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Produced by the Local Government Data Unit ~ Wales
Introduction

This report sets out the findings and conclusions from a short piece of research undertaken by the Local Government Data Unit ~ Wales (Data Unit) on behalf of the Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) and the Welsh Strategic Migration Partnership (WSMP), and funded by Welsh Government.

The research examined the support provided by local authorities and other organisations to those with ‘No Recourse to Public Funds’ (NRPF) in Wales who experience gender based violence, domestic abuse and sexual violence (GBVDASV). During the course of the research the Violence against Women, Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence (Wales) Act 2015 received Royal Assent on 29 April 2015. This Act seeks to improve arrangements for the prevention of gender based violence, domestic abuse and sexual violence; to improve arrangements for the protection of victims of such abuse and violence; to improve support for people affected by such abuse and violence. The research did not extend to this Act due to timing.

It was intended that the research would begin to address recommendations made around NRPF in the report, ‘Uncharted Territory’¹ and provide pointers to areas for further in-depth research or follow up activity.

Background

No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) is an area of non-devolved policy that is the responsibility of the Home Office and the UK Visas and Immigration (UKVI).

It is a condition imposed on someone due to their immigration status. Section 115 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 states that a person will have 'No Recourse to Public Funds' if they are 'subject to immigration control'. Someone who is 'subject to immigration control’ meets one of the following conditions:

- needs leave to remain in the UK, but does not have it; or
- has leave to remain, but is subject to a No Recourse to Public Funds restriction; or
- has leave to remain on a maintenance undertaking; or
- is waiting for the outcome of an appeal.

1 **No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF)**

No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) legislation affects people with insecure immigration status and can make finding support such as access to a refuge very difficult, because income support or housing benefit is the usual method of funding these services. This can lead to people being given the choice of remaining in abusive situations or becoming homeless.

If a person with NRPF becomes destitute (for example, fleeing an abusive situation) they might turn to a community organisation, a non-governmental organisation (NGO) such as Bawso2 or their local social services department for support. Support from a local authority provided under community care and children’s legislation is not classed as public funding (however some categories of migrants are excluded from receiving such support). A local authority may have a duty to provide accommodation and/or subsistence support to:

- an adult with a need for ‘care and attention’ under s.21 (1)(a) National Assistance Act 1948;
- a pregnant or nursing mother in need of care and attention under s.21 (1)(aa) National Assistance Act 1948;
- a family, if there is a child in need under s.17 of the Children Act 1989; and
- a young person who has been looked after by the local authority, under s.23-24 of the Children Act 1989.

The following services are not regarded as ‘public funds’ for immigration purposes:

- social services care and support;
- compulsory school age state education;
- student grants or loans;
- NHS treatment; and
- certain work-related welfare benefits.

A person with NRPF is not prohibited from accessing these services. However, they would need to satisfy the eligibility criteria applicable to the relevant service.

---

2 www.bawso.org.uk
2 Guidance to local authorities

Because of its non-devolved status, NRPF policy is the responsibility of the UK government and not the Welsh Government. Consequently, there is no Wales specific guidance available to local authorities on their duties and legal restrictions regarding supporting people with NRPF. However, the WLGA endorsed the NRPF Network Practice Guidance\(^3\) in 2011, although it is not known how widely this guidance is used. Also, the legislation and policy around NRPF is dynamic and complex and with frequent developments in case law.

Public bodies are not financially compensated for the costs of supporting NRPF cases by the Home Office. Also, it is not currently clear how many local authorities in Wales are supporting people with NRPF, the number and types of cases or the level of spend on this activity. Only one local authority in Wales, Newport, is a member of the NRPF Connect Project which is a system for monitoring NRPF numbers and costs and can support engagement between local authorities and the Home Office (UKVI) in order to resolve people’s cases.

3 'Uncharted Territory’

The research report 'Uncharted Territory - violence against migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women in Wales'\(^4\) highlights that asylum-seeking, migrant and refugee women can face higher levels of violence than native-born women due to a variety of factors, such as age, language barriers, vulnerability, isolation and poverty.

Their vulnerability can be exacerbated by their immigration status, which may limit their entitlement to support and services. The report highlights that although immigration policy on NRPF is a non-devolved issue, the impacts of supporting those with NRPF is most obvious in devolved services and services provided by public bodies and the third sector, and leaves many women and girls outside the framework of protection.

\(^3\) NRPF Network Practice Guidance for Local Authorities Assessing and Supporting Children and Families and former looked after children who have NRPF for support under the Children Act 1989


Methodology

A full description of the methodology can be found in Annex A.

4 Research bid

The Welsh Local Government Association (WLGA) and the Wales Strategic Migration Partnership (WSMP) submitted a bid for funding to the Welsh Government to commission a piece of research on how NRPF affects those experiencing or fleeing gender based violence, domestic abuse and sexual violence (GBVDASV) in Wales.

The WLGA and the WSMP commissioned the Local Government Data Unit ~ Wales (Data Unit) to undertake this work. The following outcomes were agreed for the research:

- understand the number of adults and children with NRPF status who are experiencing violence and abuse and seeking local authority support;
- understand and highlight the cost to local authorities of supporting those with NRPF;
- understand the level of awareness within local authorities and NGOs around NRPF;
- identify and share good and innovative practice;
- understand where more support and guidance is required; and
- provide evidence to underpin future work on NRPF in Wales.

WSMP, working with relevant partners, will consider the findings of this research and draw wider conclusions on policy and practice.

5 Validity of findings and conclusions

Local authority interviews

All 22 local authorities were contacted and invited to contribute to this research. Ten local authorities replied and eight were interviewed in March 2015. The interview framework is shown in Annex B.

During the design of the methodology, it was recognised that it may be difficult to obtain robust data around the number of cases and presentations received by local authorities. However, the research would aim to get ‘a feel’ for the number of cases and presentations, and how these impacted on local authority services.

In terms of coverage for the research and using data from the 2013 Annual Population Survey, the local authorities interviewed contain 1.4 million people, 45% of the total population of Wales. These authorities also contain 91,000 people from a non-white background (mixed, Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British, Chinese or other ethnic group), which is 74% of the total non-white background population in Wales.

Some of the quantitative data received was highlighted by organisations as possibly not being fully robust.

Online survey

Through mailing lists held by the WSMP and other partner organisations, a number of organisations were signposted to an online survey. Six organisations completed the survey. This included women’s aid organisations, a housing charity and a family crisis support organisation. Although not an NGO, the Gwent

http://www.infobasecymru.net/IAS/themes/people
Education Minority Ethnic Service (a statutory, schools based service) responded to the online survey and their response has been included in the findings.

**Bawso**

Bawso is an all Wales, Welsh Government accredited support provider, delivering specialist services to people from Black and Ethnic Minority backgrounds who are affected by domestic abuse and other forms of violence against women.

The early local authority interviews reinforced the key role Bawso plays in providing support to those presenting as NRPF and survivors of gender based violence, domestic abuse and sexual violence (GBVDASV). Bawso was invited to contribute to the research study and was interviewed using the NGO online survey questions as a template (Annex C).

Many of the presentations reported by Bawso will be referrals from other agencies, reinforcing that there will be duplication in the numbers of cases reported in this study. Given the scale of the support given by Bawso, and the likely overlap with the numbers reported by other agencies where appropriate, its support arrangements and numbers are reported separately.
Figure 1: Local authorities that participated in this research
Findings

While the number of respondents was perhaps lower than was hoped, those who were interviewed appeared to be well-placed to provide a picture of activity in their organisations.

Those that were interviewed were knowledgeable about the subject and gave some confidence in their ability to provide full responses on behalf of their organisations. However, one or two interviewees said they were ‘uncertain’ about the completeness of their responses to some questions. For example, because of their role, some authority interviewees were very well-placed to respond regarding cases involving children or safeguarding issues. Others were particularly well-placed to provide details of support which involved situations of people experiencing ‘domestic abuse’.

It was not possible within the timescale and budget, to gain a definitive picture of local authority NRPF costs, practice and situations of people experiencing GBVDASV in Wales. Furthermore, it was recognised that the questions in both the structured interviews and the online survey were ambitious, particularly with respect to the qualitative information being sought. The lack of detailed information which could be provided, including quantitative data, was a common feature across most of the participating organisations, with the exception of Bawso. While this has diminished the detail of our findings, it is an important key finding in itself.

6 Data and recording of presentations

Local authorities

Many of the local authorities interviewed stated that at the time of the interview they had received very few or no NRPF presentations in 2014-15. Additionally, a number of local authorities also stated they could not recall any presentations in previous years either.

The authority reporting the largest number identified at least seven cases in the last two years where support was given to individuals or families who were NRPF. Its cases included eight adults and eight children of varying ages, from newborns to teenagers. They reported that one of these cases involved GBVDASV.

Local authorities interviewed reported that, in most instances, they did not have a bespoke system for recording and collating information on NRPF presentations. As a result, many of the interviewees could not be certain about how many NRPF presentations their local authority had, either in the current financial year or previously. Some authorities reported that they had systems that would be capable of recording such cases if such information were needed.

A key issue around understanding the numbers of NRPF cases and their recording is around the various service areas within a local authority that could be dealing with, or leading on, NRPF. This will often be dependent on the circumstances of each case. Some local authorities who took part said that presentations could be recorded by Adults’ Social Services, or Children’s Services, or both. Some interviewees thought most cases would go though a central person/point and be recorded. However, it was not clear that cases recorded separately would be collated to provide a local authority picture.

Where children are involved, some local authorities reported that all new cases would be passed through a nominated post, a Safeguarding Manager for instance, but that there was not always a mechanism for formally recording that the cases were NRPF.
One local authority used its social care client recording system to record the NRPF cases it receives. This system would also identify which if any of the cases involved ‘domestic abuse’, although nothing specific about other types of NRPF presentations. This authority reported three cases in 2014-15, all family units, with 14 children involved (seven male children and seven female children). The interviewee was aware anecdotally that there had been one NRPF case involving a failed asylum-seeker, although this did not appear on its formal recording system.

Another authority reported that cases of NRPF involving domestic violence or abuse in its area would be recorded by an external provider of support. That authority confirmed it had received no such cases in the past two years.

The Minority Ethnic Education Service, which works across the five local authorities in the Gwent region, worked with children in 12 separate family units who were NRPF in 2014-15.

As discussed above, the recording of cases appears to be patchy and inconsistent across local authorities. Only two of the local authorities interviewed were able to confirm they had formal recording mechanisms for identifying NRPF cases. These systems were not comprehensive in terms of their coverage of cases or the level of detail recorded, when judged against the information being sought in this study.

**NGOs (excluding Bawso)**

The NGOs that responded to the online survey also reported involvement in a higher number of NRPF cases, than those reported by local authorities.

In 2014-15, the NGOs who responded had around 24 people in seven family units present with NRPF, of which ten of these people were subsequently supported by them.

The NGOs who recorded cases stated that these covered individuals from the following countries:

Bangladesh, Afghanistan, the Philippines, Africa (sic), the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Russia, Lithuania, Pakistan, Iraq, Gambia, Thailand and Iran.

As reported above the same family unit could be recorded as an NRPF presentation by both a local authority and several NGOs.

**Bawso**

Bawso reported keeping comprehensive records of the NRPF presentations it receives, including a range of information about the survivors and any family members. It recorded that 145 individuals (many with families) had presented as NRPF and a survivor of GBVDASV in 2014-15. The organisation was able to support 67 of these.

Of the 67 individuals who were supported, four were male and 63 were female. 27 of the 67 did not have accompanying family. Of the 40 individuals who presented with families, 60 children were supported along with them.

Of the 67 supported, 23 were supported under the Destitution Domestic Violence (DDV) concession. Six of these 23 ‘cases’ were recorded as still open as at 31 March 2015.

The age of the individuals are shown in Figure 2.
The individuals were asked to give their ethnicity. This was grouped to give the categories shown in Figure 3.

**Figure 3: Originating area of GBVDASV survivors supported by Bawso, 2014-15**

![Originating area of GBVDASV survivors](image)

Source: Bawso

The local authority area of each individual is shown in Table 1

**Table 1: Local authority area at time of presentations of GBVDASV survivors supported by Bawso, 2014-15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthenshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bawso
Bawso also recorded the source of referral for these individuals. This is shown in Figure 4 where ‘Other’ includes those referred by Health Visitors, Solicitors and family and friends.

**Figure 4: Referral source of GBVDA survivors supported by Bawso, 2014-15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawso project referral</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority (inc Social Services)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Women’s Aid</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self referral</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Bawso*

Out of the 67 supported; 46 were supported in secure accommodation and 21 through floating support and outreach. Out of the 46 supported in secure accommodation; 23 were supported under the DDV concession; 15 supported by social services; eight were supported by Bawso.

In terms of outcomes, of the 23 supported under DDV:
- 12 received indefinite leave to remain;
- one received limited leave to remain for one year;
- four returned to the ‘perpetrator’ before the application was made; and
- six cases remained ‘open’ at year end.

Of the 78 cases presented which Bawso did not support:
- 21 were limited to requests for advice and guidance;
- 14 were asylum-seekers sign posted to other support;
- nine were on student visas;
- seven were ‘over stayers’; and
- 27 were not supported due to a lack of space and therefore sign posted to other women’s aid organisations.

7 **Local authority interviews**

*Who manages NRPF work?*

The responsibility for managing or coordinating NRPF work within the participating local authorities is spread across a number of different areas and roles.

In some instances, the interviewee had an established personal interest in NRPF and covered this area in the absence of other colleagues filling this role.

Locally some individuals hold significant knowledge and play a pivotal role in leading on the provision of advice and support on NRPF cases. Although not explored in any detail in this research, it is unclear what the impact would be on
support provision if these individuals were absent (e.g. being on extended absence or leaving the authority).

**Awareness across local authority staff of NRPF**

Most interviewees were confident that they had colleagues in appropriate posts who shared some knowledge and understanding of NRPF policy. However, they also felt that the overall awareness of NRPF across other colleagues/service areas was not as good as it could, or should, be.

Some interviewees were unsure if all colleagues knew where they could seek advice and support on NRPF, or who to notify if they came across a case that involved NRPF. This fact could lead to NRPF cases not being identified as such, and contributes to the general uncertainty (in many cases) around the number of cases a local authority has seen.

**Training and guidance**

From the interviews, it appears that local authorities are currently providing little or no training or specific support to staff around NRPF. Some authorities indicated that training had been provided previously, but that it has either now been surpassed by changes in guidance or legislation, or the staff who received it had moved on.

Some members of staff in Welsh local authorities maintain links with the London Borough of Islington, which has a history of leading on NRPF work. This includes receiving newsletters and updates, and having a point of contact for questions and queries regarding NRPF policy. Some authorities pointed to the availability of training from Bawso.

While in some cases staff training was not ‘up to date’, none of the interviewees identified the lack of training as a significant issue, and some pointed out that training in other areas of social services work (Children in Need for instance) would cover some aspects of NRPF policy.

**Working with other organisations**

All local authorities highlighted that they worked closely with NGOs operating in their local area. Some were able to provide examples where this work has a formal structure, with constituted groups and regular, multi-agency meetings. For instance, in Newport there is an Asylum Seekers Practitioners Group which discusses case loads and shares information between agencies and organisations across the public, private and third sectors.

Local authorities told us that they signpost NRPF cases to specialist organisations if they are not able to provide support.

Two local authorities commented on the lack of a national group or framework through which local authorities could share best practice, receive information and guidance from Home Office or Welsh Government and support each other around NRPF policy.

One local authority reported regularly collaborating with, and receiving advice from, the Home Office often on individual cases. Such liaison was not reported across the other local authorities interviewed.

**Awareness of Destitution Domestic Violence (DDV) concession**

The DDV concession is available to people on spousal visas. It excludes some categories, for example, those married to EU nationals or in marriages which are not legally recognised in the UK. For those who are eligible to apply, the DDV concession allows them to claim public funds and benefits whilst applying to settle in the UK. Without the DDV concession, they would not be able to access public funds.
All interviewees except one were aware of the DDV concession. More widely, awareness of the DDV concession was thought to be mixed across the participating local authorities.

Some interviewees felt that very few other colleagues in their local authority would be aware of the concession and how it could affect NRPF cases. However, there were mixed views as to whether this was an issue or not. Some interviewees stated that because all NRPF cases would come to their attention anyway, a lack of awareness of the DDV concession by other staff would not affect the service provided.

Another interviewee stated that they thought all NGOs in the local area would be aware of the DDV concession, and that they would be the more appropriate provider for DDV concession support.

**WLGA endorsed guidance on NRPF**

Of the eight local authorities interviewed, only two interviewees had no knowledge of the NRPF Network Practice Guidance which had been endorsed by the WLGA. However, those interviewees that were aware of the guidance felt that wider awareness within their local authority could be improved.

**Cost of supporting NRPF cases**

The responses provided only limited information on the costs to local authorities of providing support to NRPF cases. For a number of authorities with no recorded NRPF cases, they had no record of associated costs.

One local authority reported the annual cost of providing support was £23,000. Another authority reported that the cost of providing support for one NRPF case for nine months had been over £11,000.

8 **Non-governmental organisations (NGOs)**

**Range of support provided**

Bawso has no formal remit or funding for supporting individuals who have NRPF status and are experiencing GBV/DASV. However, it provides a range of support to such individuals and their families including:

- advice, guidance and advocacy support;
- emotional support;
- help to access legal support/solicitor;
- monetary support; and
- accommodation.

Four places in Bawso refuges are earmarked specifically for NRPF survivors. Its support tends to be for survivors who fall outside the entitlement to other support.

A similar range of support is offered by other NGOs to NRPF cases including:

- accommodation in refuges and safe houses;
- outreach and 1:1 support;
- the provision of interpreters and translators; and
- signposting and advocacy.

Where NGOs provided support to cases where individuals were eligible for the DDV concession, this support included:

- foodbank parcels;
- bus passes and travel concession;
- free access to local authority leisure facilities; and
- language tuition and lessons.
Cost of supporting NRPF cases

Most NGOs who responded were unable to provide accurate costs for the support they provided in 2014-15. One was able to use detailed records to provide an average monthly cost per survivor supported of £1,471.

Training and guidance

Bawso provides training to its staff on NRPF. This forms part of the initial induction programme for new staff within the organisation.

According to survey responses, no specific NRPF training or guidance had been provided by other NGOs to their staff in the last year.

One NGO stated that its staff had attended training on forced marriage, human trafficking and domestic abuse from a BME perspective, all of which had a link to NRPF.

Working with other organisations

Bawso works with the Home Office and a range of other agencies including local authorities across Wales. Two other NGOs named Bawso as their main external contact for support and collaboration when working on NRPF cases or policy. Another NGO mentioned the 'Southall Black Sisters' advice line as a source of support and advice.

9 Other comments

A range of additional comments were received from local authorities and NGOs that were not covered elsewhere in the telephone interviews or online survey. These are included below (they have not been edited):

- Guidance and support at a national level on policy and legislation was missing. A number of respondents thought that more could be done, either from the UK Government or the Welsh Government, to provide more support and advice to organisations on how to deal with NRPF.
- The cost and complexity of supporting NRPF cases can be very high. Emergency accommodation and interpreters are expensive, and organisations are having to manage with too few staff and an over-demand for services. Cases have to be prioritised, and this can lead to some cases being prioritised over others.
- It would be helpful to have a toolkit developed to support staff better assess for, and identify, NRPF cases.
- NRPF extends to an inability for agencies (specifically the UK Border Agency) to provide support to failed asylum seekers. This means between their application being rejected and their deportation date, many individuals are at risk of being left destitute.

6 http://www.southallblacksisters.org.uk/
Summary and areas for further work

It was an ambitious aim of the research to obtain information on the numbers of adults and children with NRPF status who are experiencing abuse and who seek local authority support, and the associated costs of providing that support. The fact that local authorities were in the main unable to provide this information is a key finding in itself. On NRPF presentations more generally, local authorities do not all routinely have robust estimates of the numbers seeking their support.

Bawso maintains robust and detailed information about survivors with NRPF status that present to them and that they subsequently support. Although recognised as a key player in the provision of support, they may not see all cases. Nevertheless, there is robust information on minimum levels of presentations and support, including detailed characteristics, the numbers of children involved and the numbers who are able to pursue the DDV concession.

While the lack of well developed recording systems is a key finding, the solution may not be straightforward. Our research suggests that a key challenge will be joining up the various parts of local government to paint a complete picture. As this was a short, time limited study it sought one nominated lead officer (or in some cases officers) to take part in the interviews. The service areas from which these officers came varied (domestic abuse support team, families and safe guarding, migration leads etc.). While some had consulted other colleagues, it was not always possible to get a comprehensive picture from one interview. Similarly, it is to be expected that the range of service areas involved in supporting survivors will mean challenges in terms of providing comprehensive data on such cases.

Further work would need to be undertaken to understand if there is value in introducing a common recording system. It is not clear how this could be justified for authorities with few or no NRPF presentations. How such a system would work across, or integrate with, existing systems, such as social care systems which are currently used to identify NRPF cases, is also a consideration. Work would also need to be undertaken to define what should be recorded.

Similarly further work would be needed to define how local authorities should estimate the costs of supporting NRPF cases. We were given limited examples of the external cost of support suggesting these were not routinely maintained in authorities. Local authorities did not offer estimates of the internal costs of delivering advice. The question remains, would this be useful to know?

Linked, in part, to the recording issue is the role of individuals and lead officers and the important role they play in providing support. This issue and the sustainability of current arrangements might need to be pursued further. Questions to consider might include:

- how realistic is it to have a single authority lead officer for NRPF?
- where should such a lead be placed e.g. social services?
- what should the lead role involve and how would it be supported both internally and externally?
- is there a risk associated with much of the knowledge and expertise being held by just one or two individuals in an authority?

The awareness of NRPF policy (and related policies) across local authorities is mixed. Whilst all participants to this research appeared to have a significant technical and practical knowledge, this did not necessarily extend to colleagues, either within the same team or in other teams or departments within the local authority.
While authorities appeared to be clear on their responsibilities, it might be worth exploring further whether these are indeed clear and consistent across authorities. One example provided was where a survivor received significant support from one local authority, but was refused support from another when he/she moved, despite his/her status and circumstances remaining unchanged. There may also be inconsistencies in the approach of local authorities to supporting survivors who may be covered by the DDV concession. While authorities reported an awareness of the DDV concession, it is not clear if this is universal or whether approaches are consistent. Some local authorities may be supporting applications, while others suggest they are immediately signposting survivors to NGOs. Bawso reported that in around 50% of referrals it received, where the DDV concession could have been pursued, the referring organisation had not done so.

While responses around training and skills were not definitive, further work with local authorities, other public sector organisations and NGOs could be conducted to identify what further information, support and training they want from the Home Office and the Welsh Government, and how this can best be resourced and provided.

A number of local authorities (and some NGO respondents) advocated the need for more guidance and support from the Home Office and the Welsh Government on the NRPF policy area. In addition to following this up it may be worth exploring whether there is a need and a desire for a national group or network to be set up through which all parties with an interest in NRPF could meet.
Annex A - methodology

It was agreed that both local authorities and NGOs should contribute to this research. Their different roles and the information they would be able to provide meant that bespoke approaches would be required to allow them to participate.

For local authorities, letters were sent to the Directors of Adults’ and Children’s Social Services outlining the research and asking them to identify and nominate the best placed officers in their authorities to participate in a structured telephone interview. The questions for this interview are shown in Annex B.

The interviews focused on gaining quantitative and qualitative information. Where questions asked for quantitative responses, answers were asked to cover the 2014-15 financial year only (1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015).

However, in constructing the structured interview questions, it was felt that many local authorities would either have none or very few cases presenting to them in the timeframe, or would not be in a position to provide robust answers because of weaknesses in the recording systems they used for NRPF.

WSMP and the Data Unit decided to still collect information where it existed and also report on instances where local authorities were unable to collate this information. Part of the research methodology included identifying the level of awareness of NRPF and this includes where local authorities are unable to count the number of presentations or cases they receive.

NGOs are less restricted by legislation to provide support to NRPF and were felt to be more likely to receive presentations and cases. This includes instances where local authorities would signpost cases that they could not accept. Because of this, alternative questions were developed, and because of the potential for more responses, an online survey was developed. This was deployed and awareness raised through emails to national and local organisations who distributed this on behalf of WSMP and the Data Unit.

The online survey was in the field for three weeks during February and March 2015. In addition, large national organisations were contacted directly to ensure their participation in the research.

The early local authority interviews reinforced the key role Bawso plays in providing support to those presenting as NRPF and as a survivor of GBV/DASV. Bawso was asked to contribute to the research study and was interviewed using the NGO online survey questions as a template.

The Data Unit would like to thank Dr Mwenya Chimba and Dr Jo Payton for their support in question development.

A copy of the online survey can be found in Annex C.
Annex B – interview framework for local authorities

1. How are you involved in NRPF work within your local authority?

2. Does your organisation record data on NRPF referrals?

3. Of the people presenting as NRPF, how many were:
   a. Survivors of GBVDASV
   b. Spousal visas
   c. Failed asylum seekers
   d. Survivors refused Section 4

4. How many survivors of gender-based violence, domestic abuse or sexual violence (GBVDASV) affected by NRPF has your organisation supported in the last 12 months?
   - Single adults
   - Family units (adults and children)
   - Unaccompanied Asylum seeking children (UASC)
   a. Have there been instances where you have not been able to provide support to survivors of GBVDASV affected by NRPF?

5. What is the profile of the adults’ and children supported by your organisation in the last 12 months?
   - Ethnicity/nationality
   - Gender and age
   - Family groups (number of children)

6. How much money have you spent supporting these survivors by service area?
   - Adults’ services
   - Children’s services
   - Other services

7. Of all the survivors you have dealt with in the last 12 months that are now ‘closed’, what was the outcome?
   - Resolved
   - Granted status
   - Refused
   - Removed from the UK
   - Dispersed/moved to other LA area

8. How do you currently provide support to survivors with NRPF?
   a. Do you have a dedicated NRPF officer in your local authority/organisation?
   b. Is this work a ‘formal’ part of someone’s role in your local authority/organisation?
9. Is your organisation aware of the statutory guidance for local authorities, endorsed by the WLGA, covering NRPF policy in England and Wales?
   a. If so, how do you use the guidance?

10. Does your local authority have internal policies and training in place to support staff dealing with people with NRPF?
   a. How widely are these policies known?
   b. What does this support look like?
   c. Who has provided training/advice to you/your organisation on NRPF?

11. Do you work with other local authorities/NGOs to provide support to women with NRPF?
   a. If so, with whom?
   b. What do you share? How do you work together?

12. Are staff in your organisation aware of the Destitution Domestic Violence (DDV) concession (DDV is only available to persons on partner visas to claim public funds benefits while applying to settle in the UK because of domestic violence)?
   a. If so, how are staff aware of this DDV concession?
   b. Do staff inform survivors of the concession?
   c. Do staff assist with completion of paperwork for the concession, including evidentiary requirements (photos of injuries, providing statements, etc.)?
   d. Does your organisation provide financial or other support to survivors during the application process?

13. Could you provide us with numbers where you have been able, or not able, to provide support to NRPF survivors of GBV/DA/SV?

14. Can you provide numbers of victims you encounter who have NRPF but are not eligible for DDV?

15. Can you provide us with case study examples of when you have not been able to provide support?

16. Do you have examples of best practice, innovation or collaborative working that your organisation is involved in that we could use in our report?

17. Is there any support or guidance that you would like that isn’t currently provided?

18. Is there anything that we haven’t covered that you would like to add?
Annex C – online survey for non-governmental organisations

Your organisation

1: Your organisation:

2: Does your organisation work with people with NRPF?

Please tick one option only

☐ ☐
Yes No

If you answered "No" to question 2 then:

Thank you for your time.

At present we only require information from organisations who work with people with NRPF.

3: Does your organisation have a formal remit or receive funding to work with people with NRPF?

Please tick one option only

☐ ☐
Yes No
Some of the following questions ask you to provide numerical answers. If you do not have records that allow you to provide a specific and accurate answer, please give your best estimate and explain how accurate your answer is.

We understand that some organisations will not have detailed records of their work with NRPF. In these instances, your answers are still of interest to us.

4: Please describe the support that your organisation provides to survivors of GBV/ASV with NRPF:

5: How many people presenting as NRPF who are *not* survivors of GBV/ASV has your organisation seen in this financial year?

6: How many people presenting as NRPF who *are* survivors of GBV/ASV has your organisation seen in this financial year?

7: How many people presenting as NRPF who *are* survivors of GBV/ASV has your organisation *been able to support* in this financial year?

---

How many of the survivors of GBV/ASV affected by NRPF that your organisation supported in this financial year were...

8: a) Single adults
8: b) Family units (adults and children)

8: c) Unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC) or former UASC

What is the profile of the adults and children supported by your organisation in this financial year? Please describe them in terms of their...

9: a) Ethnicity/nationality

9: b) Gender and age

Of the people supported by your organisation as NRPF in this financial year, approximately how many were...

10: a) Spousal visas
10: b) Failed asylum seekers

10: c) Refused Section 4 support

10: d) On a work permit (points-based system)

10: e) Other circumstances

---PAGE BREAK---

11: How much money has your organisation spent supporting survivors of GBVDASV in this financial year?

---PAGE BREAK---

12: Have there been instances where you have not been able to provide support to survivors of GBVDASV affected by NRPF who have presented to your organisation in this financial year?

Please tick one option only

☐ Yes    ☐ No

---PAGE BREAK---
If you answered "No" to question 12 then go to question 17

13: Please provide examples of why you have *not* been able to provide support to survivors of GBV/DASV affected by NRPF who have presented to your organisation in this financial year?

Of the cases that have been resolved in this financial year, approximately how many fit these outcomes:

15: a) Granted status

15: b) Refused
15: c) Removed from the UK

15: d) Dispersed/moved to another local authority area

----------------------------------------------PAGE BREAK---------------------------------------

16: Of the cases that have been resolved in this financial year, can you estimate how long they took to close (to the nearest number of months):

----------------------------------------------PAGE BREAK---------------------------------------

**Destitution Domestic Violence concession**

The Destitution Domestic Violence (DDV) concession is only available to persons on partner visas to claim public funds/benefits while applying to settle in the UK because of domestic violence.

17: Are staff in your organisation aware of this DDV concession?

Please tick one option only

☐ ☐

Yes

No

----------------------------------------------PAGE BREAK---------------------------------------

*If you answered "No" to question 17 then go to question 24*

18: Do staff inform survivors of the DDV concession?
Please tick one option only

☐ ☐
Yes No

19: Do staff assist with completion of paperwork for the DDV concession, including evidentiary requirements (photos of injuries, providing statements, etc.)?

Please tick one option only

☐ ☐
Yes No

20: Does your organisation provide financial or other support to survivors during the DDV application process?

Please tick one option only

☐ ☐
Yes No

If you answered "No" to question 20 then go to question 24

21: Please describe what this support to survivors during the DDV application process looks like:


22: Approximately how many survivors have you encountered who have NRPF but are not eligible for DDV in this financial year?
23: Can you provide us with examples of situations where survivors of GBVDASV were not eligible for DDV?

Policies, training and collaboration

24: Does your organisation have internal policies and training in place to support people with NRPF?

Please tick one option only

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If you answered "No" to question 24 then go to question 26

25: Please can you give further information about your organisation's policies and training in place to support people with NRPF?

26: Do you work with other organisations, for instance local authorities and voluntary sector organisations, to provide support to survivors with NRPF?

Please tick one option only

☐ Yes  ☐ No
If you answered "No" to question 26 then go to question 28

27: Please can you list the other organisations and give further information about your work with them?

28: Do you have examples of best practice, innovation or collaborative working in the area of NRPF that your organisation is involved in?

29: Do you have anything further you would like to tell us about working with survivors of GBVDASV or NRPF policy in Wales?

Future contact

We may wish to contact respondents for further information about some of their answers.

30: Would you be willing for us to contact you?

Please tick one option only

☐ Yes ☐ No
If you answered "No" to question 30 then go to end

Thank you, please provide your contact details:

31. Your name

32: Your telephone number

43. Email: ________________________________________________
   Retype your email_________________________________________
Annex D – participating local authorities and non-governmental organisations

**Local authorities:**
- Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council
- Cardiff Council
- Denbighshire County Council
- Newport City Council
- Powys County Council
- City and County of Swansea
- Carmarthenshire County Council
- Wrexham County Borough Council

Gwent Minority Ethnic Education support

**Non-governmental organisations:**
- Bawso
- Hafan Cymru
- Montgomeryshire Family Crisis Centre
- Swansea Women’s Aid
- Port Talbot and Afan Women’s Aid
- Welsh Women’s Aid
The Data Unit is part of the local government family in Wales. We have long-standing, trusted and direct working relationships with local government. For many years we have been supporting the drive for improvement through a range of products and services specifically designed for local government. Many of these have also been used to support improvement in other public and private sector organisations.

Our range of specialist services is designed to help you find and use information effectively.

For more information visit [www.dataunitwales.gov.uk](http://www.dataunitwales.gov.uk) or call 029 2090 9500.