles and approach may clearly be discerned. There are several points emerging from the cases decided in 2022 that may be relevant to wider discussions about the House's culture or processes.

### Confidentiality in ICGS cases

- 3.2 The ICGS is intended to be a confidential scheme, and the Panel go to great lengths to maintain that confidentiality. A complaint has been made and the names of those under investigation are not published. At the conclusion of a case, the Panel will only normally publish a report into complaints that are upheld. Exceptionally, it may also publish a report if an appeal by a respondent MP has been upheld, but the fact of the complaint, or any of the detail, have been given publicity. Complainants and witnesses are not named in the Panel's reports unless they choose to be.
- 3.3 Confidentiality is vitally important to protect the welfare of all involved and the fairness of investigations. It provides assurance to potential complainants and witnesses who may not otherwise come forward. MPs subject to a complaint that is publicised, but then not upheld can face substantial and lasting reputational damage.
- 3.4 It is therefore of great concern to the Panel that, although the anonymity of complainants and witnesses was not compromised in any case, there were nevertheless breaches of confidentiality in all the cases the Panel reported on in 2022. ICGS investigations were completed into MPs that were not referred or appealed to the Panel without breaches of confidentiality. Although it is not possible to identify the source in every case, they have stemmed in relation to



- one individual from the respondent,<sup>11</sup> and in others from the complainant.<sup>12</sup> It also seems likely that some breaches come from others in the Parliamentary community with whom a party to a complaint has shared information in confidence, to receive advice or support.<sup>13</sup>
- 3.5 This is of real concern. The Panel can take breaches of confidentiality by a respondent or complainant into account when deciding sanction. In one case this year a sanction was reduced owing to the complainant's deliberate and repeated breaches of confidentiality, which were intended to discredit the respondent.<sup>14</sup> The deliberate breaches of confidentiality by a former MP were also highlighted as an aggravating factor in the sub-panel's sanctioning decision in his case.<sup>15</sup>
- 3.6 The Panel also, exceptionally, published a report on a successful appeal by a respondent. The actions of the complainant led to the respondent MP being "subjected to significant online abuse and harassment, including sexual threats, as well as derogatory graffiti at her place of work which necessitated an increase in personal security."<sup>16</sup>
- 3.7 It is imperative that parties to ICGS cases understand the confidentiality requirements, and why they are important. It may also be necessary for those responsible for the ICGS to consider whether further steps are required to deter breaches of confidentiality beyond their potential impact on a sanction.

## Appeals

- 3.8 In considering appeals the Panel operates a two-stage procedure. First the sub-panel decides if the issues sought to be raised fall within the relevant grounds of appeal, and if so whether there is substance to them. Only if it decides that both tests are met, will it then consider the merits of the appeal in detail.<sup>17</sup> This

---

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, Independent Expert Panel, *The Conduct of Mr John Bercow*, (HC 1189), 8 March 2022, para 2.54 p. 20

<sup>12</sup> Independent Expert Panel, *The Conduct of Mr Patrick Grady MP* (HC368), 14 June 2022, para 1.6 and Independent Expert Panel, *The Conduct of Ms Patricia Gibson MP*, (HC 505), 23 June 2022, para 2.61.

<sup>13</sup> The Panel's guidance allows for parties to share information in confidence with a limited number of advisers and supporters. This could include whips, trade union representatives, legal advisers and friends and family.

<sup>14</sup> *The Conduct of Mr Patrick Grady MP* para 1.13

<sup>15</sup> *The Conduct of Mr John Bercow* para 3.6

<sup>16</sup> *The Conduct of Ms Patricia Gibson MP* para 2.63

<sup>17</sup> See, for example, paragraphs 30-31 of the *Guidance for the parties on a appeals, referrals and sanctions under the ICGS*.

approach ensures that sub-panels can deal quickly with those that have no prospect of success and provide quicker decisions for all involved.

- 3.9 Sub-panels refused permission to appeal in two ICGS cases in 2022. In one, an appeal against sanction by a respondent was found to have raised no substantive grounds of appeal.<sup>18</sup> In the other a complainant appealed a decision by the Commissioner not to uphold one of his allegations.<sup>19</sup> In the latter case, the sub-panel refused permission on the grounds it was “unarguable” that the conduct complained about amounted to bullying under the ICGS policies.
- 3.10 The sub-panel in that case also stressed that the ICGS is not a private dispute resolution scheme but operates on behalf of the whole Parliamentary community, a principle which guides how the Panel will approach appeals by complainants:

**[...] it is important to understand that the [ICGS] does not represent resolution of a private dispute between a complainant and a respondent. This scheme is conducted on behalf of Parliament, as part of the wish of Parliament to maintain and improve standards.** It is for that reason, [...] that proceedings under the ICGS are inquisitorial in nature: Parliament enquiring into events and imposing standards and sanctions, not Parliament providing a means to resolve disputes between Members of Parliament and others. In that context, the opportunity for appeal by complainants must be limited to technical, procedural or legal challenges, and it is only in an exceptional case affecting the integrity of the system where it will be right to allow a complainant to mount an appeal based on his or her disagreement with the Commissioner’s conclusions of fact.<sup>20</sup> [emphasis added]

---

<sup>18</sup> Independent Expert Panel, *The Conduct of Mr Christian Matheson MP*, (HC 823), 21 October 2022

<sup>19</sup> *The Conduct of Mr Patrick Grady MP*, section 2.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid* paragraph, 2.3.

### **Length of the ICGS process**

- 3.11 The Panel noted concerns about the length of time ICGS cases take to conclude in its last annual report. Those concerns remain. The Panel is very aware of the impact that delays to cases can have on both complainants and respondents. The majority of the time taken from complaint to resolution of an appeal to the Panel is taken up by the investigation. Further action is required to ensure that investigations are completed as quickly and thoroughly as possible, and any delays caused by weaknesses in the initial investigation are minimised.
- 3.12 As set out in its annual report last year the Panel has also been taking steps to ensure that sub-panels conclude their work as quickly as possible, consistent with providing a fair and robust process.

## Panel members' fees and expenses

- 4.1 The tables on the following pages set out the fees and expenses claimed by each Panel member since January 2022. These are published quarterly in arrears on the Panel's website.<sup>21</sup>
- 4.2 Panel members are paid fees of £350 (excluding VAT) per half day of work they carry out for the Panel. They may also claim for expenses incurred in carrying out work for the Panel; in practice this generally means the costs of travelling to Westminster for meetings. Panel members are drawn from across the United Kingdom and the differing distances they must travel to attend meetings is reflected in their expense claims. No in-person meetings occurred before September 2021 owing to the pandemic. It is expected that most routine sub-panel meetings and other work will continue to happen remotely, and Panel members have been provided with secure Parliamentary IT equipment to facilitate this.
- 4.3 The fees paid to individual members vary according to the number and complexity of cases they have undertaken. Panel members also contributed time and expertise to creating and then developing the Panel's practices and procedures in the period immediately following the creation of the Panel. This is reflected in the level of fees claimed during this period. The Chair, Sir Stephen Irwin, has additional responsibilities to co-ordinate the work of the Panel and sub-panels, and to engage with the parliamentary community on behalf of the Panel.
- 4.4 The Panel is supported by a small secretariat of House staff, consisting (as of December 2022) of a Senior Clerk (Band A1, 0.8 FTE) and a Committee Operations Manager (Band B2 0.5 FTE).

---

<sup>21</sup> The Independent Expert Panel, [Summary of invoice claims](#).

## Summary of invoice claims

The table sets out totals claimed each month, exclusive of VAT.

In some cases, individual members have submitted invoices for two or three consecutive months; amounts claimed for each individual month have been calculated on work undertaken, rounded to the nearest half day.

	<b>Lisa Ball</b>	<b>Monica Daley</b>	<b>Johanna Higgins</b>	<b>Stephen Irwin</b>	<b>Clare McGlynn</b>	<b>Dale Simon</b>	<b>Peter Thornton</b>	<b>Matthew Vickers</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Jan 2022	£3,500	£1,400	£700	£5,600	£700	£2,100	£9,100	£1,400	£24,500
Feb 2022	£1,050	£350	-	£2,450	-	£350	£2,100	£350	£6,650
Mar 2022	£350	£350	-	£1,750	-	£1,050	£350	£350	£4,200
Apr 2022	-	£1,050	-	£1,750	-	£2,450	-	£750	£6,000
May 2022	£1,400	£2,450	-	£2,800	£2,450	£2,450	-	£700	£12,250
Jun 2022	£1,400	£1,750	-	£2,100	£2,100	-	-	-	£7,350
Jul 2022	£700	£350	£700	£1,750	£700	£700	£2,100	£350	£7,350
Aug 2022	-	£1,750	£2,100	£350	£350	-	£3,150	-	£7,700
Sep 2022	£1,050	-	-	£1,400	-	-	-	£350	£2,800
Oct 2022	£1,050	-	£350	£1,400	-	£1,750	-	£1,050	£3,850
Nov 2022	£700	£700	£350	£1,750	£1,400	£1,400	£700	£700	£7,700
Dec 2022	-	-	£1,400	£3,150	-	-	£700	£350	£5,600
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£11, 200</b>	<b>£10,150</b>	<b>£5,600</b>	<b>£26,250</b>	<b>£9,100</b>	<b>£10,500</b>	<b>£18,200</b>	<b>£6,350</b>	<b>£97,350</b>

### Summary of expenses claims

	<b>Lisa Ball</b>	<b>Monica Daley</b>	<b>Johanna Higgins</b>	<b>Stephen Irwin</b>	<b>Clare McGlynn</b>	<b>Dale Simon</b>	<b>Peter Thornton</b>	<b>Matthew Vickers</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Jan 2022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Feb 2022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mar 2022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Apr 2022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
May 2022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jun 2022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jul 2022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aug 2022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sep 2022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oct 2022	-	-	£195	-	-	-	-	-	£195
Nov 2022	£16.10	-	£257.20	-	£200	-	-	-	£473.30
Dec 2022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£16.10</b>		<b>£452.20</b>		<b>£200</b>				<b>£668.30</b>