

# Consultation report: MPs' pay for 2026-29

June 2026



## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Background to the consultation.....	3
What we proposed.....	5
Responses to the consultation.....	6
Our decisions.....	8

## Consultation report: MPs' pay for 2026-29

### Introduction

1. One of IPSA's key duties is to set MPs' pay independent of both Parliament and government. After a General Election, IPSA is required to review its determination on MPs' pay.
2. Between 6 and 31 October 2025, [IPSA consulted on the mechanism for setting MPs' pay for the remainder of the current Parliament](#) (assumed to be 2026 to 2029). This report summarises the responses we received and the decisions that were made as a result.
3. Prior to the formal consultation, we engaged in new stakeholder and public engagement activity to ensure we heard different views on this topic, which is sensitive and rightly a focal point of public debate. This engagement directly informed our proposals on how MPs' pay should be handled for this Parliament.
4. We are grateful for those who took the time to share their views with us during this engagement as well as those who responded formally to the consultation. We do not take our responsibility for setting MPs' pay lightly and aim to make decisions that are fair – for both MPs and taxpayers – and that support a diverse and representative Parliament.

### Background to the consultation

5. IPSA has had responsibility for independently setting MPs' pay since 2011. Following a detailed review of the whole remuneration package for MPs, IPSA concluded in 2015 that it was right to use a transparent, independent benchmark as the mechanism for updating MPs' pay annually and settled on an Office for National Statistics (ONS) Average Weekly Earnings (AWE) series, which measured the annual change in earnings in the public sector.<sup>1</sup>
6. This approach had the benefit of MPs' pay following developments in the rest of the public sector, albeit with a degree of time lag. It provided a transparent, objective basis for periodic adjustments and relative stability for several years. However, the economic uncertainty of the Covid pandemic and the years since has impacted the useability of the data for this purpose and led IPSA to reconsider its approach.

---

<sup>1</sup> The AWE KAC9 series provides the seasonally adjusted, three-month average (mean) of the percentage year-on-year change in average weekly earnings. IPSA used the October figure, published in December, for adjustments to pay taking effect the following April.

7. Following a consultation in 2021, IPSA's determination was updated to provide some 'bounded discretion' to depart from the AWE figure for annual salary adjustments if that was necessary to reach an outcome in line with our remuneration principles – fair to both MPs and taxpayers, having regard to the experience of constituents and MPs' overall remuneration. During the next few years, when deciding whether an adjustment was necessary, IPSA considered information, data and commentary on wage settlements, earnings statistics and trends and the outlook for the UK economy and wider public sector pay policy.
8. Following the General Election in July 2024, as required by legislation, we embarked on a further review of MPs' pay and remuneration including consideration of other pay and economic metrics, domestic and international comparators, non-pay benefits and aspects of the MPs' pension scheme in relation to the wider pensions landscape. As an interim measure, for the salary taking effect in April 2025, IPSA decided to make a one-off adjustment in line with the government's recommended affordability level for public sector pay settlements in 2025-26.
9. The next task was to decide what the mechanism for setting MPs' pay should be from April 2026 to the end of the current Parliament. In this phase of the review, we were keen to expand our direct engagement with the public, and as part of our objective to support trust in democracy, to invite an open, transparent and informed conversation about MPs' pay. We also hoped to address what we perceived as a lack of awareness about what the role of an MP entails as well as the role of IPSA and how pay is set.
10. In 2025 IPSA held its first ever Citizens' Forum on MPs' Pay and Funding. Facilitated independently by New Citizen Project, 23 members of the public who were selected to represent the wider UK population heard evidence from people with a professional interest in the issues, including the media, not-for-profit and advocacy organisations, former MPs and MPs' staff members, and academics. At the end of the forum, participants agreed a statement and recommendations for the IPSA Board on what they should consider when deciding on MPs' pay and funding.
11. As well as hearing directly from citizens, we have also sought views from specialist stakeholders with an interest in pay and funding. Experts from academia, the media, democratic pressure groups and Parliament came together in 2025 to discuss how pay and funding impacts the health of our democracy, how decisions are made in other countries and the opportunities to promote and protect democracy.
12. The Citizens' Forum concluded that the level of MPs' pay was mostly right but that it needed to be grounded in the context of social and economic realities facing ordinary working people. There was clear emphasis placed on benchmarking against comparable roles in the UK and other parliamentarians in similar democracies as well as linking to

national average household incomes as a way of ensuring decisions reflect the experience of the people MPs represent.

13. The outputs from the forum were also clear about the interplay between pay and funding for MPs' parliamentary work, with both necessary to ensure a diverse and effective Parliament where people from all backgrounds can become MPs and are supported appropriately in this demanding job. The Citizens' Forum also set a challenge for IPSA and the wider parliamentary community to design the future of a modern, efficient, transparent and accountable Parliament.
14. In late 2025, we published the [Citizens' Forum report and full set of recommendations, as well as IPSA's response](#).

## What we proposed

15. The main proposal in the consultation was that for the remainder of this Parliament, decisions on MPs' pay should be made annually, taking into account a range of information, data and commentary on pay settlements, earnings statistics and the outlook for the UK economy and wider public sector pay policy. Based on the experience of recent years, we did not believe that binding ourselves to one particular metric was still the right approach, but rather it would be important to retain flexibility to make a decision that best meets our objectives and principles for MP remuneration.
16. Although we did not propose a fixed set of metrics and data to feed into the annual decision, we suggested that this would include economic forecasts, inflation measures, data on the labour market and average earnings, information about pay awards in the public sector, and the pay of similar public sector roles and parliamentarians in other similar democracies.
17. As recommended by the Citizens' Forum, we proposed that this annual decision should include explicit consideration of MPs' pay as compared with average UK earnings and household income as well as domestic and international benchmarks.
18. The consultation also asked for views on the appropriate domestic professions we should consider as a suitable benchmark when setting the level of MPs' pay, although we were conscious that direct comparisons with other professions were difficult and did not intend to make any value judgments about one profession over another.
19. The consultation also asked whether there should be some flexibility in the timing of IPSA's annual decision-making, e.g. to allow for decisions after the start of the relevant financial year with any adjustments to pay backdated to 1 April, to ensure these can be done in full view of relevant, up-to-date data and information.

20. Lastly, we asked respondents to consider whether the proposals in this consultation would have or be likely to have any positive or negative impacts on protected characteristic groups. One of IPSA's objectives is to ensure decisions about MPs' remuneration are fair to all MPs and support a diverse Parliament where people of all backgrounds and circumstances can take up the role.

## Responses to the consultation

21. We received 44 responses in total – 43 responses to the online survey and one response via email. Online respondents were a relatively even spread of MPs (16), MPs' staff members (16) and members of the public (11).

### **Question 1: Do you agree with IPSA's proposal that for the remainder of this Parliament, decisions on MPs' pay will be made annually, taking into account a range of information, data and commentary on pay settlements, earnings statistics and the outlook for the UK economy and wider public sector pay policy?**

22. The vast majority of respondents (84%) agreed with the main proposal of the consultation, while 7% disagreed and 9% were unsure. Some respondents who said 'yes' highlighted the importance of aligning with how pay is decided in other settings including annual pay awards in the public sector. There was one suggestion that MPs' salary should be a multiplier of the national average wage.
23. Meanwhile a small number felt that an annual discussion about MP pay would be unhelpful, preferring one change per parliament or one just in advance of the next General Election. A small number were unsure about the value of considering the UK's economic outlook as part of IPSA's decision-making.
24. Other comments included suggestion of a pay freeze, potentially with the funding going instead to MPs' offices, and a system of pay progression for MPs based on seniority.

### **Question 2: Are there any additional sources of metrics, data or information beyond those mentioned above that IPSA should incorporate in its decision making?**

25. Responses were mixed: 41% of respondents said 'yes' with the rest evenly split between 'no' and 'unsure'.
26. Some of the 19 respondents who provided further comments listed sources of data and information already mentioned in the consultation.
27. Comments covered the importance of using data on senior roles rather than junior or mid-level roles to reflect MPs' level of responsibility and suggested that IPSA should consider differential pay for MPs based on constituency (e.g. to recognise the impact of having to travel from constituencies further away from London).

28. Meanwhile other comments advocated for lower salaries for MPs and/or restriction on outside work and emphasised the importance of reflecting the precarious nature of the role.

**Question 3: What, if any, other professions should IPSA use as a benchmark when setting MPs' pay?**

29. Thirty-three respondents provided comments, with a wide range of suggested professions including parliamentarians in other European countries, senior civil servants, GPs, secondary school headteachers, university lecturers, local authority executive directors, NHS directors, senior army officers, chief constables, judges, senior finance executives, surgeons and lawyers.
30. A few highlighted the disparity between MPs' pay and pay for senior staff in 'quangos', local government and the NHS. On the other hand, one respondent suggested that MPs' pay should instead be benchmarked against pay for care workers, nurses, teachers and retail workers.

**Question 4: Do you agree that there should be some flexibility allowed in the timing of annual decisions, so that the IPSA Board can take account of the full range of relevant data and information?**

31. Most respondents (65%) agreed, while 16% disagreed and 19% were unsure.
32. Of those who responded 'yes', a couple of respondents suggested that even with flexibility there should be a commitment for the pay decision to be made no later than a certain period after the start of the financial year.
33. Of those who said 'no' or 'unsure', some emphasised that MPs deserve certainty about their salary for the upcoming year, especially given they have limited job security. Others noted the importance of having a decision at the same point each year for transparency and to build public confidence. One respondent suggested that allowing flexibility could risk IPSA making decisions in response to public pressure.

**Question 5: What likely or actual impact do you believe proposals in this consultation could have on equality and diversity in relation to MPs, to prospective parliamentary candidates or to any other group of people?**

34. Thirty respondents added comments, out of which five commented only to say there were no impacts or that they were not sure.
35. Several respondents highlighted the importance to the diversity of parliamentary candidates of ensuring pay and other working conditions was commensurate with other senior professionals, and that eroding pay over time would make it more difficult for

people without private wealth to become MPs. Some highlighted the challenges of the role including a loss of privacy, online abuse and security concerns.

36. Respondents called out the need for reasonable adjustments as well as issues around childcare, long hours and parliamentary practices that created a barrier to people from all walks of life becoming MPs.
37. Other comments included that the proposal for flexibility in the timing of decisions could have an undue impact on MPs from diverse backgrounds.
38. A couple of respondents also commented on the consultation process itself, stating that the consultation document and online survey were not accessible in terms of language and format, which could disadvantage people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds from taking part.

## Our decisions

39. Following consideration of the consultation responses, which were overwhelmingly supportive of our proposals, IPSA confirmed that during the remainder of this Parliament decisions about adjustments to MPs' salaries will be made annually, taking into account data on pay settlements, earnings statistics, the outlook for the UK economy and wider public sector pay policy including:
  - Economic forecasts, including those of the Office for Budget Responsibility and Bank of England
  - Inflation measures and information about forecast inflation
  - Earnings data and labour market trends, including official data on average earnings and average household income
  - Employer surveys and pay trends
  - Public sector pay awards, the evidence and recommendations from the eight pay review bodies including the Senior Salaries Review Body and the remit given to them by the government
  - Salaries of parliamentarians in other similar democracies
  - Salaries of other professionals who hold positions of responsibility in the community
40. We have not set out a defined group of comparator professions to be considered at each annual decision point. Understandably, respondents suggested many different comparator professions, and while there was no consensus, there was a common theme of comparison with senior-level (CEO and director) roles in the civil service, NHS, local government and other public sector bodies. We therefore believe that future decisions

should include a range of professions with responsibility in the community as a way of contextualising its annual decision rather than as predetermined benchmarks.

41. Although the consultation proposed flexibility in the timing of IPSA's annual decision-making on the level of MPs' pay, we noted the concerns raised by some respondents and were persuaded that it was right to make these decisions by the beginning of the relevant financial year, i.e. 1 April. This will provide MPs with certainty about their own finances and dispel any suggestion that IPSA is 'picking and choosing' data at a point in time that suits it.
42. This [determination](#), which applies to both the basic salary and the additional salary paid to MPs who act as chairs of select committees and members of the Panel of Chairs, was published on 2 March 2026.
43. At the same time, IPSA announced its decision on the MP salary adjustment for the 2026-27 financial year. From 1 April 2026, both the basic salary for an MP and the additional salary for committee chairs increased by 5%, including a 3.5% cost-of-living element and a 1.5% benchmarking increase. The data, metrics and information considered and rationale for this decision were published in [IPSA's Supporting Democracy report](#).