

Project 17 frontline data analysis

April 2022-March 2023

This data is based on clients we worked with between April 2022 and March 2023.

During this period we worked with 433 families, up from 396 last year. Of the 433 families, 199 were new clients, down from 205 last year.

Part 1: Demographic information:

| Immigration Status (at first approach) | Number of clients | Percentage | 2022 comparison |
|---|-------------------|------------|-----------------|
| [Not Specified] | 2 | 0% | 0% |
| Asylum Seeker | 8 | 2% | 1% |
| Discretionary Leave to Remain | 1 | 0% | 0% |
| EU Citizen | 1 | 0% | 0% |
| EU family member | 3 | 1% | 1% |
| EU pre-settled status | 16 | 4% | 1% |
| EU settled status | 1 | 0% | 0% |
| Failed Asylum Seeker | 10 | 2% | 2% |
| Limited leave (NRPF) | 103 | 24% | 31% |
| Other | 9 | 2% | 4% |
| Undocumented (no outstanding application) | 153 | 35% | 33% |
| Undocumented (outstanding application) | 86 | 20% | 20% |
| Tier 2 | 1 | 0% | 0% |
| Tier 4 Student | 13 | 3% | 1% |
| Visitors Visa | 21 | 5% | 2% |
| Zambrano carer | 5 | 1% | 2% |

- There is a predictable increase in the number of people with pre-settled status following the end of the EUSS transition and grace period.

- The reduction in the number of clients with LLR (NRPF). This is likely due to a different approach to initial enquiries: unless the situation is very urgent, we tend to signpost people with LLR (NRPF) for immigration advice on a change of conditions, instead of taking on cases.
- An increase in the number of students and visitors may be a response to the cost of living crisis. It could also result from increased awareness of Project 17 in particular communities.

| Household Status | Number of Clients | Percentage | 2022 comparison |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Couple (no dependant children) | 1 | 0% | 1% |
| Couple (with dependant children) | 89 | 21% | 23% |
| Lone Parent (with dependant children) | 315 | 73% | 71% |
| Other | 3 | 1% | 1% |
| Single adult (no dependent children) | 5 | 1% | 1% |
| Single Adults | 20 | 5% | 3% |

Gender of clients (point of contact within the family):

- Female: 403 (93%)
- Male: 30 (7%)

Nationality:

We worked with clients from 64 different countries, including:

- Bangladesh: 12 (3%)

- Ghana: 60 (14%)
- Grenada: 12 (3%)
- Jamaica: 14 (3%)
- Nigeria: 179 (41%)
- Pakistan: 12 (3%)

Local authorities:

We worked with families living in 92 local authorities. 313 families (72%) lived in Greater London, up from 66% last year. A breakdown by London borough is below

| London borough | 2023 | 2022 |
|----------------------|------|------|
| Barking and Dagenham | 20 | 16 |
| Barnet | 5 | 6 |
| Bexley | 28 | 12 |
| Brent | 11 | 9 |
| Camden | 2 | 7 |
| Croydon | 23 | 10 |
| Ealing | 16 | 8 |
| Enfield | 10 | 9 |
| Greenwich | 31 | 31 |
| Hackney | 4 | 4 |
| Hammersmith and | 1 | 2 |

| | | |
|----------------------------|----|----|
| Fulham | | |
| Haringey | 5 | 7 |
| Harrow | 2 | 2 |
| Havering | 5 | 4 |
| Hillingdon | 2 | 3 |
| Hounslow | 3 | 4 |
| Islington | 1 | 2 |
| Kensington and Chelsea | 1 | 0 |
| Kingston upon Thames | 1 | 0 |
| Lambeth | 20 | 18 |
| Lewisham | 31 | 31 |
| Merton | 4 | 2 |
| Newham | 21 | 17 |
| Redbridge | 18 | 12 |
| Southwark | 20 | 21 |
| Tower Hamlets | 10 | 3 |
| Waltham Forest | 9 | 9 |
| Wandsworth | 6 | 3 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|---|
| Westminster | 2 | 2 |
|-------------|---|---|

Outside London, most of our clients are in the South East of England, with larger numbers in Essex, Kent and Surrey.

Health and disability

151 clients (33%) had a health problem or disability. 122 clients (28%) had children with health problems or disabilities. However, we believe this may be under-recorded because health problems identified after our initial appointment may not be recorded.

Part 2: Requests for s.17 support

233 of the 433 of families (54%) had tried to access support under s.17 before they approached us. Of those families, 12% had tried to access support more than once.

73 families (16% of the total number of clients, and 31% of those who had already asked for help from local authorities) successfully accessed s.17 before coming to Project 17. People in this situation might request help from us because their support is being terminated, or because it is inadequate.

Problems accessing support:

Only 22 families were supported following an initial referral from Project 17, with no need for further advocacy or legal intervention.

Families experience a range of problems when trying to access support. We use the term 'gatekeeping' to describe poor practice by local authorities that wrongly prevents families from accessing assessments.

The table below shows the gatekeeping problems experienced by our clients, separated into those who approached their local authority before asking Project 17 for help, and those we referred for support.

| Gatekeeping | Without P17's support | With P17's support |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Threaten child into care | 3% | 5% |
| Ineligible because of immigration status | 27% | 18% |
| No support available | 23% | 11% |
| Not destitute | 6% | 11% |
| Not seen | 6% | 5% |
| Other | 3% | 1% |
| Another LA's responsibility | 4% | 5% |
| Refused assessment | 13% | 9% |
| Rely on friends/family | 10% | 17% |

Note that the gatekeeping reported 'without P17 support' is likely to be an underestimate because of the difficulties of self-reporting, and because individuals may struggle to identify gatekeeping without prior knowledge of how support should be implemented. Nevertheless, the data shows that families are more likely to be refused an assessment based on their immigration status, and told there is no support available, when requesting support without an advocate. Conversely, families appear more likely to be told to rely on friends and family if approaching with Project 17's support.

Our clients experience multiple problems during the assessment process, as displayed in the table below. Again, we think the self-reported data is less reliable than our own monitoring. However, it is interesting to note that over a quarter of families face delays

| Assessment problems | % before support from P17 | % with P17 |
|---------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| Aggression | 3% | 4% |
| Attack credibility | 3% | 8% |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|----|-----|
| Delays | 6% | 26% |
| Denying evidence provided | 3% | 4% |
| Immigration advice | 8% | 9% |
| None | 1% | 3% |
| Other | 3% | 5% |
| Racism | 2% | 2% |
| Request unreasonable evidence | 0% | 3% |
| Threaten children into care | 4% | 2% |

Part 3: Impact of destitution

243 families (56%) had been unable to meet their basic needs for more than 90 days when they first approached us. 121 families (27%) had been destitute for more than a year.

Being refused support under s.17 can have serious consequences. Clients have experienced the issues displayed in the table below after being refused support from social services. These figures represent both those who were refused support when they requested it on their own, and those who requested support with advocacy from Project 17,

| Impact of refusal | Number of families |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Domestic exploitation | 1 |
| Domestic violence | 17 |
| Immigration problems | 4 |
| Inadequate housing | 93 |

| | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Moving around | 28 |
| Not enough money | 146 |
| Other | 11 |
| Street homelessness | 19 |
| Supported by out of hours | 7 |
| Threat to safety | 17 |

Part 4: Provision of s.17 support

Accommodation:

Project 17 supported 200 families to access accommodation under s.17 in 2022-23. 39 families (20% of those who accessed accommodation) were provided with suitable accommodation.

| Accommodation issue | Number of clients | % |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-----|
| Disrepair | 9 | 5% |
| Far away | 49 | 25% |
| HMO | 34 | 17% |
| Hostel/hotel | 55 | 28% |
| In borough | 61 | 31% |
| In neighbouring borough | 45 | 23% |
| Interim provided | 116 | 58% |
| Interim refused | 39 | 20% |
| Other | 13 | 7% |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|----|-----|
| Problems with other residents | 16 | 8% |
| Suitable | 39 | 20% |
| Too small | 23 | 12% |

Subsistence

217 families were awarded subsistence support following our intervention. Of those who access s.17 subsistence:

- 18% receive financial support above s.4 asylum support rates
- 21% received financial support equivalent to s.4 asylum support rates
- 33% received financial support below s.4 asylum support rates
- 8% received vouchers instead of cash support

We did not record this data for 20% of clients.

Part 5: Outcomes

34 families (7%) had no recorded positive outcomes following our intervention.

217 families (50%) accessed s.17 financial support and 200 families (46%) accessed s.17 accommodation following our intervention.

Other outcomes are listed below:

| Outcome | Number of clients | % |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----|
| Access to benefits (PSS) | 2 | 0% |
| Asylum support | 15 | 3% |
| Baby bank items | 137 | 32% |
| Benefits | 31 | 7% |

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| Care Act accommodation | 2 | 0% |
| Care Act financial support | 1 | 0% |
| Charitable grant | 60 | 14% |
| Child Benefit | 3 | 1% |
| Child maintenance | 2 | 0% |
| Declaration of parentage | 3 | 1% |
| Destitution Fund | 213 | 49% |
| Destitution support in kind | 56 | 13% |
| Foodbank voucher | 285 | 66% |
| Free school meals | 31 | 7% |
| Free school meals debt write-off | 5 | 1% |
| FSM vouchers (Covid-19) | 9 | 2% |
| Granted LLR* | 103 | 24% |
| Granted PSS* | 3 | 1% |
| Granted recourse to public funds* | 167 | 39% |
| Health Access | 22 | 5% |
| Healthy Start vouchers (NRPF extension) | 19 | 4% |
| Hotel fund | 18 | 4% |
| Internal small grant | 96 | 22% |
| NRM support | 3 | 1% |
| Nursery access | 17 | 4% |
| Other immigration outcome* | 18 | 4% |
| S.17 subsistence | 212 | 49% |

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----|-----|
| S17 accommodation | 147 | 34% |
| S17 interim accommodation | 50 | 12% |

*Immigration outcomes are not the result of our direct work as we do not provide immigration advice, although they may result from signposting or referrals. We record these outcomes because of the significant impact immigration status has on our clients' lives, and because it affects their eligibility for other support.

Referrals:

We referred 37% of clients to other organisations for specialist support outside the scope of our work. A breakdown of these referrals is below:

| Type of referral | Number of clients | % |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----|
| Benefits adviser | 3 | 1% |
| Community care solicitor | 22 | 5% |
| Community group | 3 | 1% |
| Debt advice | 1 | 0% |
| Destitution support | 16 | 4% |
| Domestic abuse services | 8 | 2% |
| Family solicitor | 3 | 1% |
| Health services | 2 | 0% |
| Housing adviser/solicitor | 14 | 3% |
| Immigration adviser/solicitor | 80 | 18% |
| NRPF lift | 23 | 5% |
| Other | 9 | 2% |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|----|----|
| Other Advice Centre | 11 | 3% |
| Other Community Organisations | 9 | 2% |
| Signpost for NRPF lift | 9 | 2% |