

How does the cost-per-case or efficiency metric of Palantir's algorithmic decision-making in the NHS compare to the previous manual or legacy system baseline, and who bears the financial risk if the algorithmic errors lead to costly audits or appeals?

July 25, 2026 | SnugLab Research

Executive Summary

The cost-per-case efficiency of Palantir's algorithmic decision-making in the NHS, when compared to legacy systems, is currently unproven and subject to significant dispute, with evidence suggesting operational slowness in some areas. The NHS primarily bears the financial risk for costly audits or appeals arising from algorithmic errors, largely due to the proprietary nature of the software, vendor lock-in, and the lack of a definitive causal link between the platform and reported efficiency gains.

Key Findings

Efficiency Metrics and Performance Comparison

In the NHS context, efficiency metrics primarily refer to administrative processing time, reductions in delayed discharge days, increases in elective surgeries, and improvements in waiting list management [1, 3]. However, direct cost-per-case comparisons between Palantir's algorithmic system and previous manual or legacy baselines are not explicitly provided in the available research [4].

Palantir and NHS England have reported significant operational gains, including over 110,000 additional procedures and a 15% to 35% reduction in delayed discharge days [1, 3, 14, 15]. For example, Chelsea and Westminster NHS Foundation Trust reported a 28% reduction in inpatient waiting lists [12]. However, the NHS has amended its website to admit it cannot draw a definitive causal link between the Federated Data Platform (FDP) implementation and these specific efficiency metrics, with the Office for Statistics Regulation currently reviewing these headline claims [1]. This suggests the reported gains may be correlational shifts attributable to broader NHS recovery efforts or localized staffing changes, rather than proven causal outcomes of the algorithmic intervention [1].

Conversely, leaked internal NHS documents indicate that tasks taking 30 seconds on existing legacy systems can extend to 4 or 10 minutes under Palantir's platform, directly undermining claims of superior operational efficiency [11]. This processing delay suggests significantly slower performance compared to legacy tools for certain operations [11]. Furthermore, adoption of the FDP has been limited, with fewer than a quarter of England's 215 hospital trusts actively using the platform by the end of 2024 [13]. Several health authorities, including Greater Manchester Integrated Care Board and Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, have rejected or opted out of adopting FDP tools, citing that the platform did not exceed their existing local capabilities or would cause them to "lose functionality rather than gain it" [13, 14].

Financial Risk and Liability for Algorithmic Errors

The contractual and operational structure of the FDP largely forces NHS Trusts and Integrated Care Boards (ICBs) to absorb the financial burden of audits, appeals, and downstream care corrections, leaving Palantir with limited liability exposure [3]. Palantir's algorithms often operate as "black boxes," lacking the transparency necessary for thorough public examination and independent auditing [1, 5]. The proprietary nature of the software makes it difficult to audit why specific outputs are produced, complicating the assignment of liability for erroneous decisions [3, 5]. The House of Commons committee has recommended requiring independent audits of workflows and clarifying citizens' rights to appeal algorithmic decisions to ensure accountability [5].

Palantir's historical algorithmic deployments generally demonstrate low error rates in their core data integration functions, with reporting opacity often reflecting standard infrastructure complexity and security requirements [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. However, the typical allocation of financial risk in Palantir's sector deployments structurally passes these burdens downstream to clients through indemnity limitations [2, 7, 8, 9, 23, 24]. This means Palantir's contractual framework, characterized by limited warranties and the exclusion of consequential damages, places the primary financial responsibility for algorithmic system failures and associated appeal costs on its clients [2, 7, 8, 9, 23, 24].

No specific financial caps on Palantir's liability for data breaches or algorithmic errors under the current NHS contract are detailed in the available research [1, 5]. Similarly, there are no specific named instances where the Palantir FDP in the NHS triggered a formal audit or patient appeal directly due to an algorithmic error causing adverse patient outcomes [7, 12, 14]. While data quality issues with discharge-delay records were confirmed by several English NHS trusts, these were characterized as data quality

problems rather than supplier failures or algorithmic errors [16].

Contract Costs and Value for Money

The FDP contract, awarded in 2023, was initially valued at Â£330 million over seven years [1, 5, 8, 9, 14]. However, capital commitments have escalated, with initial estimates rising to Â£360 million, then Â£480 million, and potential whole-life costs exceeding Â£1 billion if fully deployed [6]. This escalating cost is compounded by a separate Â£8 million Department of Health and Social Care contract with KPMG to promote adoption [13].

The UK government has forecasted that the overall FDP program will deliver Â£5 of benefits for every Â£1 spent [1, 10]. However, this forecast is made against a backdrop of unproven efficiency gains, with the NHS admitting it cannot draw a causal link between the FDP and reported outcomes [1]. The lack of specific monetary savings from reduced delayed discharges, combined with the escalating contract costs and the NHS bearing the primary financial risk for unproven value delivery, leaves the NHS financially exposed to algorithmic inefficiencies over the contract term [1, 5, 6, 11].

Implications

The research indicates that the NHS faces significant financial exposure regarding its Federated Data Platform. While Palantir and NHS England report operational improvements, the lack of a proven causal link between the FDP and these gains means the NHS cannot definitively hold Palantir accountable for value delivery. This situation, coupled with the platform's proprietary "black box" nature and the contractual structure that limits Palantir's liability, shifts the financial burden of potential algorithmic errors, audits, and appeals primarily onto NHS Trusts and Integrated Care Boards. The escalating contract costs further amplify this exposure, suggesting that the unproven efficiency gains may be offset by substantial capital commitments and high exit costs associated with vendor lock-in.

Limitations and Caveats

The available research has several limitations. Direct, explicit cost-per-case comparisons between Palantir's FDP and legacy systems are not provided, making a precise quantitative assessment challenging. The empirical validity of reported efficiency gains is currently under review by the Office for Statistics Regulation, and the NHS itself admits to

a lack of proven causation. Furthermore, specific financial caps on Palantir's liability for algorithmic errors under the NHS contract are not detailed in the public findings, and there are no named instances of formal audits or patient appeals directly triggered by algorithmic errors within the FDP. The proprietary nature of Palantir's software also poses a practical barrier to independent algorithmic auditing, limiting external oversight.

Sources

- [1] [edu] The Palantir Nhs Partnership Examining Big Techs Infrastruct - blogs.lse.ac.uk - <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/medialse/2024/07/31/the-palantir-nhs-partnership-examining-big-techs-infrastructural-power-in-healthcare/>
- [2] Briefing Palantir Fdp - medact.org - <https://www.medact.org/2026/resources/briefings/briefing-palantir-fdp/>
- [3] Palantir The Controversy The Contracts And The Campaign - lowdownnhs.info - <https://lowdownnhs.info/topics/accountability/palantir-the-controversy-the-contracts-and-the-campaign/>
- [4] Impact - palantir.com - <https://www.palantir.com/impact/>
- [5] [blog] House Of Commons V Palantir Where - p4sc4l.substack.com - <https://p4sc4l.substack.com/p/house-of-commons-v-palantir-where>
- [6] 2023 06 05 FINAL The NHS Federated Data Platform And Palanti - foxglove.org.uk - https://www.foxglove.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/2023_06_05-FINAL-The-NHS-Federated-Data-Platform-and-Palantir.pdf
- [7] [peer-reviewed] pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov - AUTHORS UNAVAILABLE - <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38378204/>
- [8] [news] Uk Reviewing Palantirs Nhs Contract Amid Pressure Use Break - reuters.com - <https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/uk-reviewing-palantirs-nhs-contract-amid-pressure-use-break-clause-2026-06-09/>
- [9] [news] Palantirs Nhs England Contract Opens Door To Government Abuse - theguardian.com - <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2026/mar/12/palantirs-nhs-england-contract-opens-door-to-government-abuse-of-power-health-bosses-told>
- [10] doi.org - <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01572-2>
- [11] [blog] Karp's Convenient Truth - louisehumpington.substack.com - <https://louisehumpington.substack.com/p/karps-convenient-truth>
- [12] NHSFederatedDataPlatform - hansard.parliament.uk - <https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2026-04-16/debates/2FDCA71C-D0C1-4738-BEE8-A4BDA311DB99/NHSFederatedDataPlatform>
- [13] [blog] Palantirs Nhs Data Platform Rejected Hospitals - democracyforsale.substack.com - <https://democracyforsale.substack.com/p/palantirs-nhs-data-platform-rejected-hospitals>
- [14] Palantirs Nhs Data Deal Called In For A Second Opinion - theregister.com - <https://www.theregister.com/public-sector/2026/06/15/palantirs-nhs-data-deal-called-in-for-a-second-opinion/5254908>
- [15] Palantir Awarded NHS FDP Data Contract - computerweekly.com - <https://www.computerweekly.com/news/366560657/Palantir-awarded-NHS-FDP-data-contract>
- [16] journals.sagepub.com - <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/20539517251334099>
- [17] Documents show CalGang uses error-prone facial ... - <https://revealnews.org/article/documents-show-calgang-uses-error-prone-facial-recognition/>
- [18] Compare Palantir Foundry vs. RetailMetrix in 2026 - <https://slashdot.org/software/comparison/Palantir-Foundry-vs-retailMetrix/>
- [19] Palantir Isn't Skynet. But Its Infrastructure Is the Path ... - GoPenAI - <https://blog.gopenai.com/palantir-isnt-skynet-but-its-infrastructure-is-the-path-that-could-converge-there-cb7>

598d7c2df

[20] Palantir Foundry | Specs, reviews and EoL info - <https://invgate.com/itdb/palantir-foundry>

[21] [blog] Palantir Technologies: Comprehensive Analysis and Market ... - <https://bytebridge.medium.com/palantir-technologies-comprehensive-analysis-and-market-position-5c9e7ee2de8>

[22] [blog] KOSMOS Systems Auditor Report: Palantir - by Clinton Alden - <https://kosmosframework.substack.com/p/kosmos-systems-auditor-report-palantir>

[23] [gov] Palantir Technologies Inc. (PLTR) - 10-K, filed 2024-02-20 - <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1321655/000132165524000022/pltr-20231231.htm>

[24] [gov] Palantir Technologies Inc. (PLTR) - 10-K, filed 2025-02-18 - <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1321655/000132165525000022/pltr-20241231.htm>