Commentary and Critique **Research Commentary**
Vol. 11 (2026) · ISSN 3006-6220 journal.pe.ac/Commentary-and-Critique

Pay in time, verify in sequence: Automatic social protection during energy price shocks

Samuel Tay[a], Dilorom Usmonova[a]

[a]Academy of Public Policy and Economics, London E1 0SG, United Kingdom

Corresponding author: Samuel Tay, samuel.tay@pe.ac.

Published 21 September, 2026.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62432/APPE.CC.2026.11.21

Article webpage: https://journal.pe.ac/Commentary-and-Critique/article/view/21

Abstract

Britain's £400 energy support reached households through markedly unequal administrative routes. The main Energy Bills Support Scheme successfully made 98.7% of expected instalment payments, while its vouchers reached 87% redemption by the final deadline. The application-based Alternative Funding scheme opened in February 2023, roughly four months after the main channel, and reported take-up of 18.2% against a provisional eligible-population estimate. Its completed route reached 145,190 households, with average application processing of 28 days. These official measures describe different populations and endpoints. Together with implementation evidence, they show how existing account recognition organized access: established customers entered the main channel, voucher users still had to redeem support, and households outside direct electricity contracts faced a later application route. Winter Fuel Payment in 2025–26 demonstrates a further design choice, separating broad initial payment from subsequent income-tax recovery. The policy conclusion is to launch funded automatic and assisted channels together, with essential release checks and a workable correction process. Administrative inclusion is part of the emergency benefit itself: the same nominal grant can offer different practical protection when households face different routes and waiting periods.

Keywords: social protection; energy prices; administrative burden; benefit take-up; automatic payments; Winter Fuel Payment

1. Protection has a deadline

On 15 September 2026, the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) reported that 10.9 million people in England and Wales had received a Winter Fuel Payment for winter 2025–26. The figure followed a major change in eligibility and exceeded the preceding winter's count by 9.6 million. It described payments recorded by 6 July 2026; although most payments occur in November or December, some continue through the year (DWP, 2026). A large recipient count therefore answers an important question about reach while leaving open whether support was usable when a household needed it.

During an energy price shock, a household facing an empty prepayment meter needs current credit, even if a future payment is assured. An overdue payment may subsequently restore its annual income without undoing a period of disconnection or borrowing. The design determines which households wait and who must supply evidence before obtaining support. The central judgment advanced here is that emergency support should use a deliberate sequence of verification. Essential checks on identity, payment destination, and duplication belong before release. More detailed income assessments can follow where

© 2026 Academy of Public Policy and Economics · Open Access (CC BY 4.0).

the state has reliable recovery and correction arrangements. Households outside its existing records need a funded, assisted route operating alongside the main payment channel.

This argument concerns the conversion of a policy commitment into usable support. Automatic enrolment, automatic payment, and automatic activation in response to prices are distinct design choices. Britain's emergency energy grants were politically introduced; Winter Fuel Payment is an annual provision. Neither is evidence that a government has adopted a precommitted price threshold for expanding protection. The comparison below examines delivery after activation and identifies what would have to be secured for a rule-based response to work.

2. Comparing equal grants through unequal routes

The analysis draws on official documents available by 20 September 2026: the National Audit Office's (NAO) implementation review, two Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) evaluations, Winter Fuel Payment statistics and policy analysis, current payment guidance, and enacted legislation. The main comparison holds the emergency and nominal grant amount constant: the £400 Energy Bills Support Scheme (EBSS) in Great Britain and its Alternative Funding route (EBSS AF). Their intended populations differed, so differences in coverage describe the performance of different institutional arrangements rather than an estimated causal effect of automation. The later Winter Fuel Payment design provides an additional comparison of where income verification occurs, with its statistical population confined to England and Wales.

The nearest research already establishes that administrative burdens shape benefit access. Herd et al. (2023) explain how policy rules, organizational capacity, third parties, and tax administration distribute those burdens; universal eligibility alone does not ensure access. Bennett et al. (2026), drawing on interviews with 44 Universal Credit claimants in Scotland during 2022–23, show how automated calculation and income-data exchange can impose temporal, financial, and emotional costs. In a randomized study of older people likely eligible for the United States' Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Finkelstein and Notowidigdo (2019) demonstrate that information and application assistance increase enrolment, while the people induced to enrol are not necessarily those in greatest observable need.

The contribution here is to show how registry position organized access to an equal nominal crisis grant, and to connect that result to the ordering of later fiscal targeting. A system can minimize application work for people already visible to it while concentrating delay among others. It can also deliver immediate liquidity more broadly than the ultimate net transfer. These are separate choices with different evidentiary requirements. Table 1 sets out the arrangements; Table 2 identifies the observed outcomes that support the comparison. This is a purposive comparative commentary, with source-level extraction, rather than a systematic review or a new household survey.

3. The £400 comparison: A strong main channel and a late alternative

EBSS used an existing national network of supplier accounts to distribute £400 in six monthly instalments from October 2022 to March 2023. This arrangement substantially reduced the information a household had to supply before receiving support. The NAO (2024, para. 3.12) reports that 98.7% of expected payments were successfully made. The denominator comprised approximately 173 million instalment payments for around 28.9 million customers, rather than a census of households in energy hardship. The result demonstrates considerable delivery capacity within the chosen account system.

The main scheme also contained a revealing difference between payment channels. Traditional prepayment customers received vouchers, which had to reach the intended recipient, be redeemed, and be applied as meter credit. The NAO's end-of-scheme evidence reports 87% redemption for EBSS vouchers in Great Britain, rounded to a whole percentage point. Its definition explicitly distinguishes a voucher is-

Table 1. Where verification and household action enter the selected arrangements

Arrangement and population	Initial recognition and finance	Route to usable support	Subsequent checks or obligations
EBSS, Great Britain, 2022–23; domestic electricity customers	Supplier account identifies the delivery channel; government finances £400 in six instalments	Account credit or payment through the supplier; traditional prepayment customers generally receive vouchers requiring redemption	Supplier reporting and reconciliation; household action remains necessary where vouchers are used
EBSS AF, Great Britain, 2023; eligible households without a direct domestic electricity contract	Household application, central checks, and local authority eligibility assessment; government finances the same £400	Local authority payment following approval	Documentary clarification and duplicate-payment checks can precede release
Winter Fuel Payment, England and Wales, 2025–26; pension-age eligibility subject to statutory exceptions	Social Fund payment, usually without a claim; age, residence, and household circumstances determine initial entitlement and amount	Payment to the recipient; some eligible people must claim	A separate income-tax charge recovers the payment above £35,000 individual annual income, with specified benefit exemptions

Note. The schemes cover different populations and observation periods. The table summarizes institutional design, not equivalent household outcomes. Sources: National Audit Office (2024, pp. 6–7 and paras. 3.12–3.15); DESNZ (2025b, pp. 47–63); Social Fund Winter Fuel Payment Regulations 2025, regulations 2–5; Finance Act 2026, schedule 10.

sued by a supplier from support delivered through redemption; the final redemption deadline was 30 June 2023 (NAO, 2024, Figure 9). Automatic issuance therefore left a material task between a government-funded payment and usable energy.

This task interacted with circumstances that an account-based delivery system could not simply resolve. The NAO recorded outdated contact details, problems with voucher arrival, and practical difficulties redeeming vouchers. Suppliers and advice organizations described barriers involving language, literacy, and concerns about scams. These observations explain plausible points of failure; they do not establish the individual cause of every unredeemed voucher. They nevertheless show why a high aggregate payment rate can coexist with a channel whose recipients must do more work to obtain equivalent support.

Households without a direct domestic electricity contract faced a more substantial separation. EBSS AF opened in February 2023 and closed in May, after the main scheme had already been operating through much of the winter. It relied on applications and local authority checks. The NAO reported Great Britain take-up of 18.2% against a provisional estimate of 798,700 potentially eligible households, explicitly warning that the population estimate rested on uncertain data (NAO, 2024, para. 3.14). The later interim evaluation recorded 145,190 households reached and an average application processing time of 28 days (DESNZ, 2025b, pp. 60–61). Those observations measure reach and processing after application, respectively; neither measures how long every eligible household waited from the onset of higher bills.

The same evaluation identifies a mechanism connecting the channels. Communications for the main scheme emphasized that payments were automatic and that households should be wary of requests to apply. The alternative scheme subsequently required an application. Local authorities and organizations working with vulnerable groups reported confusion from this sequencing. The evaluation also found that some applicants encountered address mismatches, difficulties evidencing care-home payments, or problems involving powers of attorney (DESNZ, 2025b, pp. 59–63). A support system built around formal supplier relationships had to recognize circumstances for which its strongest administrative data were absent.

Among households that received EBSS AF, the experience was often favorable: recipients described the application as straightforward, and 86% of those surveyed were satisfied with payment delivery. That favorable result sits alongside low estimated reach because the survey covered recipients, while the eval-

uation lacked a reliable sampling frame for eligible non-applicants (DESNZ, 2025b, pp. 29, 34–35, 61). Satisfaction among people who successfully entered the system cannot settle its performance for people who never entered it.

Table 2. Observed delivery measures and the judgment each permits

Observation	Statistical unit and period	Interpretation for timely protection
EBSS: 98.7% of expected payments successfully made	Instalment payments; scheme delivered October 2022–March 2023, subsequently reconciled	Strong delivery within the supplier-account channel; not a household-level timely-coverage probability
EBSS GB vouchers: 87% redeemed	Vouchers, rounded; end-of-scheme data, redemption deadline 30 June 2023	Identifies incomplete conversion to usable credit; does not give the distribution of redemption dates
EBSS AF GB: 18.2% estimated take-up	Potentially eligible households; provisional denominator 798,700	Indicates limited reach subject to denominator uncertainty; not directly comparable with the payment rate above
EBSS AF: 28 days average processing	Applications; reported in the April 2025 interim evaluation	Measures time within the application route; omits non-application and pre-launch waiting
Winter Fuel Payment: 10.9 million recipients	Individuals in England and Wales, winter 2025–26; extract 6 July 2026, released 15 September 2026	Establishes broad initial payment; does not measure timely availability or final income-tax recovery

Note. All values are reported observations, not estimates newly calculated from household microdata. Sources: NAO (2024, paras. 3.12–3.14 and Figure 9); DESNZ (2025b, p. 61); DWP (2026, sections 1–3). The measures are intentionally kept separate because their denominators, endpoints, and dates differ.

4. Paying first changes the location of targeting

Winter Fuel Payment provides a concrete alternative to making full income targeting a condition of initial release. For winter 2024–25, eligibility in England and Wales had been tied to specified means-tested benefits. The 2025 regulations restored a broader pension-age entitlement, subject to residence, household, and other statutory conditions. Regulation 5 permits payment without a claim where entitlement appears established; people not paid through this route can still need to claim (Social Fund Winter Fuel Payment Regulations 2025). The change thus used existing records broadly while retaining an administrative boundary.

The income restriction moved to a separate fiscal operation. Schedule 10 of the Finance Act 2026, enacted on 18 March 2026 and effective from tax year 2025–26, imposes a charge equal to the Winter Fuel Payment where individual total annual income exceeds £35,000. It exempts people entitled to specified means-tested benefits during the qualifying week. Official guidance describes recovery through tax codes or Self Assessment and provides an opt-out from receiving the payment (Finance Act 2026; GOV.UK, n.d.). Initial payment and ultimate net benefit therefore have different determinants and observation dates.

The DWP's (2025) equality analysis had projected 10.9 million initial recipients and approximately 8.9 million net beneficiaries after recovery. The September 2026 statistics subsequently recorded 10.9 million recipients, but they do not establish that the projected recovery or net-beneficiary count was realized. The numerical match in the initial count does not validate every part of the forecast. Nor does the increase from winter 2024–25 isolate an automation effect: the population legally eligible for payment changed markedly.

A legally authorized tax process can determine the net transfer after the payment authority releases seasonal support, allowing detailed annual income assessment to follow the initial payment. The state can carry some verification and financing risk during the interval. For a person who later repays the full amount, the benefit of the initial transfer is temporary liquidity rather than a permanent addition to

annual resources. Whether that liquidity is valuable depends on the person's circumstances, the timing of recovery, and the cost of dealing with it.

Recovery also brings its own burden. Current guidance states that an incomplete collection through a tax code can result in a tax calculation letter, while people filing Self Assessment must include the payment in their return. It describes periods when deductions for two annual payments overlap (GOV.UK, n.d.). These are genuine administrative obligations even if the initial payment was automatic. The arrangement therefore supports a conditional claim about sequencing: later targeting is a feasible legal and administrative design, whose overall performance must include the accuracy, intelligibility, and timing of the later recovery.

5. Who should carry the verification risk?

The strongest case for early payment is a combination of urgent household need, a credible existing identity or payment record, and a later assessment that the state can administer more effectively than a distressed applicant. Under those conditions, waiting for complete income information can transfer the cost of administrative uncertainty onto households least able to finance it. A modest, legally defined initial payment can preserve current consumption while the authority completes the more demanding assessment.

The evidence makes proportionality important. The NAO (2024, p. 9) reports that DESNZ assessed universal, flat-payment schemes as posing lower fraud and error risks than more complex targeted schemes. In discussing EBSS AF and the separate Alternative Fuel Payment Alternative Fund, DESNZ (2025b, pp. 62–63) reports checks against duplicate applications and funding already received through the main schemes. Local authorities described limited evidence of systematic fraud and difficulty distinguishing deliberate deception from confusion over eligibility. DESNZ and local authorities also reported that initial checks might have wrongly rejected eligible households sharing an address in assisted living facilities. These findings support checking payment history while providing prompt correction of disputed matches; they do not establish that earlier checks caused lower fraud. Essential verification therefore needs a route to reconsider mistaken exclusions, as well as controls against duplicate payment.

There are also circumstances in which broad early payment performs poorly. If the supposed payment record omits the most exposed households, accelerating it may mainly improve service for those easiest to reach. If income data cannot be matched reliably, a recovery process can generate disputes or impose repayments on the wrong person. The Universal Credit evidence illustrates the consequence of making recipients wait for employers or government data systems to correct errors that they cannot directly resolve (Bennett et al., 2026). Shifting a check to a later date without assigning someone the power to correct it relocates the burden rather than settling it.

For this reason, the alternative route belongs in the initial design and budget. Its role is to recognize households whose eligibility cannot be inferred from the main record, accept appropriate evidence of their circumstances, and resolve responsibility across intermediaries. The responsible authority needs staff, decision-making powers, and funds to release support while manageable uncertainties are addressed. Telephone access alone cannot perform this function if an applicant still has to produce documentation that does not exist in the required form. Communication must tell each household which route applies, with a consistent explanation of why one route is automatic and another requires assistance.

The evidence also challenges the assumption that any increase in take-up disproportionately helps the worst off. In Finkelstein and Notowidigdo's (2019) experiment, information and application assistance increased enrolment, but the induced participants had higher net incomes and were less sick than control-group enrollees on average. The distribution of gains from assistance consequently needs empirical assessment. A funded alternative route should consequently report whether it reaches people with

unstable housing, limited access to formal accounts, or difficulties acting through representatives, rather than relying only on aggregate applications processed.

Fiscal opportunity cost remains part of the choice. DESNZ's (2025a) impact and economic evaluation credited the energy schemes with reducing underconsumption while recognizing the considerable fiscal cost of broad support and the demands placed on delivery partners. Its modeled welfare results answer a different question from administrative reach. A government with limited capacity to recover payments may reasonably choose a broad non-recoverable emergency grant, a categorical payment, or a narrower advance. Each choice should state who retains the money and how errors are corrected. Urgency supports simplifying verification; it does not determine a uniquely optimal transfer amount or targeting rule.

6. Administrative inclusion is part of the benefit

The comparison identifies three different stages at which support became conditional on household circumstances. The main EBSS used an existing supplier relationship to reach customers at scale. Vouchers added a redemption step even within that relationship. AF required households outside direct contracts to establish their position through a route that opened later. The same £400 commitment thus involved different work and waiting, organized around what the state and its delivery partners already knew about the household.

The especially consequential separation was between rapid use of the main registry and delayed availability of the alternative route. AF's February opening and its later average processing time refer to successive parts of access. Improving processing after application could help entrants while leaving pre-launch waiting and non-application untouched. Similarly, high satisfaction among AF recipients describes people who had successfully crossed the entry boundary. These observations make a practical distinction: efficient handling of recognized cases and reaching eligible households are separate administrative achievements.

Winter Fuel Payment shows that the timing of recognition and the timing of final income targeting can be separated. Its recorded 10.9 million initial recipients establish broad payment; the projected 8.9 million net beneficiaries remain a forecast pending recovery outcomes. The significance for emergency policy is institutional: the payment authority can deliver a legally defined advance while a later tax process determines retention. That option is useful where the state can administer recovery and correct errors, with the financing and repayment obligations made clear to recipients.

The resulting design judgment is to treat automatic and assisted delivery as coequal components at launch. A household outside the principal registry should have an operational route, staff able to resolve its circumstances and funds available at the same time as the main scheme. Within each route, the completion event should be usable support: bank funds, applied meter credit or a realized bill reduction. This recommendation follows from the observed points where payment instructions, applications and actual access diverged. It assigns responsibility to the delivery authority for those gaps instead of leaving households to discover a later remedy.

7. Conclusion

The energy-support comparison shows an unequal conversion of a common nominal entitlement into practical access. Main-channel instalment delivery reached 98.7%, while voucher redemption reached 87%. Households requiring AF encountered a scheme launched roughly four months later, with 18.2% estimated take-up and 28 days of average processing after application. Each figure measures a different stage, but the institutional finding is consistent: households outside the strongest administrative records faced additional steps and a later route to the same £400 support.

Emergency programmes should finance and open their assisted channel alongside automatic payment. Essential identity and duplicate-payment checks should come with a rapid correction route; income assessment can follow payment where lawful recovery is workable. Winter Fuel Payment demonstrates that separation in design, with broad receipt now recorded and final recovery still to be evaluated. The substantive policy priority is to make existing registry coverage a delivery advantage without allowing absence from that registry to postpone access to emergency protection.

Statements

Funding. This work received institutional support from the Academy of Public Policy and Economics (APPE).

Competing interests. The authors are affiliated with APPE, which operates this journal. No external competing interests are declared.

References

Bennett, H., Currie, M., & Podoletz, L. (2026). Universal Credit: Administrative burdens of automated welfare. *Journal of Social Policy*, *55*(1), 24–42. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279424000175

Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. (2025a). *Domestic energy affordability support schemes: Impact and economic evaluation* (RAF002/2425). https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/69257f399fd433badebc3102/domestic-energy-affordability-support-impact-economic-evaluation.pdf

Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. (2025b). *Interim evaluation of domestic energy affordability support schemes in Great Britain* (DESNZ Report Number 130/2223). https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6808eb534dd7e0f8897a624f/domestic-energy-affordability-evaluation-interim-gb-report.pdf

Department for Work and Pensions. (2025, August 22). *Equality analysis for Winter Fuel Payments 2025*. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/equality-analysis-for-winter-fuel-payments-2025/equality-analysis-for-winter-fuel-payments-2025

Department for Work and Pensions. (2026, September 15). *Winter Fuel Payment statistics for winter 2025 to 2026*. https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/winter-fuel-payment-statistics-for-winter-2025-to-2026/winter-fuel-payment-statistics-for-winter-2025-to-2026

Finance Act 2026, c. 11, § 57 & sch. 10 (UK). https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2026/11/pdfs/ukpga_20260011_en.pdf.

Finkelstein, A., & Notowidigdo, M. J. (2019). Take-up and targeting: Experimental evidence from SNAP. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *134*(3), 1505–1556. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz013

GOV.UK. (n.d.). *Winter Fuel Payment: If your income is over £35,000*. Retrieved September 20, 2026, from https://www.gov.uk/winter-fuel-payment/if-your-income-is-over-35000

Herd, P., Hoynes, H., Michener, J., & Moynihan, D. (2023). Introduction: Administrative burden as a mechanism of inequality in policy implementation. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, *9*(5), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2023.9.5.01

National Audit Office. (2024). *Energy bills support: An update*. https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/energy-bills-support-an-update.pdf

The Social Fund Winter Fuel Payment Regulations 2025, SI 2025/969 (UK). https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2025/969/pdfs/uksi_20250969_en.pdf.