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Asylum Link Merseyside is a charity dedicated to assisting asylum seekers and refugees, offering welcome and support, and raising public awareness. With 90 volunteers, its services include destitution support, legal casework, and English classes. www.asylumlink.org.uk

Edmund Rice International is an NGO with UN consultative (ECOSOC) status, advocating human rights, especially of children and young people denied access to education, healthcare and social participation because of conflict or political, social, environmental, or economic circumstances. www.edmundriceinternational.org

GMIAU is a Registered Charity providing specialist legal immigration and asylum advice and representation. It offers free service to refugees qualifying for assistance under the Legal Help scheme, and has a contract with Manchester City Council to provide an integrated immigration advice service. http://gmiau.org/

Manchester City of Sanctuary is a registered charity working to unite Manchester as a welcoming city, open and fair for all, especially to those seeking sanctuary. It works for community cohesion and its projects include befriending and signposting services for refugees. https://manchester.cityofsanctuary.org/

Rainbow Haven operates drop-ins in Manchester and Salford, providing services for asylum seekers, refugees and migrant workers. As well as providing signposting and support, it acts as a communal space where social networks and mutual support can help refugees settle into their new lives. http://www.rainbowhaven.org.uk/

Revive is a social justice project of the British Province of the Spiritans (Holy Ghost Fathers), working with the support of Caritas International, the Roman Catholic Diocese of Salford, and the Congregation of Christian Brothers. It provides social work support, immigration advice, and drop-in services http://www.revive-uk.org/

United for Change is a Manchester-based refugee-led coalition of organisations campaigning for the human rights of refugees and people seeking asylum. With the motto, ‘Dignity not Destitution’, it aims to improve public awareness and achieve change in policies and systems http://www.revive-uk.org/advocaterevive-action-group/united-for-change/

Vivat International is a faith-based NGO with consultative (ECOSOC) status at the UN. Working with NGOs and lay people across 122 countries, it functions as a hub for advocacy and lobbying on issues of human rights, justice and peace at the UN in Geneva and in New York. http://vivatinternational.org/
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Executive summary

This submission focusses on:

1. The UK Government’s failure to provide adequate follow-on support for successful asylum-seekers: recognised refugees frequently face a phase of transitional cashless destitution and a longer period of homelessness.

2. The UK Government’s policy of subjecting failed asylum seekers to total and indefinite destitution.

In both cases the UK fails to fulfil:

- Articles 22 and 25.1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: the realisation of socio-economic rights commensurate with human dignity and the right to an adequate standard of living, including the rights to food, clothing, housing, medical care, and necessary social services.

- Article 11.1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR): the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living, including adequate food, clothing and housing, and the right to continuous improvement of living conditions

These rights are recognised as intrinsic to all human beings. As a ratifying party to the relevant treaties and conventions, the UK government is under legal and moral obligation to promote, protect and progressively realise the human rights they guarantee.

1. RECOGNISED REFUGEES: BENEFIT HIATUS AND HOMELESSNESS

1) The British Government’s well-publicised Syrian Vulnerable Person Resettlement Programme (VPR) aims to take in 20,000 specially vulnerable Syrian refugees over the 5 year period 2015-2020. Beneficiaries of VPR receive housing, intensive support, and a tailored integration package. This is not available to asylum-seekers who have reached the UK by their own perilous journeys (overland, across the Mediterranean, through the Calais ‘jungle’, and dangerous cross-Channel transit by lorry or train) and then achieved refugee status through the adversarial individual asylum process. There is no ‘asylum visa’ allowing safe and lawful entry into the U.K.

2) For these independently-arriving refugees, present in the UK in far greater numbers than VPR beneficiaries, if they succeed in obtaining status and leave to remain, there is no programme of support and integration.

3) As the Refugee Council’s Head of Advocacy puts it: ‘Bizarrely, at the very point refugees are granted asylum, the Government washes its hands of them, leaving often traumatised and disoriented people to survive on their own.’ And in the words of Refugee Action’s Chief Executive, ‘It is madness to help one group of refugees to integrate fully whilst at the same time neglecting others.’

1.1. BENEFIT GAP: THE DESTITUITION PERIOD

4) With no government integration strategy or programme of transitional support, the great majority of successful asylum-seekers face a ‘move-on’ period characterized by the alarming threat of homelessness and financial crisis in the transition between the end of Home Office ‘NASS’ support and the processing of welfare and housing
benefits. The problem has been surveyed and analysed by the British Red Cross in The Move-On Period: An Ordeal for New Refugees and by the Refugee Council in 28 Days Later: experiences of new refugees in the UK and, most recently, England’s forgotten refugees: Out of the fire and into the frying pan. On Merseyside, with a greater supply of voluntary sector hostel accommodation and shared housing, prolonged individual homelessness is rare. In Greater Manchester the typical experience is a temporary period of destitution without benefits or shelter followed by an indefinite period with unemployment benefits but no shelter. Many wait 3 months for initial hostel accommodation.

5) Newly recognised refugees are given only 28 days ‘grace’ to access benefits and housing before having to vacate their asylum accommodation. Unable to obtain housing in the timescale, Manchester refugees without children or special vulnerabilities are evicted from Home Office NASS accommodation into street homelessness.

6) Many refugees experience considerable obstacles and complexity in accessing benefits. Though the refugee has the right to work and to access mainstream benefits administered by the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP), the ‘grace’ period is rarely sufficient to secure employment, benefits, or housing.

7) For a number of years up to 2011 a programme of integration support (including advice on benefits, housing, and accommodation) was provided by the Refugee Integration and Employment Service (RIES). Though time-limited and underfunded, its abolition marked the end of government statutory funding in support of refugee integration.

8) No subsequent Government has introduced a replacement service or strategy, instead leaving refugees to their own devices and the accident of local charity provision and capacity. The major stakeholders, the Home Office and the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP, operating through JobCentre Plus branches) do not work together in aid of refugees. The Home Office discharges its responsibility once NASS35 has been issued and the onward work is in the hands of JobCentre Plus to process benefit claims and offer job search and language support. Significant issues arise where there are delays in the processing of National Insurance allocations, erroneous application of the Habitual Residence Test and onward delays in the issue of benefits payments until a refugee can set up a bank account. In some cases JobCentre personnel adopt a negative, adversarial stance.

9) Refugee support thus falls to charitable organisations, without whose aid increasing numbers of refugees would face or be at risk of destitution for longer. The range and bureaucratic complexity of welfare provision makes every case time-consuming for the volunteers who staff these organisations and the volume of casework is frequently beyond their capacity.

Factors in the benefit gap:

10) The ‘grace period’ of 28 days is insufficient for an unaided refugee in a foreign land to make the transition from NASS provision to mainstream support by negotiating the bureaucratic complexities of benefit, job-seeking, and housing applications. In the 2016 Refugee Council study only one interviewee had succeeded in securing welfare benefits within the 28 day period.

☐ Often refugees do not understand the time limit or the necessary processes and cannot access help in time.

☐ Frequently the DWP benefits contact centre wrongly advises refugees that they cannot apply until their asylum support has actually ceased.

☐ Frequent delays in the issue of essential proofs of entitlement - the Biometric Residence Permit (BRP) and National Insurance Number (NINO) - create consequential delays in the timely processing of benefits. In theory the NINO paperwork is initiated by the Home Office and sent to DWP/HMRC, but there is no clear way of checking what or where problems arise if the NINO is not issued shortly after the issue of leave to remain papers.

☐ Once issued with a NINO, the refugee must apply for Jobseeker’s Allowance or Universal Credit online and needs not only computer access but sufficient command of English to negotiate a complex online application. If the
Home Office caseowner does not prompt the issue of a NINO the applicant has to manage a detailed 40 minute telephone application through the JobCentre Plus contact centre. JobCentres are currently reporting increasing delays in the issue of NINOs. Both processes are demanding for native applicants and advisers let alone disoriented, traumatised, non-English speaking refugees from Sudan, Eritrea, or Syria.

Once, following a JobCentre Plus interview, benefit is set up, refugees are often unable to access payments. Without passports, utility bills, or fixed address, setting up a bank account is difficult. Sometimes bank staff make additional difficulties, including refusing the BRP as a form of identification and refusing the refugee’s proof of address. In the past, with help, instead of a bank account, refugees have able to set up a Post Office account or access a Simple Payment system through designated PayPoints. Because of the transition to the system of Universal Credit, JobCentres are refusing these alternative modes of payment and insisting on bank accounts.

Further problems arise if the refugee moves from where NASS accommodation was provided. For the first time free to move, refugees sometimes re-locate to another area where they have friends, or believe they will find better community support, a job, or a homeless shelter. This takes away the ‘local connection’ needed for housing applications.

Language difficulties, lack of UK qualifications and work experience, and enforced unemployment throughout the period of flight and asylum-seeking, make job-seeking a long-term challenge, a matter of months or years rather than weeks. Organisations report an average of two years. The most significant obstacle is the lack of sufficient and appropriate English language provision. In the past when colleges could offer at least 15 hours a week, refugees could expect to progress at least one level a year in language proficiency: job entry is unlikely below Entry Level 3.

While dependent on benefits, refugees frequently face benefit sanctions, including the complete withdrawal of benefits, for non-compliance with JobCentre requirements in terms of attending interviews and courses, composing curriculum vitae, and expected volume of job applications.

11) The length of the period without financial support or accommodation, ‘having status but destitute’, depends on the ability of the refugee to access third sector help. In the Red Cross snapshot refugees accessing the service were already too late to avoid destitution, and a number had been destitute for more than 75 days. For many refugees in Greater Manchester the joy of receiving leave to remain quickly turns to extreme vulnerability and despair when they find themselves evicted from asylum accommodation into street homelessness. On Merseyside significant street homelessness has been eliminated by effective collaboration between DWP and the refugee support sector. The overall need is for government-facilitated joined-up working and communication between the Home Office, DWP, local authorities and the voluntary sector.

1.2. REFUGEE HOMELESSNESS

12) Access to safe and secure housing is a basic human right. Homelessness entails other human rights deficits: violations of the right to an adequate standard of living, to education, to security of the person, to privacy, to social security, to freedom from discrimination, to vote. Homelessness also means lack of connectedness with friends and community and lack of control over one’s environment. The recently published survey by the Refugee Council highlighting ‘a massive hidden problem of homelessness amongst newly recognised refugees’ is confirmed by all the organisations endorsing this submission. In the Refugee Council study, 81% of service-users were homeless or about to be homeless at the point they accessed the service.

13) Under existing UK housing legislation and regulations, local authorities have a statutory duty to house persons classified as ‘statutorily homeless’. This duty may be discharged by arranging social or private sector housing, or if none is available, providing temporary bed and breakfast accommodation. To qualify as statutorily homeless applicants must demonstrate they (i) are ‘eligible for public funds’ (ii) have a ‘local connection’ (iii) are not ‘intentionally homeless’ (iv) are in ‘priority need’. Single refugees without dependent children are excluded
from the homelessness duty by the fourth criterion. Unless they succeed in gaining recognition as specially vulnerable, individual refugees are classified as single homeless people not in ‘priority need’. The great majority of refugees aided by the signatory organisations to this submission are ‘non-statutory homeless’ for whom housing authorities are not obliged to make provision.

14) Refugees classified as ‘non-statutory homeless’, like other ‘non-statutory homeless’, are reduced to substantial periods of homelessness, including rough sleeping in doorways, subways, public parks, railway and bus stations. Not all homelessness is street-visible. The term includes sleeping rough; living temporarily in hostels, shelters, or supported accommodation; ‘sofa-surfing’ in the houses of friends or acquaintances.

15) Many refugees live in continuous insecurity, with periods of rough sleeping punctuated by nights in shelters or surfing as available. Ineligible for local authority housing, unemployment benefit is usually inadequate to provide deposits or sureties for the private rented sector and refugees lack the knowhow or assistance to access rental bond schemes. Government-provided Integration Loans are available to offer some help to new refugees with housing and employability costs (including possibly a limited housing deposit) but this is generally insufficient and currently subject to a three-month delay. Those who cannot prove a local connection are ineligible for the rental bond schemes provided by local councils. There is in any case an acute shortage of one-bedroom properties whether or not a person is judged in priority need. Current reform proposals on eligibility for housing benefit will make the plight of refugees worse; under 25s will not be eligible for housing benefit unless they fall within a discretion group and under 35s will be eligible only for a one room rate.

16) There is thus no strategy or system for supporting and integrating recognised refugees. In key documents on refugee integration published 2005-2010 the Home Office recognised it is “essential we support refugees in realising their full potential - economically, culturally and in terms of social inclusion” and affirmed the link between successful refugee integration and the wider aims of building cohesion, reducing health inequalities, tackling extremism and increasing community empowerment. Defining integration as empowering refugees to achieve their full potential as members of British society, the Home Office accepted that refugees need at least 12 months of funded integration support. In fact since the abolition of the Refugee Integration and Employment Service integration programmes for refugees arriving by the asylum route have been completely withdrawn. Tens of thousands of refugees are thus deprived of the support necessary to achieve living conditions commensurate with their human dignity and universal human rights, conditions which would also enable them to more quickly contribute, economically and socially, to British society and minimise the risks of their becoming marginalised, exploited, or radicalised.

Recommendations

The Government should:

1. Implement a comprehensive refugee integration strategy, including a properly funded integration support service for recognised refugees.
2. Extend the transitional ‘grace’ period beyond 28 days, continuing asylum support until the first mainstream benefits are paid.
3. Allow recognised refugees to remain in their asylum accommodation until they have been able to access housing or hostel accommodation.
4. Fund local authorities to provide active guidance and rental bond schemes for recognised refugees ineligible for priority social housing.
5. Review wide variations in practice and provision in different regions of the UK to enable a meaningful national strategy to be developed.
6. Ensure the effective implementation of UPR recommendations through the establishment, by the time of a mid-term assessment of the current UPR cycle, of a permanent governmental mechanism to liaise with relevant ministries and consult with Civil Society, NHRI’s and all relevant stakeholders.
2. FAILED ASYLUM SEEKERS: TOTAL DESTITUTION / NO STATUTORY SUPPORT

17) In the year ending March 2016 there were 34,687 asylum applications in the UK. Of the 26,618 decisions, 40% (10,549) were acceptances. The current acceptance rate, inflated by high numbers of grants to refugees from Sudan and Syria, is higher than in 2012, 2013, 2014. Even so, 60% of asylum seekers (16,069) were refused.16

18) Once a claim is refused and appeal rights exhausted, ‘failed asylum seekers’ are expected to leave UK within 21 days. Those without accompanying children are evicted from asylum accommodation and the (‘Section 95’) benefits granted during the claim process are withdrawn.17 Prohibited from working and denied all statutory support, failed asylum seekers without accompanying children are rendered cashless and street homeless, deprived of the minimum material necessities of human existence: shelter, food, heating, clothing.18

19) The Red Cross and Refugee Council describe the result as a ‘humanitarian crisis’ on the streets of Britain: ‘Giving food to destitute asylum seekers here is not very different from handing out food from the back of lorries in the Sudan. The humanitarian need is the same.’19

20) In the words of the Refugee Council’s Chief Executive, ‘Although refugees need help to establish safe and stable lives, the grim reality is that some refugees are systematically denied such assistance, leaving them hungry and sleeping on the streets in one of the richest countries in the world.’20 Reporting record numbers of destitute asylum-seekers aided by the British Red Cross (9,000 in 2015), its head of refugee services declared, ‘Asylum support is not a matter of privilege but a means of providing a lifeline and basic human dignity to those who have come to the UK in search of a place of safety’.21

21) In its conclusions on the 6th Periodic Review of UK (58th Session 6-24 June 2016), the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) concluded that “the level of support granted to asylum seekers during consideration of their cases is inadequate and recommended an increase in the daily allowance.” CESC did not address the situation of refused asylum seekers who receive no support at all.

22) Failed asylum seekers with children continue to received minimal benefits. A minority of other failed asylum seekers receive minimal statutory provision (accommodation and ‘Azure Card’ cashless benefits) under Section 4 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 if they are able to fulfil strict eligibility criteria.22 Support is granted if the failed asylum seeker can show he or she is taking steps to leave UK, or is so critically ill as to be unable to travel, or is unable to leave because there is no viable route of return, or has a judicial review or a fresh asylum claim in process. A Red Cross survey concluded that Section 4 support is inadequate to meet the basic needs of the refused asylum seekers who receive it and does not allow them to live with dignity, ‘thereby causing unnecessary humanitarian suffering’.23 Section 4 provision is about to be further restricted in accordance with the 2016 Immigration Act, to ‘curtail the scope of such support’ even to failed asylum seekers with children. In the words of the Immigration Minister, the Government intends to make asylum provision more restrictive, even for families, in order to show that the UK is not a ‘land of milk and honey’.24

23) The great majority of failed asylum seekers remain outside Section 4 criteria and in total destitution, receiving no statutory support at all: evicted into street homelessness they are dependent on the vagaries of charitable provision. The deliberate withdrawal of food and shelter from individuals unable to support themselves is itself a violation of their human rights.

24) While asylum-seekers and Section 4 recipients are entitled to free primary and secondary healthcare, refused asylum seekers are excluded from free secondary care.25 They remain in a state of homeless and cashless ‘limbo’, prohibited from working, ineligible for statutory support, and totally reliant for the minimum necessities of existence on charity hand-outs, food banks, friends, begging, illegal employment, or criminal activity. Many service users of the support charities making this submission sleep out in doorways, parks, subways, railway and bus stations, in a sequence punctuated by temporary ‘surfing’ with acquaintances and short periods in charity sector and faith group night shelters when available.26 Failed asylum seekers are ‘characterised by vulnerability, inability to satisfy essential needs, and poor health and wellbeing’.27

25) The destitution of refused asylum seekers goes beyond a destitution the UK Government fails to address: it is a form of destitution, of extreme human marginalisation, Government policy intentionally creates. The plight of failed asylum-seekers has been extensively documented in research by the British Red Cross in A Decade of Destitution (2013) and Poor Health, No Wealth, No Home (2015).28 Earlier studies still descriptive of the plight
of failed asylum seekers include Oxfam’s Coping with Destitution: survival and livelihood Strategies of refused asylum seekers (2011) and the Red Cross report ‘Not gone, but forgotten’. (2010). Since 2008 the Still Human Still Here coalition of civil society organisations, headed by the British Red Cross, Amnesty International, the Refugee Council, and OXFAM, has campaigned for the end of the policy of forced destitution. The June 2016 Still Human Still Here submission to CESCR was made on behalf of 80 civil society organisations. 29

26) Red Cross studies identify alarming rates of hunger, rough sleeping, personal isolation, and deteriorating mental and physical health. In a Yorkshire-based study 57% had been without support for more than a year and one had been destitute for 8 years. 66% experienced serious hunger on a weekly basis. Those destitute for longest exhibited ‘a pattern of deteriorating health’, with health and well-being significantly lower than that of the general population and ‘characterised by the presence of a range of physical and mental health morbidities’. 30 In the 2013 Manchester-based study, involving 150 destitute participants from 29 different countries, almost half had been destitute for at least two years and 41% for between two and five years. 31 In 2015 the Red Cross, with 59 centres opening their doors to 11,782 failed asylum seekers, reported a 39% increase in the number of people using Red Cross refugee services, with the provision of destitution relief for failed asylum-seekers the most common form of support. 32

“These are our ghost people. Invisible and disappeared. Thousands of refused asylum seekers are alone and adrift with nothing at all, nowhere to live and banned from working. They are not accidental victims, but deliberately made destitute to starve them back to a land to which they cannot return. Their suffering is designed by successive governments as a public deterrence to would-be arrivals.” 33

27) In 2015, one provider, the Red Cross, provided destitution services (food, clothing, small amounts of cash) to 9,000 people. Reporting a 10% increase in the number of destitute service-users in the first three months of 2016, the Red Cross Director of Refugee Support, reported, ‘These figures show that people who seek safety in the UK after fleeing conflict and persecution are increasingly at risk of becoming destitute in the most literal sense of the word’. 34

28) As a refugee support worker expresses it, ‘The UK’s attitude towards refugees has become, on the whole, bitter and extremely nasty. The hardest thing about working at a charity for asylum seekers is seeing the increase in numbers of very vulnerable people who are destitute and starving, with no rights to work or claim benefits and nowhere to live, leaving them dependent on charities like ours and vulnerable to being exploited’. 35

29) When the plight of refused asylum seekers was considered by the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Human Rights in 2007 it concluded that ‘the Government has indeed been practising a deliberate policy of destitution of this highly vulnerable group. We believe that the deliberate use of inhumane treatment is unacceptable. We have seen instances in all cases where the Government’s treatment of asylum seekers and refused asylum seekers falls below the requirements of the common law of humanity and of international human rights law. The policy of enforced destitution must cease’. 36 In fact there has been no amelioration since the 2007 critique. Enforced destitution continues to be used, in violation of international human rights instruments, as an instrument of public policy in a vain attempt to drive failed asylum-seekers into returning to their country of origin. 37

30) Even within its own terms, the policy of enforced destitution fails. The great majority of failed asylum seekers will not return, cannot return, or are unreturnable. Having fled war, civil war, inter-ethnic conflict, political or religious persecution, or other severe human rights violations, they have endured an odyssey they are unwilling and unable to reverse. Most prefer destitution in the UK to the life-threatening circumstances in the country of return. 38 Most do not have the resources or travel documents to return. 39 UKBA’s own attempts at forced removal, often after lengthy detention, frequently fail because of the impossibility of re-documentation and the refusal of destination nations to recognise returnees as their own nationals. 40

31) The ‘Still Human Still Here’ response to a 2015 Home Office consultation cited the Home Office’s own research as showing the ineffectiveness of enforced destitution in coercing failed asylum seekers to return to their country of origin. Indeed it indicated that closing off all support and accommodation undermined immigration control by removing the incentive to stay in touch with the authorities and led to failed asylum seekers going underground
and ceasing to report. Home Office staff themselves proposed that refused asylum seekers be left in their accommodation until removable from the UK.41

32) The signatory organisations to this submission testify that the informal and uncertain patchwork of voluntary sector resources they help to provide in the absence of governmental provision is inadequate to satisfy essential needs, depriving vulnerable people of their human rights under United Nations treaties and conventions and driving some into desperate survival strategies such as begging, illegal working, exploitative relationships, and prostitution.42

Recommendations

The Government should:

1. Provide a level of statutory support for failed asylum seekers adequate to sustain essential human needs, including food and shelter, until they either return to their country of origin or receive leave to remain in the UK.

2. Grant limited leave to remain to individuals who cannot be returned.

3. Make primary and secondary healthcare free and available to all asylum seekers, as in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland.

4. Ensure the effective implementation of UPR recommendations through the establishment, by the time of a mid-term assessment of the current UPR cycle, of a permanent governmental mechanism to liaise with relevant ministries and consult with Civil Society, NHRI’s and all relevant stakeholders.
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