



APPG on Access to Justice

10 June 2026
House of Commons

Doing Data Justice

Minutes

Introduction:

Better data has the potential to transform how governments, businesses, and communities deliver services at scale. When systems can securely share information, government becomes more efficient, duplicate services are reduced, and costs fall.

Equally important, interoperable data enables joined up, citizen-centric digital services in health, in property, and increasingly in justice. It also underpins evidence-based policymaking by making data accessible and usable across departments for better decision making.

The APPG on Access to Justice hosted an expert panel event on 10 June 2026 to explore how data is being utilised to expand access to justice and progress being made in cross-departmental policy development.

Speakers:

Lord James Timpson, Minister of State for Prisons, Probation and Reducing Reoffending

Lord James Timpson is the Minister for Prisons, Parole and Reducing Reoffending. As part of his role, the Minister has responsibility for Cross-cutting Artificial Intelligence, Digital, Data and transformation. Before entering government, he served as Chief Executive of Timpson Group, where he championed employment of people with criminal records through the company's Upside Down Management model. He is a longstanding advocate for rehabilitation and a justice system that addresses the root causes of offending. He also founded the Employment Advisory Board Network, which creates connection between prisons and employers to improve employment opportunities for ex-offenders.

Dr Nisha de Silva, Programme Director, Data First & BOLD (Better Outcomes through Linked Data)

Nisha has a PhD in Operational Research from Lancaster University (UK) and has worked across a number of sectors including the public sector, private sector, academia, and international organisations, prior to joining the UK Civil Service. She was part of the founding team of the Global Disaster Information Network established under a United Nations resolution, a global network of specialist resource that is mobilised when disasters occur around the world. She currently leads the Cross Government Division of Justice Digital and Data at the Ministry of Justice. She is also a Trustee of Amnesty International UK (Charitable Trust).

Nisha has an interest in the use of technology in social policy and has focused her recent efforts in central government to improve public services for the most vulnerable in society. Prior to taking responsibility for Data First and the BOLD programme, she led a variety of units at the Home Office and Cabinet Office.

Katy Savage, Deputy Chief Executive, Revolving Doors

Katy is Deputy Chief Exec at Revolving Doors. She led Preventing the Revolving Door, a groundbreaking report delivered in partnership with Newton, putting numbers and costs to the revolving door cohort for the first time. While at Nacro she managed the Offender Health Collaborative, a consortium of third sector and academic partners, supporting NHS England in the early roll out of liaison and diversion services. She began her career in international development.

Discussion:

Sarah Russell MP:

Sarah Russell MP, Chair of the APPG on Access to Justice opened the meeting and thanked everyone for attending the expert panel.

As Chair of the panel, she introduced the panellists: Lord Timpson, Minister of State for Prisons, Probation and Reducing Reoffending, noting his longstanding work for the good of society and particularly in reducing reoffending through the Timpson Group; Dr Nisha De Silva, Programme Director of Data First and BOLD, who holds a PhD from the University of Lancaster and has worked as part of the Global Disaster Information Network; and Katy Savage, Deputy Chief Executive of Revolving Doors, who led the 'Preventing the Revolving Door' project.

Sarah invited Nisha to begin.

Dr Nisha De Silva:

Nisha began by outlining that she currently sits within the Ministry of Justice and has overseen two cross-government programmes that try to harness the power of data linking to do data justice: Data First and BOLD (Better Outcomes through Linked Data).

On why data-linking matters, Nisha explained that there is clear feedback from service users about the frustration of giving the same data repeatedly across services and departments. Public

engagement carried out before the programme began showed that people, particularly those with complex needs and chaotic lives, would find it easier if they only had to give their data once, and that they did not want to be stigmatised, for example by having a criminal record influence a benefits assessment.

Nisha added that staff delivering services also raised concerns, describing the amount of time spent contacting police, prisons and health services to build up a picture of an offender on probation. She explained there is therefore immense potential in linking data to reduce frustration for both service users and those delivering services.

Nisha also noted the challenge of getting an overview of the whole system when a new government comes in, given that justice spans the Ministry of Justice, the Home Office, police, education, employment and health. She explained that the absence of ID cards in the UK makes it difficult to track the same individual across systems, but that this challenge has been overcome through a technology called 'Splink'.

Nisha described the Data First programme, which links data across the Department for Education, Justice and Police National Computer data, and releases it to the public domain so that researchers can access it to improve the evidence base for policy.

Using a case study of a fictional individual, 'John', Nisha illustrated how linked data can show a person's journey from being taken into care as a child, through school (including suspensions), into the criminal justice system via the Crown Court and prison, onto probation, and into later life difficulties such as debt and housing problems. She explained this shows how interventions could take place at any stage.

Nisha presented recent analysis showing that 65% of children who have been cautioned or sentenced had been suspended from school, rising to 87% for those who had committed knife crime and 73% for those with social behaviour issues. She noted that almost three-quarters of those in young offender institutions had been persistently absent from school.

Nisha also highlighted that while 10% of all pupils were classified as 'Children in Need', this rises to 38% of those cautioned or sentenced, 63% of those who had committed knife offences, and 51% of those involved in violence against women and girls. She highlighted that these figures point to a need to focus investment on early intervention, adding that 80% of prolific offenders committed their first offence as a child, and 50% of crimes are committed by prolific offenders.

Looking at those aged 18 in 2019, Nisha explained that 70% of the most prolific young offenders had their first victim offence between the ages of 14 and 16, and that prolific young offenders are substantially overrepresented in the most deprived 10% of neighbourhoods.

Turning to the BOLD programme, Nisha described it as front-line focused, covering operational decision-making as well as research, with projects spanning 16 organisations and 22 big data assets across areas including justice, health, prevention, substance abuse and homelessness. She gave two examples:

- (i) a case information dashboard developed for the North Essex probation unit, which brings together prison, probation and police data and alerts staff if someone has been arrested in the last 24 hours, which around 70% of probation officers said had freed up time for case supervision and improved their confidence; and
- (ii) a project, supported by a Labour manifesto commitment, to use AI to estimate the number of children affected by parental imprisonment, a hidden population, working with local police and authorities to provide the right support.

On the future, Nisha argued that government investment should be driven by shared outcomes rather than the siloed approach where justice and health each engage separately with the Treasury. She noted the need for legislation to address the ongoing legal uncertainty (and clear guidance for implementation), as some Government lawyers advise that data-sharing is permitted and others advise against it. She explained that interoperability must be a key pillar of technology transformation across government, that public engagement on AI tools is essential, with charities, NGOs and research and social groups involved, and that with limited resources, linked data shows the case for focusing on early intervention and prevention.

Lord Timpson:

Lord Timpson began by noting that, coming into the role from business, he had been struck by how often the words ‘data’ and ‘problem’ are used together, describing this as a daily occurrence. He said that in business he had run an operation less complex than the justice system where information was joined-up, without the barriers he now sees to accessing data.

Lord Timpson illustrated this with the example of releases in error, explaining that these happen not because staff are not working hard, but because the information they need is not joined up, and that AI and other data tools could make the necessary decisions much easier for staff. He explained that within prisons and probation the data quality must be excellent to free up time for the face-to-face human relationships that help people turn their lives around. He also noted that whilst data is vital, it is a tool that needs to improve to deliver better public services.

Lord Timpson gave a further example concerning access to the Police National Computer (PNC), noting that some probation teams have access and others do not, and that having access makes it much easier to assess an offender's risk level. He described the current set-up as patchy, and that the next step is to consider how data can be used more effectively and quickly through AI, referencing the AI Fellows initiative at the Cabinet Office and a team within his department working to bring data together in a more usable format.

Lord Timpson said he had also noticed wide inconsistencies in performance between similar units, such as Category C prisons and probation teams. He explained that bringing data together can help build front-line confidence in that data, since those performing well tend to trust the data while those performing less well tend to criticise it.

Lord Timpson described his ambition for an end-to-end system across the justice system, from arrest through court, prison, probation and DWP, that talks to itself as one system. He linked this to the finding that people who have somewhere to live when they leave prison are far less likely to reoffend, noting that 15% of people leave prison without settled accommodation, often not because places do not exist but because systems and data are not joined up enough to match people to the right place at the right time. Lord Timpson highlighted this should be seen as a huge opportunity rather than a friction point. He concluded by noting how pleased he was with the work of the BOLD team and by recognising the importance of the discussion taking place.

Katy Savage:

Katy opened by stating that it is important to remember that when we are discussing data, we are talking about people. She introduced Revolving Doors as a national charity that exists to change the system for a specific group of people in the criminal justice system who are not currently seen as a distinct group within the justice system or the wider public sector. She explained this group is known by various names, including Revolving Door cohort, the short-sentence cohort, or frequent flyers, and that they are highly relevant to the presumption against short sentences, which Revolving Doors supports, provided the right community support is in place.

Katy described the Revolving Door cohort as people caught in cycles of repeat offending and crisis driven by unmet health and social needs, including homelessness, addiction, mental health problems and domestic violence, often rooted in childhood poverty, trauma and structural disadvantage. She outlined that Revolving Doors works with 80 to 90 people a year with recent or current lived experience of this cycle, and that her presentation would cover an opportunity to use data to identify this cohort and build a case for prevention, followed by the human perspective on the opportunities and fears around data sharing, concluding with the case for lived experience in data governance.

Katy explained that last year's work with Newton and Xantura, a data and AI company, allowed Revolving Doors, for the first time, to put robust numbers and costs to its cohort. She said that despite 30 years of insight into the cohort's childhoods, what draws them into the cycle, what keeps them trapped and how the system fails them, the cohort is not one the system can easily identify, as there is no single demographic characteristic, and it is not the whole reoffending cohort or the whole short sentence cohort. As a result, the system does not view them as a cohort and cannot respond, despite this group having multiple touch points with services and often failing to engage.

Katy highlighted that the solution was to work with Newton on a research project starting from qualitative data, in-depth case studies with a sample of members. She emphasised that when building a case for policy change, qualitative insight is often what drives change and what people remember. Alongside the research, a high-level cross-government advisory group was convened with representatives from MoJ, HMPPS, DfE and HMCLG.

Katy described producing user journeys, similar to the case study set out by Nisha, going back to members' earliest memories of school and first interactions with the police, through to how they exited the system in recovery. When asked whether they already knew this information, the advisory group responded that they knew bits relating to their part of the system but had never seen it presented holistically. Katy said this showed that high-quality insight can help address the policy gap.

Katy explained that from 20 in-depth journeys, Revolving Doors defined characteristics and patterns, which were passed to Xantura, who had access to a county-wide linked dataset covering police information, adult social care, children's services, youth justice, and housing and homelessness data, though crucially not health data, which she argued is often a sticking point for government.

Katy noted the dataset combined structured and unstructured information, the latter including case notes, which matter because councils often do not meet service thresholds and many in the cohort have undiagnosed health issues, particularly neurodiversity, that show up in case notes rather than structured data. She explained that this work demonstrated that with the right data governance, it is possible to move past fragmentation in the system, and that technology is a limiting factor that can be overcome. The work enabled Revolving Doors to find cases matching the patterns seen in qualitative data and to build a national model with robust numbers and costs.

As a result, Katy said Revolving Doors can say with confidence that its cohort is a small group within the wider reoffending cohort, at low risk of serious further reoffending but extremely high risk of reoffending generally, making it a costly group for the system. She gave figures of 30,000 to 50,000 people in England, driving £5.2 billion in costs from reoffending alone and accounting for 23% of all reoffending costs. She noted that this evidence has been used across government, including by HMPPS officials, to identify cohorts and challenge the assumption that resources should follow only the riskiest offenders, and highlighted that a 1% improvement in reoffending for this group would equate to £65 million in savings a year.

Katy explained there has also been impact on the ground, with Greater Manchester Combined Authority, part of the advisory group, independently identifying this as a priority and separately commissioning Newton to build a business case for a whole-system, multi-agency approach to diversion across justice and health. Revolving Doors has been working with Greater Manchester for the last year to co-produce this with experienced members. In the second part of her presentation, Katy focused on the first two recommendations of the report: using public sector data to target cohorts and individuals to identify and address their needs, and re-investing data and savings in the relational work that only humans can do.

Turning to the experience perspective, Katy agreed with Nisha that people are generally supportive of data sharing and want services joined up earlier, with Revolving Doors members commenting that it should not have been so obvious where their life was heading and asking why nobody stepped in. Katy explained that once in the system, people do not want to keep retelling their story, which at best is exhausting and at worst re-traumatising.

However, Katy highlighted that there is well-founded mistrust of how data is collected, used and retained. On collection, she argued that data should be collected proportionately and only where needed, but that complex policy questions can lead to over-collection, turning support workers into data gatherers and changing the relationship with the people they support. She cited the first iteration of Changing Futures, the government's national multi-disadvantage programme, which had trauma-informed principles but data collection that was not trauma-informed, affecting how support workers engage with people, an issue being addressed in the next iteration of the programme.

On how data is used, Katy described that Revolving Doors members' impression is that when data is shared, it tends to be negative information, while information that could help is often the part not shared. She noted there is a well-founded fear that disclosing information, for example about addiction, will lead to recall rather than support, and concern about implications for access to children if shared with social services. On pre-sentence reports, she said members report these are often inaccurate, focusing on offending rather than context or positive developments.

Katy explained this all sits alongside the issue of human bias in how data is framed, with the risk of that bias being amplified by AI, and that many of those surveyed believe “only the bad stuff gets shared”. She suggested that stigma around certain offences and behaviours, particularly drug use, can persist regardless of how long someone has been in recovery, and that fear of this stigma being attached prevents people seeking help.

Katy gave the example of a Revolving Doors member who tragically died of cancer earlier this year, who had delayed seeking help and was afraid to speak to her doctor because of the implications for her child. When health workers visited and noted weight loss and the smell of bleach in the house, they assumed she had relapsed based on her drug use history in the data, rather than recognising that she was gravely ill. Katy reiterated that when we talk about data, we are talking about people. She explained that fear of data sharing drives behaviour, and that it is not an emotional overreaction but a rational response to a system in which negative information triggers punitive sanctions rather than timely support.

Katy argued that the solution is to engage with data subjects and bring people with lived experience into data governance to guide decisions about what is shared, with whom and for how long, as only this can build trust that data will be recorded accurately, shared responsibly and used to respond to vulnerability rather than entrench it. She stated Revolving Doors supports a recommendation for a data advisory group, but that must include a mechanism to bring people with lived experience into that space meaningfully and supportively, acknowledging that this is easier said than done but that Revolving Doors has solutions for how to do it. Katy pointed to Changing Futures' systems maturity framework for local authorities as a positive step in this direction.

In conclusion, Katy highlighted that technology is rarely the limiting factor; the limiting factors are government and public trust, and lived experience in data governance is vital to transforming data from a system of surveillance and sanction into a tool of prevention. She said getting this right would save time and money, make communities safer, and help people live happier, healthier lives, but we must remember that when we talk about data, we are talking about people.

Sarah Russell MP:

Sarah thanked the speakers for their contributions and opened the floor for questions.

Questions

Question 1:

A representative from Cranstoun, which runs a pre-arrest diversion scheme, asked Katy and Lord Timpson why government is not focusing on pre-arrest diversion rather than post-arrest solutions, noting that Cranstoun's own data shows a re-offending equivalent rate of 4.8%, compared with around 22% for those serving under 12 months in prison, suggesting that leaning into this data could save money, reduce recidivism and support people who need help.

Question 2:

A representative from Switchback said they shared the panel's desire to use data more effectively, and asked Lord Timpson what data would convince the department that the current approach to recall is not working, given that it is driving up prison numbers and represents a step back for people trying to turn their lives around, when most recalls are for non-compliance rather than a new offence. They noted that Switchback convenes the Recall Reform Coalition with Revolving Doors and would like to see higher thresholds and a review of the decision-making framework in line with the independent sentencing review, and asked for the Minister's view.

Lord Timpson:

Lord Timpson said he completely agreed with the first question, that the goal should be to divert people away from the criminal justice system in the first place, which he said is why he came into the role. He referenced the Women's Justice Board and his personal view that most women should not be in prison, and that they should be diverted long before reaching a police cell. He praised the Intended Supervision Court model and the wraparound support such models provide, while stressing the need for a prison and probation system that also works well.

Lord Timpson explained that catching people before they fall the first time has knock-on benefits for their children, noting that nearly 200,000 children are affected by parental imprisonment, and that this is a cross-government issue, but he remains focused on diverting people away from the Criminal Justice system. He referenced the Women's Diversion Fund he helped to set up, noting his personal focus on women in the justice system arising from his own life experiences.

On recall, Lord Timpson highlighted that in 1990 fewer than 100 people were recalled, compared with 10,000 to 11,000 now, while the recall test and definition have not changed in that period. He noted the system has been in crisis for years, with people leaving prison homeless, addicted, without benefits or jobs, making a revolving door unsurprising, and that the question went somewhat beyond data, though the data clearly shows numbers and serious offences have both risen sharply, and that he sees these as connected. Lord Timpson concluded by reiterating his focus is on ensuring people are better prepared not to return to prison when they leave.

Katy Savage:

Katy responded by noting Revolving Doors is fully supportive of pre-arrest diversion and is a proud member of the Recall Coalition. On pre-arrest diversion, she said one of the barriers relates to data, specifically around how such diversion is viewed in terms of outcomes for the community, and that if this were resolved there would be greater incentive for police to use it.

Question 3:

A representative from the Youth Justice Board welcomed the discussion and the panel's focus on avoiding stigma and using data to support people's needs proactively, including the kind of diagrams described that involve people in understanding their own data, and supported the point on diversion as a way of keeping children out of the justice system and improving long-term outcomes. They asked about the quality of data, the barriers around data quality, and where there are particular strengths and weaknesses.

Question 4:

A representative from ADR UK, which funds the Data First programme and works with government and academic researchers across all four UK nations to prepare administrative data for secure justice research environments, said that they had observed that the most heart-wrenching stories come out of the data Nisha had described. They also observed, as a member of the public, that the political narrative makes it easier to argue for investment in education and health than in prevention, probation and related services, and asked Lord Timpson how campaigners and practitioners can help build the evidence base that proves investment in data would be effective.

Lord Timpson:

On data quality, Lord Timpson argued people perceive data as high quality when it is trusted and answers the questions being asked. Drawing on his business background, he noted that much of the data initially presented to him is siloed, and he is encouraging quality teams to pull data together to tell a story that supports the best action plan. He outlined his advocacy for AI in helping

to pull complex data together, describing data quality overall as a mixed bag that becomes considerably stronger when linked with other data sources.

On the case for investment, Lord Timpson said that while he works within the budget he is given, a strong case can be made for where money is spent well. He cited a 45% increase in the probation budget, achieved by making the argument about the heavy lifting probation does within the justice system, and said that without sorting out probation, prisons cannot be sorted out either. He also referenced setting up advisory boards five years ago, when 14% of people leaving prison were in a job after six months, a figure that has since risen to 38%, saying that evidence of positive results secured the investment. Lord Timpson summarised that, as in business, investment cannot be justified without evidence, particularly when competing against other departments and causes for funding, and that evidence is essential to demonstrate value for taxpayers.

Dr Nisha De Silva:

Nisha highlighted admin data is closely linked to data quality issues, and that significant effort is underway behind the scenes, including a whole programme focused on justice data quality. She suggested that as data linking work progresses, attention naturally turns to data quality, for example where an individual's details differ slightly between datasets, and that the process of linking systems naturally highlights inconsistencies which in turn drives improvements in data quality.

Katy Savage:

Katy made two points on data quality. First, she referred back to pre-sentence reports, which have huge consequences for people, saying the quality of these is of serious concern, with members giving examples where reports could be describing an entirely different person, not just a matter of framing.

Second, on AI, she stated that there are significant opportunities, but noted that in the work with Xantura, case notes were originally written by humans, whereas case notes are now increasingly written by AI. Katy noted this requires rethinking how data is framed, noting that the systems used talk about risk factors but are not trained to recognise resilience, focusing on risk rather than unmet need. She said Revolving Doors is now looking at using AI both to process case notes and to generate summaries that inform policy decisions, and that there is a great deal to unpack in this shift.

Sarah Russell MP:

Sarah Russell MP reflected on her nine years as a Manchester City Councillor, saying she would always ask for financial information alongside other reports, including departmental budgets,

spending rates across the year, and whether spending matched budget allocations, noting that cuts in one area were sometimes reallocated elsewhere without this being visible in a joined-up way. She described how financial information and outcomes information often sit separately, and that data without cost information can be unclear.

Lord Timpson:

Adding to Sarah's point, Lord Timpson said that when he started the role, performance data was presented to him but not in a league table format, which he was used to from business. He said it took some convincing to get performance data presented in league table order, and that once this happened, performance increased significantly.

Question 5:

A representative from Victim Support asked how an even playing field can be created, noting that while their organisation is large enough to invest in improving its data capabilities, this creates an unfair market for smaller, innovative organisations that lack the resources to do the same. They said the programme has a significant role to play in setting universal standards, even if this puts larger organisations at a relative disadvantage, because it would be better for victims overall.

They also raised the importance of avoiding being deterministic, saying that while rich data can show people's stories and journeys, care must be taken not to place the people into categories that constrain rather than free, describing this as a challenge for everyone in the field.

Question 6:

The founder of the Growth app, developed with people in prison and informed by their own experience of leaving prison and working in addiction recovery support, agreed with Revolving Doors on the mistrust around data sharing, including concerns about how data might be used given experiences of being monitored, but also recognised that data has often not moved between systems due to questions of server ownership and permissions. They asked Lord Timpson about vetting, noting that many people with lived experience want to make a difference but face repeated barriers that keep them out of relevant rooms, and asked, given the large number of charities, including many smaller ones, how they could work more closely together using the data they have collected.

Lord Timpson:

Lord Timpson responded using the example of disclosure to an employer, saying that when visiting prisons he asks people why they are there and what they have done, because he wants to see their

reaction and hear it honestly from them, as he wants honesty if they are to work with him. He noted disclosure is a big barrier for some people and comes back to trust, and that on vetting, he comes from a position where he has not had second chances, believing his department is far richer for the experiences of those it employs.

Lord Timpson highlighted that there are people in the House of Lords who have been to prison and whose experience of the vetting process makes their decision-making more powerful. He agreed vetting can be a barrier, but it is his job to ensure it is fair, as people need fair treatment. Lord Timpson continued, noting that within the Timpson business, people are encouraged to be open about their backgrounds, which he described as giving the business something of a superpower, as those who come through the justice system and join at the right time in their lives are often among the most loyal, hard-working, honest and successful colleagues.

Dr Nisha De Silva:

Adding to Lord Timpson's point on vetting, Nisha said the Data First and BOLD programmes have worked with charities, for example as part of work done with victims, and that when looking at the system as a whole there are no real boundaries between public services and charities. She explained investment now extends across government and into local government, and that charities are very much part of the services offered, so there is no significant distinction drawn between charity and statutory partners, particularly in the direction BOLD is heading.

Katy Savage:

Katy stated Revolving Doors fully agrees with the point about avoiding being deterministic, noting that in the data from their prevention report, all of the men interviewed had been in contact with police and excluded from school by secondary school age, suggesting a visible trajectory. She returned to the question of what data should be used for, asking whether it should be used to bring supportive services around someone or to label them.

Question 7:

An attendee from Legal Aid Practitioners Group (LAPG) asked about the future of the Data First and BOLD programmes, noting that the discussion had focused heavily on the criminal justice system (which was unsurprising given Lord Timpson and Katy's work), but asked whether the panel could expand on the civil justice system, referencing Katy's earlier point about needing a range of datasets, including housing and education, and asked about the potential to open up further datasets and how they could be used in policy work.

Dr Nisha De Silva:

Nisha highlighted that, with support from ADR UK, some civil justice data has already been released into the public domain, with further areas under discussion, including some that have faced challenges in the past. She noted this is a priority for the current financial year for Data First, with a concerted effort to release more data, and that where it can be linked properly, for example to the Census, Cafcass and other datasets, this would enrich understanding of the civil, family and legal aid space.

Nisha explained the programme is not withholding information, but wants to ensure data quality is properly addressed before joining systems, and to continually improve the data already in the public domain. She outlined that administrative data, collected on the front line, is prone to quality issues and misrepresentation, for example where the person entering data interprets someone's behaviour in a particular way, introducing bias, and that significant work happens behind the scenes alongside what is already supported by ADR UK in the public domain.

Katy Savage:

Katy picked up on this point, saying there needs to be a focus on training around what trauma-informed data collection actually means in practice, particularly in relation to how powerful notions within data are framed. She referred to a colleague, a former support worker, who recalled incident reports about clients that sounded terrible in the heat of the moment, but which, once the person's knowledge of the context was removed, became simply stark, evasive incident reports. Katy said this illustrates the need for real training in trauma-informed data collection.

Close

Sarah Russell MP:

Sarah thanked the speakers for their time and the audience for attending, noting that a number of new faces were present, which she welcomed. She encouraged attendees to follow the panel's work and to attend future meetings.