



Joint Guide for Completing the Government's Consultation on Earned Settlement

What is the guide about?

On Thursday the 20th of November, the Home Secretary delivered her [statement](#) announcing sweeping changes to the current routes to settlement / Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR).

You can find the statement [here](#) and the parliamentary recording [here](#) from approx. 13:10:07 to 14:05:38.

The statement outlines the details of the policy that was announced earlier in the year which will in effect lengthen the route to settlement for most migrants in the UK from 5 to 10 years.

As part of the changes, the Government is running a consultation that will be open until the 12th of February 2026.

Here is the [link to access the online consultation](#).

Why have we created the guide?

We have drafted this guide to help you respond to the consultation. You must not feel obliged to respond to it, but this is a good opportunity to have your voice heard along with many others.

We have pasted the Consultation's questions below.

We have also provided a few ideas for you to consider how you might respond to each question. This is only guidance and we would recommend that you answer however you think is best. You can also skip questions if you would like to. What matters most is that the Home Office receive accurate information that helps them understand and see the real human impacts of the policies they are proposing.

What to expect in the consultation?

The majority of the consultation is made up of closed questions. There are, however, a few questions where you will be asked for your opinion related to the key requirements that will be introduced as part of this new plan for settlement.

We would suggest preparing the answer on a word or google document before pasting them in the online form so that you can make sure you are respecting the 200-word limit and if you wrote too much reorganise the text to make sure you are within the word limit.

Always remember that as an individual your most important contribution is your personal experience of the immigration system:

- How would the proposals make your life easier or more difficult?
- How would they affect the aims you had for yourself and your family?
- What impact do they have on you, your partner, your children and your wider family?

Who is the guide for?

This guide is for those affected by the proposed changes, those who have been or are going through the immigration system and allies looking to help ensure migrants are treated fairly.

Our guide is being sent to the members of our organisations who, almost by definition, have found the immigration rules and associated costs challenging. Our guide has been written in that context.

We appreciate that some families will have no problems with the rules and that the challenges will vary for our own members. If any part of our guide does not apply to your own circumstances, you should feel free to ignore it. We want the Government to receive useful, truthful and accurate submissions.

Please note, the suggestions below are for guidance only and to hopefully support you in filling in the online consultation form.

The guide is not exhaustive and your answer should always be based on your views and experiences.

Consultation questions and suggested ways to answer

In the boxes in the colour **violet** are the questions that will be asked as part of the form of the call for evidence.

Question 1 asks about whether you are responding in your personal capacity or as a representative of an organisation.

This guide is aimed at individuals, so please ensure you are responding as an individual and not an organisation when using it

Questions 2 – 10 ask organisations to give more details regarding their size, sector and geographic location.

This guide is aimed at individuals. If you are replying as an individual you would not need to complete Questions 2 to 10

Questions 11 to 17 ask personal information regarding your immigration or citizenship status, age, sex, gender identity, ethnicity, where you live and your most recent occupation.

You are not required to provide financial information, i.e. information about your salary.

For any of these questions, you do not need to answer. Only answer them if you feel comfortable answering them. For almost all of them you can choose don't know or prefer not to say.

Earned Settlement Section

The following section is the one called Earned Settlement where the Home Office is asking your views regarding the proposed Earned Settlement framework.

Here is a short summary provided by the Home Office:

“Earned settlement” is a principle that recognises the value of long-term contribution to the UK. Rather than granting settlement automatically after a fixed period, this approach requires individuals to demonstrate sustained commitment (through work, community involvement, or other meaningful contributions) before being granted permanent status.

The proposed framework sets a starting point of 10 years before settlement can be obtained. This duration may be reduced based on positive indicators (e.g. contributing to the Exchequer by earning a certain salary) or extended based on negative indicators (e.g. reliance on public funds)

1. Overall, how clear do you find the proposed changes to the settlement framework?

- Very clear
- Somewhat clear
- Neither clear nor unclear
- • Somewhat unclear
- • Very unclear
- • Don’t know / prefer not to say

You could answer either “**Neither clear nor unclear**” or “**somewhat clear**”, depending on your preference. We are worried that evidence will be disregarded if people are considered not to have understood the guidance.

2. [If unclear] Which aspects of the proposed changes to settlement are not clear?

- The concept of earned settlement
- The overall purpose
- Which groups may be eligible for exemptions from the 10-year qualifying period
- How reductions to the qualifying period will be applied
- How extensions to the qualifying period will be applied
- How reductions and/or extensions will be applied if applicants meet multiple criteria
- How the proposed changes will apply to dependants and children
- Other (please specify)

If you have answered “**unclear**” to Question 1, the “**other**” option here will allow you to write an additional short answer on the reasons why the settlement plans are unclear to you. You could highlight that the entire rationale behind these changes is unclear and appears to be rooted in cruelty rather than practically enabling people to contribute and respecting the diverse contributions they have made.

To be eligible for settlement, applicants will need to meet the suitability requirements set out in the existing Immigration Rules ([Part Suitability](#))

According to the Home Office:

“This reformed system will, as now, provide for the refusal of applications where core requirements relating to their character and conduct are not met (for example, having a criminal conviction, non-compliance with immigration requirements and considerations pertaining to the public good). It will be mandatory to meet such requirements and there will be no ability to trade with other considerations to determine the qualifying period.”

Do you have any comments on how ‘Character’ should be considered in relation to settlement? (max 200 words)

This open-ended question allows you to outline any concern you might have in relation to the strict application of the ‘Character’ requirements.

For instance, some concerns that we have are:

- Through this requirement it may be impossible for people seeking safety who have entered the UK “illegally” to ever qualify for settlement. People may overstay or enter without papers for many complex reasons, often for no fault of their own and should not be punished.
- Historic convictions that prevent people from accessing settlement completely undermine the concept of rehabilitation in our criminal justice system.
- The combination of refusing people who have overstayed or entered undocumented and accrued NHS debt, punishes people for getting sick.
- Punishing people for litigation debt essentially punishes them for having ‘bad’ lawyers.
- People seeking safety, stability, and a better life should not be punished.
- Settlement is not something to be earned. It is a necessary pre-condition and the foundation for stability.
- The life someone has built in their community should outweigh historic mistakes. People should not be penalised indefinitely and prevented from building a full life, because of past mistakes.
- Insufficient distinction is made between minor and major convictions.

Integration Section

This section focuses on 'Integration'. To be eligible for settlement applicants will need to demonstrate meaningful engagement with British society. This includes passing a Life in the UK test and speaking English at an upper intermediate level (B2 standard under the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages).

1 What do you think about a 1-year reduction for applicants who can demonstrate advanced English language ability (at C1 standard)?

- The reduction doesn't go far enough (it should be longer than 1 year)
- The reduction is about right
- The reduction goes too far (it should be shorter than 1 year)
- There should be no reduction for these applicants
- Don't know / prefer not to say

Don't know/prefer not to say – you could answer this way, if you wish to avoid answering any questions which reinforce the premise that some migrants should be treated differently than others.

2 How do you think integration should be assessed? (please select all that apply)

- Through a formal test (such a revised Life in the UK Test)
- Through gathered ongoing evidence (such as participation in certified English Language education or employment/volunteering evidence)
- Through completing a cultural orientation course once arrived in the UK
- Through character references from public services professional and British Nationals
- Through evidence of learning and participation within the wider community (including testimonies from relevant organisations/groups)
- In another way (please specify)
- Don't know / prefer not to say

By selecting the option in “**another way**” you will be able to write a short answer on the ways in which you think integration should be assessed. You could also write what you think about the entire concept of assessing integration.

We are concerned that the proposals will produce segregation instead of integration by:

- increasing insecurity and precariousness for many families,
- creating structural barriers to integration, and
- entrenching a class-based model of belonging that undervalues essential but lower-paid workers.

By turning settlement into an “earned privilege,” dependent on income levels, work patterns, and ongoing proof of contribution, the proposals overlook these core dimensions. The likely result is not enhanced integration but heightened **alienation, inequality, and insecurity**. Settlement should not be framed as a reward for passing specific costly hurdles. It is the necessary foundation for integration. We suggest that the concept should not be used to create hierarchies within communities.

The proposals require migrants to be exceptional or earn exceptional amounts at a time when wages in this country have been stagnated for over a decade. This forces more people, including migrants, to need to rely on public services for support or starve and be destitute. Migrants are blamed for the UK's broader economic problems, even as the ability of migrants to contribute has been limited by the government's own decisions.

**Do you have any further comments on how 'Integration' should be considered in relation to settlement?
(max 200 words)**

As above, you could **reject the concept/model that some people contribute more than others.**

We are concerned that being a part of a community doesn't look any particular way. Access to a more stable, more permanent immigration status shouldn't be reliant on pre-defined, exclusionary visions of what it means to be included in a community.

The consultation proposes to judge integration through economic lines that make working-class and disabled migrants permanently precarious, force people to find the time to volunteer as "proof" of engagement, or introduce harsher English language requirements.

We believe that all migrants who live in the UK should have a direct/short path to settlement to ensure they have the stability necessary for them and their families to participate, integrate, etc.

Contribution Section

According to the Home Office:

This section focuses on 'Contribution'. This reinforces the principle that settlement should be earned through active participation in the economy and wider society.

To be eligible for settlement applicants must:

- Have contributed to the Exchequer by having annual earnings above £12,570 for a minimum of 3 to 5 years (subject to this consultation), in line with the current thresholds for paying income tax and National Insurance Contributions (NICs), or an alternative amount of income. Please note, however, that these income-related thresholds would not track future changes to the tax system.*
- Have no outstanding litigation, NHS, tax or other Government debt*

Do you think the following groups should be exempt from the requirement to have earned above £12,750 for at least 3 to 5 years?

Those on maternity leave or long-term illness/disability? Yes/No/Don't know

**Those in certain occupations with different pay arrangements? Yes/No/ Don't know
(e.g. Ministers of Religion)**

Are there any other groups that you think should be exempt from the requirement to have earned above £12,750 for at least 3 to 5 years?

You may list up to five separate groups. If you think there are more than five groups that should be exempt from the requirement then please list the five that you most strongly feel should be provided with an exemption from this requirement.

Yes – you could answer this way, if you think that the more groups who are exempt the better.

You could highlight groups that would struggle to meet this requirement and should, therefore, be exempt from it, including:

- Those caring for elderly parents / family members
- People with disabilities even if they don't receive a benefit from a specified list (this would be to avoid people with disabilities being discriminated against if they are not given a benefit for their disabilities)
- Part-time workers (especially those working fewer than 20 hours a week at minimum wage or working in other low-paid sectors with limited hours guaranteed regularly)
- Students (full-time)
- Single parents of young children (for instance enforced single mums due to the UK's spouse visa rules)
- Carers
- Older workers near retirement (55+) in part-time / low-wage roles
- Young people (16–21) starting in low-hour or apprentice roles
- Survivors of trafficking and modern slavery

You could avoid ranking groups, if you believe that no individual or group should be subject to minimum earning requirements for settlement.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that migrants who have worked in an occupation below RQF level 6 should have their standard qualifying period for settlement set at 15 years?

Occupations skilled to RQF level 6 are those which require a qualification equivalent to degree level or higher. You can read more about what kind of qualifications this includes [here](#).

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know / prefer not to say

Strongly disagree – You could answer this way, if you do think people shouldn't be penalised for working in jobs below degree level. For example, many of these workers were praised during the pandemic as key workers who are essential.

We believe that these proposals punish people providing vital public services! They force them into additional expensive applications and prolong instability.

To what extent to you agree or disagree that applicants who earn a taxable income above £50,270 should be eligible for a reduction in their time to settlement?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know / prefer not to say

You could answer “**Don't know/prefer not to say**”, if you wish to avoid playing into the idea that earnings should be linked to status, or “**Strongly disagree**” if you wish to highlight that people should not receive differential treatment based on their earnings.

Do you think those employed in a public service occupation (i.e. health and education occupations where going rates are based on national pay scales) should be eligible for a reduction in their qualifying period to settlement?

- **Yes**
- **No**
- **Prefer not to say**

Depending on how you feel, personally, you could answer:

Yes - to try and highlight the need to at least protect the route to settlement of public sector workers.

Prefer not to say - to avoid playing into the idea that some people are more desirable

Penalties for accessing Public Funds whilst on the route to settlement

According to the Home Office:

Under the proposed reforms, applicants who claim public funds (e.g. benefits and housing assistance) would face a penalty depending on the length of time they claimed public funds during their route to settlement.

The Home Office recognises that some applicants (such as those from vulnerable groups) may have extenuating circumstances to claim public funds. Later questions will explore whether specific groups should be exempt from the proposed reforms.

EU Citizens, protected under the Brexit agreements, won't be subject to these possible penalties.

What do you think about the proposed penalties for applicants claiming public funds?

1. 5-year penalty for applicants who claim public funds for less than 12 months during their route to settlement?
 - a. The penalty doesn't go far enough (it should be longer)
 - b. The penalty is about right
 - c. The penalty goes too far (it should be shorter than 5 years)
 - d. There should be no penalty for these applicants
 - e. Don't know / prefer not to say
2. 10-year penalty for applicants who claim public funds for more than 12 months during their route to settlement
 - a. The penalty doesn't go far enough (it should be longer)
 - b. The penalty is about right
 - c. The penalty goes too far (it should be shorter than 5 years)
 - d. There should be no penalty for these applicants
 - e. Don't know / prefer not to say

You could answer that there should be **no penalty for any of these applicants** – if you think these proposals ignore the existing no recourse to public funds condition which many migrants face, and if you think the proposal would reinforce discrimination and unfairness in the system.

It is important to remember that the large majority of migrants in the UK already have no recourse to public funds. Therefore, they cannot access public funds unless they make a successful application for a change of conditions to the Home Office.

The proposals seem to suggest that if you are currently on your route to settlement and receiving public funds (after being permitted to by the Home Office) you will be “punished” by being put on a longer and more expensive route to settlement.

This would also amount to penalising those who are able to access an essential safety net when needed, including those for whom the Home Office specifically lifts the No Recourse to Public Funds condition to avoid forcing them into destitution.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that once someone has been granted settlement in the UK they should be eligible to claim public funds (e.g. benefits and housing assistance)?

- **Strongly agree**
- **Agree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Strongly disagree**
- **Don't know / prefer not to say**

Strongly agree – You could answer this way if you agree that having paid the visa fees and the Immigration Health Surcharge for the duration of their route to settlement (for a minimum 5 years, in quite a lot of cases 10 years, or even more under the current proposals), it would be unfair and unjust if once people finally reach settlement (ILR) they are then further penalised by having to acquire citizenship – another expensive procedure, that could require giving up their other nationality if they are not allowed to hold dual citizenship – before they can finally the support they need.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that giving back to local communities (e.g. by volunteering) should be considered as a contribution that can reduce the length of time required to qualify for settlement?

- **Strongly agree**
- **Agree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Strongly disagree**
- **Don't know / prefer not to say**

Strongly disagree – You could respond this way if you think that despite the framing of this question, and not denigrating the principle of volunteering, making this a formal requirement leads to migrants being treated differently, and expected to “prove their worth” rather than being treated with dignity and respect.

We do not think it is fair or just for migrants to have to volunteer on top of their work, visa fees and Immigration Health Surcharge just to settle in the country. It also does not account for everything else which they may have to do, including working multiple jobs, particularly to cover visa costs, being parents, carers etc.

Do you have any further comments on how 'Contributions' should be considered in relation to settlement, including any potential benefits or challenges of recognising giving back to the community as a contribution towards settlement? (200 words)

You could use your available 200 words to draw on how voluntary work should be voluntary and altruistic and how much additional pressure it would place if it became necessary to undertake it to reduce one's route to settlement. In particular, you could highlight that this would make settlement unobtainable for groups who would struggle to meet these requirements, including parents, people working multiple jobs, people with disabilities, students etc.

We believe that holding migrants to a higher moral standard than British citizens is unjust and risks exploitation, particularly for people who may feel compelled to comply simply to secure their future in the UK, and who would struggle to pay for a longer route to settlement. Volunteering must remain genuinely voluntary. It should not be tied to immigration status.

Residence Section

According to the Home Office:

This section focuses on 'Residence'. This pillar aims to recognise lawful, continuous residence in the UK. In order to meet the qualifying period for settlement, applicants will need to have spent the required time in the UK on a route, or routes, that leads to settlement set out in the existing Immigration Rules.

Under the proposed reforms, a person's pathway to settlement will also depend on their history of compliance with immigration laws. Applicants who arrived in the UK illegally (e.g. via a small boat), arrived in the UK on a visit visa, or who have overstayed their visa for 6 months or more, will have additional time added to their standard qualifying period for settlement, or prevented from settling in the UK altogether.

Which of the following penalties do you think should be applied to each of the following applicants?

	A penalty of 20 years	A penalty of 10 years	A penalty of 5 years	There should be no penalty for these applicant s	Don't know / prefer not to say
Applicants who arrived in the UK illegally					
Applicants who initially entered the UK on a temporary visit visa (typically this visa permits stays of up to 6 months for tourism, visiting family or friends or short-term					

business activities)?					
Applicants who have overstayed their original visa by 6 months or more?					

In these questions you could select the option that **there should be no penalty for these applicants** if you think people should not be penalised, including for seeking safety in the UK after being a survivor of trafficking, by making them wait even longer before they can finally settle in the UK and build their life here. You could also reinforce the discriminatory nature of these proposals.

Do you have any further comments on how 'Residence' should be considered in relation to settlement? (200 words)

You could use this section to emphasise that the system should be built upon treating migrants with dignity and respect. You could describe the discriminatory and other impacts that imposing penalties based on a person's method of entry will have.

We believe that extending the qualifying period will make it impossible for people to establish themselves while they have precarious immigration status. It will also lead to a risk of exploitation and a risk that people will fall out of documented status making them unable to study and earn, all leading to increased risk of poverty/destitution.

You could also raise the need to expand the concept of residence to include any length of time spent in the UK, regardless of legal status. As penalising people for their past immigration history only prolongs instability.

The following section focuses according to the Home Office:

on whether specific groups (including potentially vulnerable groups) should be exempt from, or receive reductions to, the proposed earned settlement reforms.

Where the standard qualifying period is proposed to increase from 5 to 10 years, which of the following options do you think should apply to each of the following visa holder groups?

	Reduction (of 5 or 7 years from the Standard qualifying period of 10 years)	Apply full change (standard qualifying period of 10 years)	Don't know / prefer not to say
Applicants who currently require 3 years continuous residence under the Global Talent route			
Applicants who currently require 5 continuous years residence under the Global Talent route			
Applicants who currently require 3 continuous years residence under the Innovator Founder route			
Applicants on humanitarian visa routes (e.g. Syrian, Afghan)			

Here we would recommend selecting the **reduction option** for all these visa categories, particularly the Humanitarian visas

To what extent do you agree or disagree that dependants of migrants who hold Global Talent or Innovator Founder visa status should retain their current 5-year path to settlement?

- **Strongly agree**
- **Agree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Strongly disagree**
- **Don't know / prefer not to say**

Here you could answer “**Don't know/prefer not to say**”, if again, you wish to avoid embedding a hierarchy of migrants, and if you wish to reflect that people should be treated equally and fairly.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that there should not be transitional arrangements for those already on a pathway to settlement?

Transitional arrangements refer to temporary measures which are designed to ease the impact of the new rules for those already in the UK and on an existing pathway to settlement.

- **Strongly agree**
- **Agree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Strongly disagree**
- **Don't know / prefer not to say**

Please be aware of the “not” in the question. They are asking whether you think people already on a pathway to settlement should have these new proposals apply to them, potentially after many years of living here and if they are very close to reaching settlement under the current rules.

Depending on your personal preferences, you could answer:

Strongly disagree – if you think it is important to protect people on a current and shorter route to settlement, and if you think there should always be a transitional period so that people here are not unfairly subject to new rules when they moved here believing different rules would apply to them.

Don't know/prefer not to say – if you would like to reinforce the premise that it is unacceptable to treat people differently based upon their circumstances.

Do you think the following vulnerable groups should retain their current arrangements and be exempt from the proposed settlement changes?

	Yes	No	Don't know / prefer not to say
Victims of domestic violence and abuse			
Bereaved partners			
Children and young adults who grew up in the UK without immigration status			
Adults with long-term care needs			

Here you could select **Yes** for all the categories, if you think all these vulnerable groups should not be subject to new and harsher rules.

Are there any other vulnerable groups that you think should be considered as part of this consultation?

You may list up to five separate groups. If you think there are more than five groups that should be exempt from the requirement then please list the five that you feel will be most affected by these changes.

Here, you could highlight those groups which would face particular discrimination under these proposals, and who we think should therefore be exempt from it including:

- Those caring for elderly parents / family members
- People with disabilities even if they don't receive a benefit from a specified list (this would be to avoid people with disabilities being discriminated if they are not given a benefit for their disabilities)
- Part-time workers (especially those working fewer than 20 hours a week at minimum wage or working in other low-paid sectors with limited hours guaranteed regularly)
- Students (full-time)
- Single parents of young children (for instance enforced single mums due to the UK's spouse visa rules)
- Carers
- Older workers near retirement (55+) in part-time / low-wage roles
- Young people (16–21) starting in low-hour or apprentice roles

Alternatively, you could not list any, to flag that no one should be subject to the changes, in an attempt to avoid ranking groups.

Do you think the following Armed Forces groups should retain their current time period to settlement or should further reductions be available to this group

	Retain current arrangements	Further reductions should be applied	Don't know / prefer not to say
Members of HM Armed Forces			
Immediate family members of HM Armed Forces			

You could answer **Don't know/Prefer not to say** if you wish to reinforce the premise that it is unacceptable to treat people differently based upon their circumstances.

Settlement of family members (called by the Home Office dependants)

According to the Home Office:

Currently, most dependant partners of migrants can settle at the same time as the main applicant without meeting any additional conditions. Dependant partners of economic migrants who benefit from accelerated settlement do not themselves benefit from a reduced settlement period. Under the proposed reforms, dependant partners will have their own qualifying period based on their individual circumstances.

For children, it is recognised that they cannot meet certain requirements under the earned settlement proposals, such as National Insurance Contributions (NICs). The Home Office intends to keep a window for those admitted as dependants under 18 to settle at the same time as their parents, while considering an age cut-off after which they would need to follow their own route to qualify for settlement.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that dependant partners of migrants should earn settlement in their own right?

- **Strongly agree**
- **Agree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Strongly disagree**
- **Don't know / prefer not to say**

Strongly disagree – you could answer this way if you think stopping families from settling together would lead to unnecessary complexity within the system which would increase stress, financial struggles etc on families, as well as reinforcing potential discrimination, particularly against women who are more likely to be the primary caretakers of young children and may be unable to meet the new income thresholds.

We believe that if family members were to reach settlement at different times it would complicate the visa status of the entire family and increase the visa costs for the entire family unit.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that dependent children of migrants should earn settlement in their own right? (with employment-related requirements waived if they were admitted as a dependant under 18)

- **Strongly agree**
- **Agree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Strongly disagree**
- **Don't know / prefer not to say**

Strongly disagree – as above, you could answer this way if you think that if family members were to reach settlement at different times it would complicate the visa status of the entire family and also increase the visa costs for the entire family unit and that it would mean that children in families were on precarious immigration status routes longer, impacting their ability to be fully included in our society.

To what extent do you agree or disagree that resettled refugees should have a 10-year route to settlement?

Resettled refugees are those who have been granted protection and moved to the UK through official resettlement programmes.

- **Strongly agree**
- **Agree**
- **Neither agree nor disagree**
- **Disagree**
- **Strongly disagree**
- **Don't know / prefer not to say**

Strongly disagree – you could answer this way if you think the proposal potentially hinders opportunities for those recognised as refugees to rebuild their lives.

Resettled refugees have already recognised to be in need of protection and they should be given the possibility of rebuilding their life as soon as possible rather than kept in limbo for even longer.

Do you have any further comments on how specific groups should be considered in relation to settlement?

We particularly welcome views on how the proposed changes could affect children in the UK. (200 words maximum)

These 200 words are where you have the greatest opportunity to address issues with these changes. We would suggest focusing on your personal experiences where possible.

Alternatively, you could raise any concerns you have about the implications of these proposals.

We believe that they will reinforce the narrative that migrants should be expected to “prove their worth” to be accepted, that they will have adverse mental health and finances implications, and that they will embed racism and undermine inclusion in and cohesion of our communities.

Ultimately, we believe that no one should be subject to these changes. However, the impact on children will be profound. These changes will trap children in poverty and have long term social and financial consequences for both them and society as a whole due to their diminished life opportunities.

We believe that shorter, simpler, routes lead to better outcomes for families, children and communities and lift children and families out of poverty. This ties in with the recently announced child poverty strategy.

It might be helpful for you to organise the impacts in small subsections:

- Personal Impact
- Financial Impact
- Mental Health Impact
- Impact on children
- Impact on extended family such as elderly parents / grandparents
- Impact on wider public finances and the ability of people to contribute
- Experiences of your peers
- Any other impacts resulting from the current rules and the proposals.
- Impact on access to employment rights and / or labour market enforcement

Due to the limited word count, and the amount of information which could be included, where possibly we would suggest using short bullet points

Resources

We believe that these proposals will also engender poverty. In fact, as found by the [APPG on Migration and the APPG on Poverty](#): “regardless of immigration status or issues, families with children (and particularly larger families and families with younger children) have higher rates of poverty than other groups.”

For families with children who are subject to immigration control (including families with British-born or British citizen children), the combination of a number of additional factors increases their risk of poverty, or risks pushing them deeper into poverty:

- Families who are not permitted to access public funds cannot access Child Benefit or other social security payments targeted at the costs of supporting children, and most have missed out on much of the support made available during the pandemic and the cost-of-living crisis.
- Parents may be unable to work (even if they have the right to work) because they are not able to access sufficient childcare (for example parents who are subject to immigration control are excluded from the extended provision aimed at working families through the ‘30 hours offer’ for 3 and 4 year olds).
- Immigration fees and health surcharges may be incurred for multiple members of the family, increasing the risk of debt.

In relation to the question *“To what extent do you agree or disagree that once someone has been granted settlement in the UK they should be eligible to claim public funds (e.g. benefits and housing assistance)?”* this is a [full list of public funds](#).

In relation to the question *“To what extent do you agree or disagree that giving back to local communities (e.g. by volunteering) should be considered as a contribution that can reduce the length of time required to qualify for settlement?”* for more information, you may wish to [read this letter](#) from voluntary organisations in the UK.