



Ministry of  
**JUSTICE**

# **Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority Triennial Review 2012 Call for Evidence**

30 November 2012

## **Triennial Review programme**

The Government's response to the Public Administration Select Committee report '**Smaller Government: Shrinking the Quango state**' sets out the plans for reforming public bodies. It includes new Triennial Review requirements for Non-Departmental Public Bodies (NDPB).

Triennial Reviews are expected to take between 3 – 6 months and are carried out by the Sponsor Department of the respective bodies. The Ministry of Justice is the sponsor Department for the CICA.

## **Functions of the CICA**

The CICA was established in 1994. Details about the CICA can be found online, at <http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/criminal-injuries-compensation-authority>.

## **Purpose of the Review**

As custodians of the public purse, whether paid by the professions or directly from public funds, it is important that we deliver an efficient and effective service to the public. The periodic review of our NDPBs is one of the ways that the Government intends to ensure that we maintain a lean, but effective public sector. A Triennial Review is a Cabinet Office mandated process for reviewing the functions of Non-Departmental Public Bodies (NDPBs), the appropriateness of the body's delivery mechanism and its governance arrangements.

The Cabinet Office has identified two principal aims for Triennial Reviews:

- To provide a robust challenge of the continuing need for individual NDPBs – both their functions and their form; and
- Where it is agreed that a particular body should remain as an NDPB, to review the control and governance arrangements in place to ensure that the public body is complying with recognised principles of good corporate governance.

Where the functions should continue and the NDPB should remain, and in light of the review findings, the Government will assess whether appropriate control and governance arrangements are in place to ensure that the body is operating in line with Government policy including good corporate governance, openness, transparency and accountability.

## **Call for evidence**

In order to review the continuing need for the functions and the form of the CICA, the review team is seeking evidence from a wide range of bodies. The review would particularly welcome hearing from users of the CICA. This can be done in the form of written evidence at the following contact details:

CICA Triennial Review team  
Post point 10.02  
Ministry of Justice  
102 Petty France  
London  
SW1H 9AJ

Or by email – [CICATriennialReview@justice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:CICATriennialReview@justice.gsi.gov.uk)

All submissions must be received by the latest **12:00 on Friday 8 February 2012**.  
Late submissions will not be considered.

## Questions

The questions which follow are intended to frame the CICA Call for Evidence. Given the recent consultation on a revised Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme, it is necessary to outline what information we are seeking from consultees.

The questions below are not designed to be exhaustive and do not seek to replace invitations to respond directly to the review team.

The questions presume an understanding of the functions, form and purpose of the CICA. They are primarily aimed at key stakeholders such as legal and consumer representative bodies. We would invite these bodies to share the survey wider with their members.

The survey is divided into two parts:

1. the function of the CICA; and
2. the form the CICA takes.

These align with the Stage 1 remit for Triennial Reviews, as mandated by Cabinet Office.

### **The function of the CICA.**

The Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority is the government body responsible for administering the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme in England, Scotland and Wales. Its aim is to compensate the blameless victims of violent crime. As the body that administers the Scheme, it is an experienced caseworking organisation.

#### **1. Should the CICA continue to administer the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme?**

Points to consider:

- How does this contribute to the core business of the CICA and the Ministry of Justice?
- How does this contribute to wider Government policy objectives?
- Is providing the function a justifiable use of taxpayers' money?
- What would be the cost and effects of not delivering the function?

#### **2. Should the CICA be permitted to undertake other functions? (E.g. casework for other government departments or organisations; administering schemes for paying out damages; etc.)**

## **The form of the CICA**

The Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority was established in 1994 under prerogative powers. It is treated as an Arm's Length Body for administrative purposes. Its staff are directly employed by the Ministry of Justice. It is run by a Chief Executive and a Board of Directors.

### **Is there an alternative form that the CICA might take?**

Here follow a range of delivery options for consideration. This is not an exhaustive list – and consultees are encouraged to think creatively when assessing how the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority's functions might be delivered.

#### **3. Should the CICA move out of Central Government?**

Points to consider:

- Do the various schemes administered by the CICA need to be run by the same body?
- Why does central government need to deliver this function?
- Can the function be delivered by local government, by the voluntary sector or by the private sector?
- Is there an existing provider (or providers) in the local government, voluntary or private sector that could deliver this function?
- Can the function be privatised or delivered under contract by the voluntary or private sector?
- Can the function be delivered by a mutual, Community Interest Company or social enterprise?
- What are the risks and benefits of moving the function out of central government?

#### **4. Should the CICA be brought in-house?**

Points to consider:

- Why does the function need to be delivered at arms length from Ministers?
- Can the function be delivered more efficiently or effectively by the Ministry of Justice or by an existing Agency of the Ministry of Justice?
- What would be the cost and benefits of bringing the function in-house?

#### **5. Should the CICA be merged with another body?**

Points to consider:

- Are there any other areas of central government delivering similar or complimentary functions?
- Does the function duplicate work undertaken elsewhere?
- Could the function be merged with those of another public body?

#### **6. Should the CICA be established as a new Executive Agency?**

Points to consider:

- Could the function be delivered by a new Executive Agency?
- What would be the costs and benefits of this?

**7. Should the function continue to be delivered by a Non-Departmental Public Body?**

Points to consider:

- Is the CICA's function:
  - (i) a technical function which needs external expertise to deliver;
  - (ii) a function which needs to be, and to be seen to be, delivered with absolute political impartiality – such as certain regulatory or funding functions; or
  - (iii) a function which needs to be delivered independently of Ministers to establish facts or figures with integrity?
- How well is the CICA currently delivering the function?
- Are the freedoms and flexibilities inherent in the NDPB model being used to deliver the function?

**8. Are there any other possible delivery options?**

Please write in any alternative forms of delivery not listed above.