Awaab's Law

Phase 2 reflection checklist

for social landlords

10 questions to support reflection and discussion

Purpose and limitations

This illustrative, light-touch checklist does not determine, confirm or indicate compliance in any way. Completing it does not mean an organisation is compliant or ready. It is a supportive tool to prompt reflection and discussion, not an audit, assessment or readiness certificate.

Compliance remains the responsibility of each organisation. Each organisation must assess its own position against the relevant legislation, guidance, policies and internal processes.

A practical 5-minute conversation starter for social landlords in England preparing for Phase 2. Consider which areas of data, workflow, ownership and evidence you may want to review.

10 questions • Optional scoring • 5 minutes • Action plan included

Where could you review?

Use your answers to start a discussion about your processes.

Score each area:

0 = No

1 = Partly

2 = Yes

24h

Emergency hazard: investigate and make safe

10

Working days to investigate a potential significant hazard

3

Working days for the written summary after investigation

5

Working days for relevant safety work after investigation

Areas to consider: Day Zero, vulnerability, triage, case ownership, statutory clocks, written summaries, evidence, contractor hand-offs, management oversight and the resident journey.

The questions are illustrative and are not an exhaustive statement of legal duties. Refer to the relevant legislation and current guidance when assessing your organisation's position.

Part 1: Reflect on your processes

Choose the answer that best reflects what happens **consistently in practice**, not what the policy says should happen.

0	1	2
No	**Partly**	**Yes**
Not reliably in place	Exists, but gaps remain	Consistent and evidenced

1 Can you identify "Day Zero" for every hazard report?

Can you show the exact date/time your organisation first became aware of a potential hazard - regardless of whether it came through repairs, housing, support staff, a contractor, a complaint or another route?

Evidence to look for: timestamp, source of report, issue description, escalation route and first owner.

0 No 1 Partly 2 Yes

2 Is household vulnerability visible at the point of triage?

Can the person assessing the report quickly see relevant household circumstances that could affect risk, prioritisation or communication needs?

Evidence to look for: current vulnerability fields, accessibility needs, household composition, health context and clear update ownership.

0 No 1 Partly 2 Yes

3 Do staff follow a structured triage process?

Are frontline teams prompted to capture the right information and escalate appropriately, while still allowing trained staff to exercise professional judgement?

Evidence to look for: standard triage questions, hazard categories, escalation criteria, competency/training and recorded decision rationale.

0 No 1 Partly 2 Yes

4 Does one person or team own the case end to end?

When a case passes from contact centre to inspection, repairs, contractor and follow-up, is there clear responsibility for making sure the whole journey reaches a safe and evidenced conclusion?

Evidence to look for: named owner, hand-off rules, task ownership, escalation path and clear closure criteria.

0 No 1 Partly 2 Yes

5 Are statutory clocks visible before they are missed?

Can staff and managers see the investigation, written-summary, make-safe and follow-on-work deadlines for each relevant case without manually calculating dates?

Evidence to look for: due dates, automated alerts, exception lists, overdue flags and management escalation.

0 No 1 Partly 2 Yes

Why these five matter: MHCLG's Phase 1 Test and Learn research found inconsistent vulnerability handling, fragmented case management and systems/workflows still being adapted to support compliance.

Part 2: Continue your reflection

Now test whether your evidence, communications and management oversight can stand up when a case crosses multiple teams.

6 Can the written summary be produced from the case record?

After an investigation, can the team quickly generate a clear written summary of findings, next steps and relevant timescales using information already captured in the case?

Evidence to look for: investigation findings, action plan, tenant-ready template, accessibility requirements and proof of issue/send date.

0 No | 1 Partly | 2 Yes

7 Is the complete evidence trail held with the case?

Can another member of staff reconstruct what happened without searching emails, separate drives, contractor portals and personal notes?

Evidence to look for: photos, inspections, contractor reports, communications, decisions, access attempts, safety actions, remedial works and completion evidence.

0 No | 1 Partly | 2 Yes

8 Can information from contractors and other teams enter the same controlled process?

If a contractor, neighbourhood officer, support worker or complaints team becomes aware of a potential hazard, is there a reliable route to capture and escalate it without delay?

Evidence to look for: contractor obligations, shared reporting route, cross-team escalation, acknowledgement and audit trail.

0 No | 1 Partly | 2 Yes

9 Can managers see risk and exceptions across the whole caseload?

Can leaders immediately identify cases approaching deadlines, overdue actions, repeat hazards, contractor bottlenecks or cases where alternative accommodation may be needed?

Evidence to look for: dashboards, exception reports, ageing views, trend analysis, repeat-case reporting and senior escalation.

0 No | 1 Partly | 2 Yes

10 Have you tested the process from the resident's perspective?

Have you walked a realistic case from first report to closure to find where residents repeat their story, communication breaks down, ownership becomes unclear or evidence is lost?

Evidence to look for: scenario testing, resident feedback, repeat-contact analysis, communication checkpoints and improvement actions.

0 No | 1 Partly | 2 Yes

Your discussion score ____ / 20

Any score is only a way to organise this discussion. It does not determine, confirm or indicate compliance or readiness. Each organisation remains responsible for assessing its own position against the relevant legislation, guidance, policies and internal processes.

Part 3: Using your answers

Use this as a conversation starter across housing, repairs, compliance, customer services, support and contractor management.

Use the score as a prompt

Adding your answers can help structure a conversation. The total is not a measure, rating or indication of compliance or readiness. There are no pass marks or readiness categories.

Review individual answers

Start with areas marked No or Partly. Ask colleagues how the process works in practice, what evidence is available and which questions need further review. A Yes answer is not assurance of compliance.

Agree proportionate next steps

Choose areas for discussion, identify who should be involved and record practical follow-up actions. Use the action plan to support your own review alongside relevant legislation, guidance, policies and internal processes.

Phase 2 quick reference

30 Nov
Phase 2 starts
Guidance applies to social landlords in England.

24h
Emergency hazard
Investigation and relevant safety work completed within 24 hours of awareness.

10 working days
Investigate potential significant hazards.

3 working days
Provide written summary after investigation concludes.

5 working days
Relevant safety work after investigation; also begin/take steps to begin supplementary preventative works.

12 weeks
Latest physical start
If supplementary work cannot begin within 5 working days, it must begin as soon as reasonably practicable and within 12 weeks.

Remember: completing this checklist or achieving any score does not mean an organisation is compliant or ready. It is an illustrative discussion tool, not an audit, assessment or certificate.

Phase 2 hazards include: excess cold, excess heat, falls, structural collapse/falling elements, fire, explosions, electrical hazards, domestic hygiene/pests/refuse, food safety, and personal hygiene/sanitation/drainage. Significant damp and mould remains in scope; emergency hazards continue across almost all HHSRS hazards other than overcrowding.

Part 4: Turn your reflections into an action plan

Choose the three gaps most likely to create delay, unclear ownership or weak evidence in a live case.

Gap / risk identified	Action you will take	Owner / target date

Three things worth testing with a real case

1. Follow one recent hazard report from first contact to closure
Can you see one continuous chronology, including Day Zero, triage, household context, investigation, safety work, tenant communications, contractor actions and closure evidence?

2. Ask a manager to find the cases most at risk right now
Can they identify approaching deadlines, overdue actions and stalled hand-offs in minutes - without asking several teams to build a spreadsheet?

3. Ask a colleague who did not work the case to explain what happened
If they cannot reconstruct the story from the record alone, your evidence and communication trail may still be too fragmented.

What government research found in Phase 1: variable responsiveness, fragmented case handling, inconsistent written summaries, incomplete vulnerability data and landlords increasingly moving toward end-to-end case management to improve ownership and follow-through.

Supported housing / temporary accommodation under licence: the October 2026 proposal to extend Awaab's Law to licences is a separate consultation and is not the same as the Phase 2 social-housing duties covered by this checklist.

Source-led checklist: MHCLG, Awaab's Law Phase 2: Guidance for social housing landlords; Phase 2 hazards guidance; Awaab's Law Regulations as they apply from 30 November 2026; and Phase 1 Test and Learn research. Guidance is non-statutory; landlords should refer to the Regulations themselves.

Need to review your workflow?
CDPSoft can help you map data, workflow, evidence and reporting around your existing operational process - without assuming you need to replace the systems

www.cdpsoft.com