# Timms Review: summary

Benefitscast, December 2026

## In brief

The Timms Review looked at how Personal Independence Payment (PIP) should change. It was published on 24 November 2026 and is a set of recommendations, not government policy.

- It says PIP is valued but "no longer fit for purpose", and that claiming, assessment and review feel stressful and sometimes dehumanising.
- PIP would stay a cash benefit that is not taxed or means-tested, but with a redesigned way to claim.
- Some immediate improvements are suggested which include a simpler claim form, reducing unnecessary award reviews for long-term conditions, clearer communication, better adoption of reasonable adjustments and reviewing the 28-day hospital rule.

## The proposed new way to claim

The review suggests a new benefit with new routes to entitlement.

- **A light-touch gateway:** everyone would start with a short form, online, by phone or on paper. It would check basic eligibility, point people to the right route and start collecting evidence.
- **Fast track 1, end of life:** people receiving end-of-life care would get an award without a full assessment. It should be the quickest route, remaining similar to the existing process where an SR1 form is used.
- **Fast track 2, serious or lifelong conditions:** people with serious, well-evidenced conditions where the impact on daily life is clear, including lifelong conditions where needs are unlikely to reduce, would also get an award without a full assessment.
- **Impact assessment for everyone else:** this would look at how a condition affects daily life, including changing and cumulative effects, barriers, and extra costs. It would decide whether someone qualifies and how much they get.
- **Less repeat paperwork:** a single online profile would keep evidence using a “tell us once” approach, with a non-digital option. Reviews should avoid unnecessary reassessment, and people with lifelong or degenerative conditions should get ongoing awards with only a light check-in.

## How much might people get?

The review does not give any amounts, so nobody can yet say who would be better or worse off.

- **No rates:** it sets no weekly figures, and no new activities, descriptors or points.

- **Extra costs:** awards would reflect people's needs rather than receipts, so no one would have to add up what they spend.
- **Options not yet chosen:** payments could be regular or one-off.
- **"Rebalancing":** the review expects awards to be rebalanced to match need better, within the spending forecast.
- **Knock-on effects:** changes could affect passporting to Motability and to Carer's Allowance, which the review says would need to be considered.

## What happens next, and what we don't know yet

- **No dates:** the review gives no timetable.
- **Early implementation and later action:** it asks the government to publish a formal response with timescales, and to start with changes that can happen now, such as simpler forms, kinder letters, better evidence use, fewer unnecessary reviews and review of the hospital 28-day rule. Bigger changes to eligibility and awards would come later, and some would need legislation.
- **Still unknown:** who would carry out the impact assessment, what evidence it would use, which conditions would be fast-tracked and how long awards would last.
- **Link to the Milburn Review:** the Milburn Review would replace PIP for under-25s with a different system, so the two reviews will need to be reconciled.

This is a plain English summary and is not advice.