

Project 17 frontline data analysis April 2023-March 2024

This data is based on clients we worked with between April 2023 and March 2024.

During this period we worked with 426 families, similar to 433 last year.

Of the 426 families, 198 were new clients, similar to 199 last year.

Part 1: Demographic information

UK Immigration Status (at first approach)	2024	2023
[Not Specified]	0.2%	0.5%
Asylum Seeker	1.2%	1.8%
DDVC/MVDAC	0.2%	0.0%
Discretionary Leave to Remain	0.2%	0.2%
EU Citizen	0.5%	0.2%
EU family member	0.2%	0.7%
EU pre-settled status	3.8%	3.7%
EU settled status	0.0%	0.2%
Failed Asylum Seeker	2.1%	2.3%
Limited leave (NRPF)	17.1%	23.8%
Limited leave (with recourse)	0.2%	0.0%
Not Known	0.9%	0.0%
Other	2.6%	2.1%
Overstayer (no outstanding application)	38.3%	35.3%
Overstayer (outstanding application)	19.2%	19.9%

Tier 2	4.7%	0.2%
Tier 4 Student	4.0%	3.0%
Visitors Visa	5.9%	4.8%
Zambrano carer	0.7%	1.2%

This data is fairly consistent year on year, however it is worth noting:

- There is a significant increase in the number of people with skilled work visas. Almost all of our clients with these visas are working in health and social care.
- A continuing decrease in the number of people with LLR (NRPF) on family life routes. This reflects our changing approach which generally involves signposting for immigration advice to remove the NRPF condition, rather than taking cases on.

Household Status	2024	2023
Couple (no dependant children)	0%	0%
Couple (with dependant children)	17%	21%
Lone Parent (with dependant children)	77%	73%
Other	0%	1%
Single adult (no dependent children)	2%	1%
Single Adults	4%	5%

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

- Female: 93%

- Male: 6%
- Not specified: 1%

Nationality:

We worked with clients from 59 different countries, including:

Indian	2.3%
Pakistani	2.8%
Grenadian	3.7%
Jamaican	3.7%
Ghanaian	14.5%
Nigerian	41.6%

Local authorities:

We worked with families living in 86 local authorities. 64% lived in Greater London, down from 72% last year. A breakdown of local authorities with the highest numbers of clients is below.

Essex	15
Southwark	20
Greenwich	21
Kent	21
Lewisham	25

Health and disability

30% of clients had a health problem or disability. 22% had children with health problems or disabilities. However, we believe this may be under-recorded because health problems identified after our initial appointment are not recorded.

Part 2: Requests for s.17 support

Accessing support before coming to Project 17:

266 of the 426 of families (62%) had tried to access support under s.17 before they approached us. Of those families, 14% had tried to access support more than once.

92 families of 426 families (22% of the total number of clients, and 37% 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:

We referred 201 families for support under s.17. Only 28 families were supported following an initial referral from Project 17, with no need for further advocacy or legal intervention. In other cases further action was required, including advocacy; letters before action; referrals to solicitors for judicial review proceedings.

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 when we refer them to local authorities for support under s.17, before they are able to access an assessment.

Type of gatekeeping	Number of clients	Percentage
Threats to take child into care	9	2%
Unable to help because of Immigration status	32	7%
Denial that any support is available	36	8%
Refusal to assess because family is not considered 'destitute'	29	7%
Not seen	13	3%
Other	11	3%
Denying territorial responsibility	18	4%

Refusal to conduct an assessment	30	7%
Family told to rely on friends/family	44	10%

Our clients also experience multiple problems during the assessment process, as displayed in the table below.

Assessment problems	Number of clients	Percentage
Aggression	10	2%
Attacking credibility	23	5%
Delays	73	17%
Denying evidence provided	19	4%
Unlawful immigration advice	20	5%
None	17	4%
Other	19	4%
Racism	5	1%
Requesting unreasonable evidence	6	1%
Threaten children into care	6	1%

Part 3: Impact of destitution

251 families (59%) had been unable to meet their basic needs for more than 90 days when they first approached us. 111 families (26%) 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 of support	Percentage
Domestic violence	2%
Immigration problems	0%
Inadequate housing	30%
Moving around	12%
Not enough money	39%
Other	2%
Street homelessness	7%
Supported by out of hours	3%
Threat to safety	4%

Part 4: Provision of s.17 support

Accommodation:

Project 17 supported 204 families to access accommodation under s.17. Just 38 families (18% of those who accessed accommodation) were provided with suitable accommodation.

Disrepair	6%
Far away	24%
HMO	24%
Hostel/hotel	29%
In borough	28%
In neighbouring borough	21%
Interim refused	23%
Other	8%
Problems with other residents	7%
Suitable	19%
Too small	10%

Subsistence

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

- 15% receive financial support above s.4 asylum support rates
- 18% received financial support equivalent to s.4 asylum support rates
- 34% received financial support below s.4 asylum support rates
- 9% received vouchers instead of cash support

We did not record this data for 25% of clients.

Part 5: Outcomes

27 families (6%) had no recorded positive outcomes following our intervention.

259 families (61%) accessed support under s.17. 56% accessed financial support, and 48% accessed accommodation.

Other outcomes are listed below:

Charitable grant	18%
Child maintenance	1%
Destitution Fund	51%
Destitution support in kind	18%
Foodbank voucher	68%
Free school meals	7%
Free school meals debt write-off	1%
Granted LLR*	25%
Granted PSS*	1%
Granted recourse to public funds*	38%
Health Access	5%
Healthy Start vouchers (NRPF extension)	8%
Hotel fund	3%

Internal small grant	20%
NRM support	0%
Nursery access	4%
Other immigration outcome*	5%

*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 34% of clients to other organisations for specialist support outside the scope of our work. 70% of our referrals (24% of the total number of clients) were for immigration advice.

We referred 5% of clients to community care solicitors, to challenge refusals of s.17 support. We also made referrals for housing advice; support with domestic abuse and debt; advice on family law and others.