

## THE PATH TO CITIZENSHIP: NEXT STEPS IN REFORMING THE IMMIGRATION SYSTEM CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

FEBRUARY 2008

Completed consultation proformas should be sent no later than 14th May to the following address.

Electronic:

[ImmigrationReform@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:ImmigrationReform@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk)

By post:

Immigration Reform Consultation Responses  
Border and Immigration Agency  
11th Floor  
Apollo House  
36 Wellesley Road  
Croydon CR9 3RR

<b>DATE</b>	11 May 2008
<b>NAME</b>	Gary Christie
<b>ORGANISATION</b>	Scottish Refugee Council
<b>CONTACT DETAILS</b> (EG POSTAL ADDRESS/ E-MAIL/TEL. NUMBER)	5 Cadogan Square (170 Blythswood Court) Glasgow, G2 7PH Tel: 0141 248 9799 E-mail: <a href="mailto:gary.christie@scottishrefugeecouncil.org.uk">gary.christie@scottishrefugeecouncil.org.uk</a>

### CHAPTER 3: THREE ROUTES TO CITIZENSHIP AND THREE STAGES IN THE JOURNEY

**1. ARE ALL PARTS OF THE SYSTEM SET OUT IN CHAPTER 3 (I.E. THE THREE ROUTES TO CITIZENSHIP AND THE THREE STAGES IN THE JOURNEY) CLEAR AND EASY TO UNDERSTAND?**

- Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

**If you have answered no, please state what part of the system you think is not clear and easy to understand. (free response)**

The general assumption of the Green Paper suggests that the current path to citizenship is unclear and is difficult

for the general public to understand. The Green Paper presents no substantive evidence to prove this. It does make reference to nine 'public listening events' across the country where views were sought from members of the public on key immigration issues. However, no reference is made to whether the public found the current route difficult to understand or whether they believed it was complex. The Green Paper is suggesting radical policy changes which will impact greatly on the lives of those granted protection in the UK. Such proposals must be qualified by objective evidence.

We are unable to comprehend how these changes will increase clarity as we do not understand the concerns put forward in the Green Paper about the complexity of the current system. The current 'path to citizenship' has three stages (temporary residency, then permanent residency, then (if desired) application for citizenship after one year's permanent residency). The proposed system will replace these three stages with three stages of its own which in our view increases complexity rather than reduces it: temporary residence, another period of temporary residence (with different entitlements dependent on migration route), then options to apply for either citizenship after a varying period (minimum of one year) dependent on a number of qualifying factors or permanent residency after a varying period (minimum of three years) dependent on a number of factors.

It should be noted here that the path to citizenship is actually a four-stage process as the above does not include the period of temporary admission that refugees undergo whilst awaiting the determination of their claim. This is an important factor as it would significantly extend the period of time that refugees are in the UK before an application for citizenship or permanent residency could be made.

Currently, refugees and those granted Humanitarian Protection are granted temporary leave to remain for 5 years upon recognition of their status. It continues to be unclear how their protection needs will be reassessed after this 5-year period. How will UKBA conduct these reviews of ongoing protection needs? What are the criteria and timescales for these reviews? The Green Paper sheds no light on this despite this being an integral part of the proposals. In order for us to fully discuss the extent that the Green Paper will impact on those granted protection in the UK, it is vital that such details are made available.

Furthermore, it is unclear about the path to citizenship for those granted Discretionary Leave (DL) or Special Immigration Status (SIS).

We also suggest that the term 'probationary citizenship' is semantically confusing as it suggests some form of 'citizenship' when in actual fact it is merely referring to another period of temporary residence. In addition 'probationary citizenship' is particularly misleading and disingenuous to those refugees who are unwilling or unable to seek citizenship and who would instead apply for permanent residency, but who would still nevertheless have to progress through it.

Moreover, the terms probation and probationary have connotations of criminality and of the criminal justice system. This may negate integration and cohesion rather than promote it.

In conclusion, we suggest that if complexity is considered to be a fundamental problem for UKBA, then far greater clarity could be achieved by removing the stage of temporary leave under the current system or stages of temporary residence under the proposed system and grant those in need of international protection permanent residency upon recognition as refugees as was policy prior to August 2005.

## 2. DO YOU THINK THE CONCEPT OF 'PROBATIONARY CITIZENSHIP' IS A GOOD IDEA?

*Probationary citizenship is a new stage which is time-limited to encourage migrants to complete the journey to citizenship and integrate fully into British society. It is intended to provide a stepping stone between temporary residence and British citizenship/permanent residence. During their time as probationary citizens migrants will demonstrate whether they have earned their right to British citizenship or permanent residence.*

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)**

Scottish Refugee Council is strongly opposed to the proposal of introducing the concept of 'probationary citizenship'.

We do not believe that people who have been recognised in need of international protection in the UK should have to further earn the right to remain in the UK. Refugees [we use this term throughout our response for those granted

refugee status and those granted Humanitarian Protection unless there is a particular reason not to do so] already face a period of uncertainty as they are subject to an automatic review after 5 years resulting in anxiety and a significant fear for the future. It may also impact negatively on their employability and access to secure accommodation. They are often involved in lengthy, costly applications to be reunited with their family members.

The introduction of a period of 'probationary citizenship' will only increase and prolong uncertainty.

We believe that those with refugee status should be granted permanent residency upon grant of status. This was the UK Government's policy prior to August 2005 and we urge the UK Government to use the opportunity of the Green Paper to review the effects of this policy. This echoes the recommendation put forward by Lord Goldsmith in his recent review of citizenship, *Citizenship: Our Common Bond* (Chapter 7, para. 59)

There is an underlying assumption in the Green Paper that integration and citizenship are mutually inclusive. Integration into life in the UK is not dependent on citizenship whilst citizenship does not automatically lead to integration. We believe that integration is a process that starts from arrival in the UK and throughout the asylum process before people are granted a protection status. This position is shared by the Scottish Government through the adoption of its Scottish Refugee Integration Forum (SRIF) Action plan. Integration is a two-way process with the communities in which asylum seekers and refugees live. We believe that more consideration needs to be given to the positive developments that have been made and are being made in communities in Scotland and around the UK which are leading to the successful integration of asylum seekers and refugees.

Many refugees do wish to become UK citizens and should be supported to do this. Before introducing an additional and artificial hurdle, the UK Government should seek to understand and tackle the current barriers which refugees face in acquiring citizenship including practical difficulties such as the significant costs encountered in making an application.

Furthermore, whilst the Green Paper refers to the series of public listening sessions which were conducted around the UK, it is silent on whether any of these included refugees who had either acquired citizenship, wished to apply for citizenship or who had chosen not to. Any significant proposals to reform citizenship must be considered in light of evidence from refugees themselves and how their personal experiences, including treatment during the asylum process, shape their attitudes towards UK citizenship.

### **3. MIGRANTS OF CERTAIN NATIONALITIES MAY CHOOSE NOT TO BECOME BRITISH CITIZENS BECAUSE OF RESTRICTIONS ON HOLDING MORE THAN ONE NATIONALITY IN THE LAW OF THEIR COUNTRY OF ORIGIN. DO YOU THINK THAT A PERMANENT RESIDENCE CATEGORY SHOULD BE PROVIDED FOR PERSONS IN THIS SITUATION?**

*We recognise that some people will feel unable to apply for British citizenship - because of restrictions on holding more than one nationality in the law of their country of origin - and we have taken this into account in the proposed architecture. We intend to provide a clear route for migrants to become permanent residents, as an alternative route to British citizenship, but all migrants will need to spend longer as probationary citizens if they choose this route. A shorter progression time to British citizenship from probationary citizenship is intended to encourage migrants to choose British citizenship above permanent residence.*

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

#### **Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)**

While we have responded affirmatively that there should be a permanent residency category, we strongly disagree with the above statement that it should only simply be because of restrictions on holding one nationality.

We believe that people should not be discriminated against because they are unable or unwilling to apply. In some instances this could amount to discrimination on the basis of nationality. If the proposals are implemented, there should be equal timescales for people who choose to apply for permanent residence.

P. 23 of the consultation document states that "...we see the assumption of British citizenship as the completion of the newcomer's journey, and much more desirable as it aids successful integration". We believe that this statement and the proposal fail to acknowledge the experiences and journeys of refugees in rebuilding their lives. Whilst some refugees may actively engage with citizenship as part of the process of rebuilding their lives, others may not. This may be for valid and deeply personal reasons of cultural, political and national identity.

Many refugees see the completion of their journey as return to their country of origin once they feel it is safe for them to do so. Others will not necessarily wish to give up the citizenship and national identity of the country they fled with the view that it is not the nationality and citizenship of the country they fled but the persecution they faced in that country. Indeed it is imperative to recognise that flight from persecution is the impetus of the refugee's journey and the country where they receive protection is not necessarily a matter of choice. Refugees need permanent settlement to rebuild their lives successfully and be in a position to make choices about their future for themselves and their families and decide how they can 'complete' their journey. One of these choices may be UK citizenship. However, its adoption or the 'second-best' option of a long and bureaucratic path to permanent residency should not be forced upon them.

#### 4. DO YOU THINK THE 'UK ANCESTRY' ROUTE SHOULD BE ABOLISHED?

*Under the current UK ancestry provisions, a Commonwealth citizen, aged 17 or over, who is able to show that one of his grandparents was born in the UK, and who intends to take or seek employment here, may be granted an entry clearance on the basis of his UK ancestry.*

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)**

No comment.

#### 5. DO YOU THINK THE 'RETIRED PERSONS OF INDEPENDENT MEANS' ROUTE SHOULD BE ABOLISHED?

*Under the existing 'retired persons of independent means' provisions, a person may qualify for an entry clearance if they are aged 60 or over, have an income of at least £25,000 a year, have a close connection with the UK, and intend to make the UK their home.*

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)**

No comment.

## CHAPTER 4: EARNING THE RIGHT TO STAY

### 1. ARE THE PROPOSED MINIMUM TIME PERIODS FOR A MIGRANT TO COMPLETE THE JOURNEY TO BRITISH CITIZENSHIP SUITABLE?

#### A. 6 YEARS FOR ECONOMIC MIGRANTS (UNDER TIERS 1 AND 2 OF THE PBS) AND THEIR DEPENDANTS

*We propose that persons on the 'economic migrant' route should be able to qualify for **citizenship** after a minimum of 6 years. This period is made up of a 5 years as a temporary resident and a minimum of 1 year as a probationary citizen.*

- Yes
- No: the time period should be increased
- No: the time period should be decreased
- Unsure

#### B. 3 YEARS FOR FAMILY MEMBERS OF BRITISH CITIZENS/PERMANENT RESIDENTS

*We propose that family members of British citizens/permanent residents should be able to qualify for **citizenship** after a minimum of 3 years. This period is made up of a 2 years as a temporary resident and a minimum of 1 year*

as a probationary citizen.

- Yes
- No: the time period should be increased
- No: the time period should be decreased
- Unsure

### **C. 6 YEARS FOR MIGRANTS GIVEN PROTECTION (THOSE GRANTED REFUGEE STATUS AND HUMANITARIAN PROTECTION) AND THEIR DEPENDANTS**

*We propose that persons on the 'protection' route should be able to qualify for **citizenship** after a minimum of 6 years. This period is made up of 5 years as a temporary resident and a minimum of 1 year as a probationary citizen.*

- Yes
- No: the time period should be increased
- No: the time period should be decreased
- Unsure

**Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)**

We have not responded to the above tick box answer as we believe that the policy is fundamentally flawed and should be reconsidered.

We believe that those granted refugee status in the UK should automatically be granted Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR) / permanent residency and not temporary leave with an automatic review after 5 years.

If the current policy of granting limited leave is to be maintained, then we do not believe refugees or their dependents should be subjected to an additional year or additional years of uncertainty which the proposals would bring.

## **2. ARE THE PROPOSED MINIMUM TIME PERIODS FOR A MIGRANT TO COMPLETE THE JOURNEY TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE SUITABLE?**

### **A. 8 YEARS FOR ECONOMIC MIGRANTS (TIERS 1 AND 2 OF THE PBS) AND THEIR DEPENDANTS**

*We propose that persons on the 'economic migrant' route should be able to qualify for **permanent residence** after a minimum of 8 years. This period is made up of 5 years as a temporary resident and a minimum of 3 years as a probationary citizen.*

- Yes
- No: the time periods should be increased
- No: the time periods should be decreased
- Unsure

### **B. 5 YEARS FOR FAMILY MEMBERS OF BRITISH CITIZENS AND PERMANENT RESIDENTS**

*We propose that family members of British citizens and **permanent residents** should be able to qualify for permanent residence after a minimum of 5 years. This period is made up of 2 years as a temporary resident and a minimum of 3 years as a probationary citizen.*

- Yes
- No: the time periods should be increased
- No: the time periods should be decreased
- Unsure

### **C. 8 YEARS FOR MIGRANTS GIVEN PROTECTION (THOSE GRANTED REFUGEE STATUS OR HUMANITARIAN PROTECTION) AND THEIR DEPENDANTS**

*We propose that persons on the 'protection' route should be able to qualify for **permanent residence** after a minimum of 8 years. This period is made up of 5 years as a temporary resident and a minimum of 3 years as a probationary citizen.*

- Yes
- No: the time periods should be increased
- No: the time periods should be decreased
- Unsure

Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)

See above response.

### 3. SHOULD PARTNERS OF BRITISH CITIZENS OR PERMANENT RESIDENTS BE REQUIRED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY ARE IN AN ONGOING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CITIZEN/PERMANENT RESIDENT BEFORE PROGRESSING:

#### A. FROM THE PROBATIONARY CITIZENSHIP STAGE TO BRITISH CITIZENSHIP?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

#### B. FROM THE PROBATIONARY CITIZENSHIP STAGE TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)

No comment.

### 4. SHOULD GATEWAY REFUGEES CONTINUE TO BE GRANTED PERMANENT RESIDENCE ON ARRIVAL IN THE UK?

*The Gateway Protection Programme is the UK's international commitment to offer permanent protection for refugees in vulnerable situations where resettlement is the only solution. The Gateway Programme is run in conjunction with the UNHCR. At present, Gateway refugees are granted settlement on arrival in the UK with no requirement for an active review.*

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)

We support the proposal that refugees who are resettled in the UK through the Gateway programme continue to be granted permanent residence. Such individuals and families are selected for resettlement because of their vulnerability and length of stay in refugee camps. Permanent residency is fundamental to successful resettlement and the rebuilding of refugees' lives.

### 5. ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP

*We propose that probationary citizens who have demonstrated 'active citizenship' (e.g. volunteering with a recognised charity) should be able to apply for citizenship or permanent residency sooner than those who do not.*

*Migrants who **have demonstrated active citizenship** would be able to apply for **citizenship** after a minimum of **1 year** and **permanent residence** after a minimum of **3 years** as probationary citizens.*

*Migrants who have **not** demonstrated active citizenship would be able to apply for **citizenship** after a minimum of **3 years** and **permanent residence** after a minimum of **5 years** as probationary citizens.*

#### A. SHOULD 'ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP' BE A MEANS BY WHICH PROBATIONARY CITIZENS CAN SPEED UP

## THEIR JOURNEY BRITISH CITIZENSHIP OR PERMANENT RESIDENCE?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

We are also seeking views on whether all migrants should be **required** to demonstrate a minimum level of community involvement.

## B. SHOULD 'ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP' BE A MANDATORY REQUIREMENT FOR ALL PROBATIONARY CITIZENS TO QUALIFY FOR BRITISH CITIZENSHIP OR PERMANENT RESIDENCE?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)**

We believe that the proposals are unrealistic and unworkable.

We wholeheartedly support encouragement by the UK Government for refugees to be active members of their communities, as should British citizens. Many asylum seekers and refugees in Scotland engage in an extensive range of volunteering roles in their local communities. However it is unfair to delay the acquisition of citizenship or permanent residency if they are not able to do so.

The asylum process and exclusion from economic activity can lead to many refugees becoming highly marginalised in society before their status is determined. After what can amount to several years of inactivity in some instances, we believe that it is unrealistic to effectively force such individuals into 'active citizenship'.

In addition, those who will be disproportionately affected by this proposal are the most vulnerable in particular, single mothers with young children, the elderly, disabled, those with severe mental or physical trauma and unaccompanied refugee children. The Green Paper pays no attention to these groups. We contend that 'active citizenship' would lead to further exclusion and marginalisation of such groups.

We would also strongly argue that this proposal is at fundamental odds with the 'voluntariness' of volunteering itself.

Moreover, proving and testing a refugee's volunteering and active citizenship in their local community would be very subjective which seems to be at odds with the Green Paper's principles of reducing complexity and increasing transparency.

## 6. SHOULD THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES BE VIEWED AS DEMONSTRATIONS OF 'ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP'?

### A. VOLUNTEERING WITH A RECOGNISED ORGANISATION OR CHARITY

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

### B. EMPLOYER SUPPORTED VOLUNTEERING

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

### C. VOLUNTEERING WITH A RECOGNISED ORGANISATION TO SUPPORT THE UK'S INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES, INCLUDING SHORT PERIODS OF TIME OVERSEAS

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**D. RUNNING OR HELPING TO RUN A PLAYGROUP WHICH ENCOURAGES THE DIFFERENT COMMUNITIES TO INTERACT**

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**E. FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES FOR CHARITIES OR SCHOOLS**

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**F. SERVING ON COMMUNITY BODIES, FOR EXAMPLE AS A SCHOOL GOVERNOR**

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**G. RUNNING OR HELPING RUN A LOCAL SPORTING TEAM**

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**Please detail any other activities that you think should be viewed as demonstrations of active citizenship (free response).**

As indicated in our previous response we disagree with the proposal of 'active citizenship'.

**7. DO YOU THINK THAT COMMITTING A CRIME WHICH ATTRACTS A CUSTODIAL SENTENCE SHOULD SLOW DOWN OR STOP A MIGRANT'S PROGRESSION TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE?**

- Slow down
- Stop
- Neither
- Unsure

**8. DO YOU THINK THAT COMMITTING AN OFFENCE WHICH DOES NOT ATTRACT A CUSTODIAL SENTENCE SHOULD SLOW DOWN OR STOP A MIGRANT'S PROGRESSION TO PERMANENT RESIDENCE?**

- Slow down
- Stop
- Neither
- Unsure

**Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)**

We oppose the introduction of any 'blanket measures'. Proportionate decisions which pay regard to individual circumstances should be made on a case-by-case basis.

**9. DO YOU THINK PROGRESSION SHOULD BE STOPPED OR DELAYED FOR THOSE WHOSE CHILDREN COMMIT CRIMINAL OFFENCES?**

- Slow down
- Stop
- Neither
- Unsure

**Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)**

We do not believe that it is appropriate to penalise parents for the behaviour of their children either by delaying or stopping the path to citizenship. Instead, appropriate measures in the youth justice system should be used. The consequence of this proposal is more likely to be increased marginalisation and may result in reoffending. This does nothing to aid integration.

## CHAPTER 5: THE IMPACT OF MIGRATION AND ACCESS TO BENEFITS AND SERVICES

### 1. SHOULD PROBATIONARY CITIZENS WHO HAVE ENTERED THE UK THROUGH THE ECONOMIC OR FAMILY ROUTES HAVE ACCESS TO BENEFITS *IN ADDITION* TO THOSE BASED SOLELY ON CONTRIBUTIONS MADE THROUGH THE NATIONAL INSURANCE SCHEME?

*We are proposing that probationary citizens who have entered the UK through the economic or family routes should continue to only have access to benefits based on the contributions they have made through the National Insurance scheme, providing that the minimum level of contributions have been made.*

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)**

Whilst the proposals will exempt refugees from these benefit restrictions, it is likely in our opinion that they will have an impact due to misunderstanding and misapplication of rules by service providers and agencies.

### 2. FURTHER AND HIGHER EDUCATION

*We are proposing that probationary citizens should have access to ESOL further education courses at the 'home rate', instead of at the higher 'overseas rate' and that access to higher education at the 'home rate' should only be available at British citizenship/permanent residence. ('Home rate' fees are those which British citizens pay for further education; non-citizens pay a higher premium for access to educational institutions: the 'overseas rate')*

#### A. AT WHICH STAGE IN THE JOURNEY TO CITIZENSHIP DO YOU THINK FURTHER EDUCATION FOR THE SAME FEES AS BRITISH NATIONALS (RATHER THAN AT THE HIGHER 'OVERSEAS RATE') SHOULD BE AVAILABLE?

- Temporary residence
- Probationary citizenship
- British citizenship/permanent residence
- Unsure

#### B. AT WHICH STAGE IN THE JOURNEY TO CITIZENSHIP DO YOU THINK HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE SAME FEES AS BRITISH NATIONALS (RATHER THAN AT THE HIGHER 'OVERSEAS RATE') SHOULD BE AVAILABLE?

- Temporary residence
- Probationary citizenship
- British citizenship/permanent residence
- Unsure

### 3. SHOULD NON-EEA MIGRANTS ENTERING THROUGH THE ECONOMIC AND FAMILY ROUTES PAY AN ADDITIONAL CHARGE ON TOP OF EXISTING APPLICATION FEES IN ORDER TO CREATE A FUND WHICH WOULD BE USED TO ALLEVIATE SHORT-TERM PRESSURES ON LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICES CAUSED BY MIGRATION?

- Yes

- No
- Unsure

**Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)**

(response to Question 2 A & B)

We support the current educational entitlements granted to refugees and those with humanitarian protection in Scotland as they are in line with entitlements granted to people in Scotland. We are opposed to any changes proposed by the UK Government to seek to remove entitlements from the point when status is granted to after 5 years or possibly further. We see no justification whatsoever for how such changes would improve integration or community cohesion. Instead, we see positive value in increasing opportunities for asylum seekers to develop their skills and knowledge by widening their access to education both at FE and HE level. This would lead to greater integration, community cohesion and develop new skills for Scotland's economy. We welcome the Scottish Government's progress in this area.

## CHAPTER 7: SIMPLIFYING THE SYSTEM AND REFORMING THE LAW

**1. OVERALL, ARE THE SIMPLIFICATION PROPOSALS SET OUT IN CHAPTER 7 OF THE GREEN PAPER IN KEEPING WITH THE SIMPLIFICATION PRINCIPLES OUTLINED IN PARAGRAPH 223?**

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**ARE THERE ANY SIMPLIFICATION PROPOSALS THAT YOU FEEL ARE NOT IN KEEPING WITH THE SIMPLIFICATION PRINCIPLES IN PARAGRAPH 223?**

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**Please state which proposals you feel are not in keeping with the simplification principles and why (free response).**

See response below.

**2. DO YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER THOUGHTS OR COMMENTS ON THE SIMPLIFICATION PROPOSALS SET OUT?  
(free response)**

We are deeply disappointed by the lack of detail offered in chapter 7 about the whole simplification process. The information given does not afford the opportunity for detailed and meaningful comment and scrutiny. We were led to understand that there would be consultation on the content and scope of the whole simplification process. The timescale for this seems to have slipped and we are now being asked to comment here on certain aspects of that process which in themselves lack any substance.

We would reiterate the key comments we made in the initial consultation on the simplification process in August 2007.

Firstly, we strongly believe that simplification should be seen as an aspiration after existing immigration legislation has been consolidated. Consolidation alone is a Herculean task which would require time, extensive drafting due care and attention, and detailed scrutiny. It should be regarded in itself as an important process to 'simplify' current legislation. Simplification should be seen as a potential second stage process and not the initial goal.

Secondly, the 'principles' of simplification which are restated in paragraph 223 are essentially objectives for the process but are not a statement of principles. We are very disappointed that there is no reference made to protection and the international human rights obligations that the UK Government has to provide sanctuary to those fleeing persecution. The rights and principles of the 1951 Refugee Convention and the European Convention on

Human Rights and the UK Government's commitment to them must be guiding principles of this process. Their inclusion and the inclusion of other principles such as promoting equality and avoiding discrimination and providing access to justice would be essential markers to assess whether any proposals for simplification are necessary or appropriate. Simplification for simplification's sake will lead to arbitrary, inflexible and bureaucratic rules and regulations.

## ANNEX C: CONSULTATION ON IMPACTS OF GREEN PAPER PROPOSALS

### 1. DO YOU THINK THAT THE SCOPE OF THE IDENTIFIED COSTS AND BENEFITS IN ANNEX C IS CORRECT?

*In Annex C we discuss areas where the Green paper proposals may give rise to costs or benefits. We are seeking comments on whether the scope of identified costs and benefits seems broadly correct.*

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

**Please list any reasons for your response below. (free response)**

## RESPONDENT INFORMATION

### HOW DID YOU FIND OUT ABOUT THE CONSULTATION?

- a) from the Home Office
- b) on line
- c) through your organisation
- d) through friends
- e) through a consultation event
- f) through the media
- g) other (please specify)

### HOW ARE YOU REPLYING TO US?

- a) by e-mail
- b) by post
- c) at a consultation event
- d) other (please specify)

### ARE YOU A:

- a) British Citizen
- b) non-British Citizen permanently resident in the UK
- c) non-British Citizen temporarily resident in the UK
- d) other (please state)

PLEASE INDICATE THE REGION OF THE UK YOU ARE FROM, OR THE ORGANISATION WHICH YOU REPRESENT IS BASED:

- a) England
- b) Scotland
- c) Wales
- D) Northern Ireland

ARE YOU A: (PLEASE SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)

- a) member of the general public
- b) voluntary/community organisation or charity
- c) an employment agency
- d) educational institution
- e) local government
- f) immigration advisor/Immigration Law Practitioner
- g) central government
- h) an employer/trade association
- i) other (please specify)

ARE YOU A:

- a) public sector body
- b) private sector body
- c) other (please specify)

PLEASE TICK THE BOX THAT BEST DESCRIBES THE SECTOR YOUR ORGANISATION FALLS INTO (IF ANY)

- a) administration, business and management services
- b) agricultural activities
- c) computer services
- d) construction and land services
- e) education and cultural activities
- f) entertainment and leisure services
- g) extraction industries
- h) financial services
- i) government
- j) private health and medical services
- k) NHS Trust
- l) hospitality, hotel and catering and other related services
- m) law related services
- n) manufacturing
- o) real estate and property services
- p) retail and related services
- q) security and protective services
- r) social care services
- s) sporting activities
- t) telecommunications
- u) transport
- v) utilities – gas, electricity and water
- w) other services

