National Statistics Quality Review Series

Report No.46

Review of Home Office publications of Control of Immigration Statistics

Denis Allnutt

Published by:
Home Office

Theme: Population and Migration

The views expressed in this report are those of the author, not necessarily those of the Home Office (nor do they represent Government policy). The report was submitted to the Home Office in March 2006

August 2006
©Crown Copyright 2006

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.
This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium
for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it
being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be
acknowledged as Crown Copyright and the title of the publication specified.
This is a value added publication which falls outside the scope of the HMSO Class Licence.
For any other use of this material, please write to HMSO, The Copyright Unit, St Clements
House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ. Fax: 01603 723000 or e-mail:
copyright@hmso.gov.uk

Contact points:

For enquiries about this review publication:
Patrick Collier - Programme Director
Immigration Research and Statistics Service (IRSS) - Home Office
Tel: 020 8760 8304
Email: Patrick.Collier@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

For enquiries on the review programme:
The Review Programme Management Team, ONS
Tel: 020 7533 6298 / 01633 655 524
Email: National.Statistics@ons.gsi.gov.uk

National Statistics are produced to high professional standards set out in the National
Statistics Code of Practice. They undergo regular quality assurance reviews to ensure that
they meet customer needs. They are produced free from any political interference.
Review of Home Office publications of Control of Immigration Statistics

This is the third review to be published under the National Statistics Population and Migration theme.

National Statistics Quality Reviews

In 1999 the Government issued the “Building Trust in Statistics” White Paper, which set out the framework for quality assuring National Statistics outputs. This was confirmed in 2000 with the launch of National Statistics and publication of the Framework for National Statistics. A key component of the Framework is:

“a programme of thorough reviews of key outputs, at least every five years, with the involvement of methodologists and outside expertise, as appropriate.”

This programme of quality reviews is an important way of ensuring that National Statistics and other official statistical outputs are fit for purpose and that we are continuing to improve the quality and value of these outputs.
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Executive summary

Uses of the statistics

The review has identified four main categories of use for the National Statistics (NS) on immigration control:

- monitoring the volume and nature of immigration;
- monitoring the effects and efficiency of control procedures;
- planning and focusing the activities, services and briefing of various external agencies; and
- input to the production of total migration statistics.

In this context, the remainder of this summary first describes the needs that the review has identified, then makes recommendations and notes some implications of these recommendations. This review did not find a reason to recommend the removal of National Statistics status from any of the statistics as presently produced. The Immigration Research and Statistics Service (IRSS) and others should actively pursue the recommendations in this report so as to more fully satisfy the requirements and standards of National Statistics.

Need for strategic review of data

The quality of any statistics depends on the quality of the data on which they are based. This is true in terms both of the ability of the statistics to support uses of such types and of their numerical precision. While IRSS proactively contributes to improvements in the data derived in the course of administration by the Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND) of immigration controls, these data continue to have these three shortcomings as the foundation for high quality statistics.

- An individual’s progress through all the various control processes cannot readily be tracked – i.e. there is no coherent and comprehensive cohort database. A cohort approach to the management of data would also have benefits outside the statistical area.
- Individual elements of data often need extensive quality assurance before they can be used to produce NS. This limits the range of NS that can be produced with any given level of resources. It also casts doubt on the usefulness of the data for other purposes, including the production of statistics outside the scope of NS.
- The categories used to classify some variables are not always ideally suited to the needs of users of the statistics.

Data quality is of fundamental importance for operational and policy – as well as statistical – purposes. For this reason, it is important that IRSS engages with other parts of IND (and those, such as UKvisas, responsible for other elements of the data) to encourage, and participate fully in, a strategic review of data and data systems. Such a review should be overseen by the IND Corporate Change Board. It should cover the production, exploitation and management of data for the full range of control processes (including e-Borders and the granting of citizenship, and data – such as about visas – for which IND is not responsible) and should consider all uses of such data. The current development of the strategy outlined in Controlling our borders: Making migration work for Britain provides an opportunity for this. Given its fundamental importance to the range and quality of future statistics, work on such a review should, in the event of conflicting demands on limited resources, take priority over other work that might improve the statistics in the shorter term. The strategic consideration of data management should bear in mind the desirability, for statistical and analytical purposes, of subsequent linking – subject to appropriate data protection – of individuals’ migration control data to other (e.g. benefit or education) data about the same individuals.

In this context it is welcome that decisions have been taken, since the production of emerging initial findings from this review, to seek agreement from the IND Board and Home Office (HO) ministers that:

- IRSS should be adopted as a formal stakeholder in the development of all IND administrative systems to ensure joined-up approaches; and
• IND should seek to identify resources to carry out a migration, settlement/citizenship and enforcement data audit as scoped by the Economics and Resource Analysis (ERA) Group of RDS in the Home Office and IRSS.

Need for statistics to be put in context of the controls they monitor

The quality and usefulness of statistics derived from administrative systems also depends on users having an understanding of the administrative processes from which they are derived and which they monitor. The current presentation of the NS does not support this. As one user said, one has to be an expert to understand the statistics as currently published. To address this need, the NS publications should lead with a description and process, or route map, of the immigration control systems. In addition to helping the intelligent, interested layman to understand the statistics and their implications, this should provide a framework for an overview summary, the design of some of the statistical tables, and the presentation of metadata describing the nature and limitations of the statistics. This form of presentation should be fully introduced as the new control systems described in Controlling our borders: Making migration work for Britain are rolled out. Interim steps in this direction, such as the inclusion in Bulletin 13/05 of a summary flowchart of the asylum decisions and appeal process – produced by the National Audit Office (NAO) – are welcome.

Need for more cohort-based statistics and for statistics to be put in context of total immigration

Similarly, users’ understanding of the statistics and their implications should, importantly, be enhanced by two means.

• Many more statistics should be based on an analysis of cohorts of applicants\(^1\) rather than numbers reaching a particular stage during a reference period, or being in a particular situation on a reference date. Such cohort-based statistics give a much more informative picture both of the efficiency and effectiveness of the procedures and of the scale and nature of controlled immigration. Reference period statistics may be kept but presented as marginal totals from tables of cohort-based statistics.

• There should be a clearer and more detailed description of how controlled immigration contributes to, and is reflected in, total immigration.

Need to exploit the web

The web is almost totally unexploited as a resource for disseminating these statistics in a manner that assists users in understanding and exploiting them. The facilities provided by the web should include the following.

• A searchable index to the content of the paper publications.

• Word as well as PDF versions of the publications and Excel versions of the publications’ tables.

• A high-level version of the immigration control process map with:
  - a drill-down facility giving greater detail of the processes; and
  - links from the map to relevant statistical tables and metadata.

• More detailed tables – including a drill-down facility from key summary statistics and from the web copy of the tables in the paper publications.

• Well laid-out graphics showing trends in volume and composition of flows.

• A graphics facility allowing users to produce their own graphics from the tables.

• Links to other relevant government websites.

• Links to analyses of broader aspects of migration and its socio-economic impact.

---

\(^1\) The term “applicant” is used to refer to persons who make an application (e.g. for a work permit, asylum or settlement), this resulting in the person being included in the statistics. Hence, asylum seekers are referred to in this report as asylum applicants.
Need for improved user consultation

There is insufficient user consultation about the nature of these statistics. As a key step in addressing this, IRSS should establish an annual users’ forum to which all users – internal and external to the HO – are invited. The action plan in response to this review should be a major item for the first of these meetings.

Other issues

The report identifies a number of more detailed possible developments of the statistics and gives indications of the priority these should attract.

In addition to improvements in the statistics and their presentation, the programme of in-depth analyses calling on a wider range of sources should be maintained. A number of possible subjects for future analyses of this type are identified.

Eleven recommendations

In brief, the review makes these 11 recommendations (refer to Chapter 8 for the full text of these recommendations).

1. There should be a strategic review of the data, and data management systems, supporting the operation, monitoring and development of all immigration controls.

2. IRSS should significantly extend its consultation with users about the development, and limitations, of statistics of immigration control.

3. The web should be better exploited for the presentation of these NS.

4. The paper publications of NS should consist of the following two elements.
   - Brief quarterly hard copy releases for each strand, with detailed statistics simultaneously released on the web.
   - An annual document of record, presenting detailed statistics for the full range of controls (including those not at present covered) leading with a process map, and supporting description of the routes that can be taken through the full range of immigration control procedures, followed by:
     - summary tables and commentary showing the main flows through all aspects of the controls, and the numbers at each key intermediate point at the end of the reference period;
     - tables and commentary putting the controlled flows in the context of total gross immigration;
     - subject chapters as in the current Command Paper with additions to reflect the broadening of the coverage of the statistics; and
     - clarified and more detailed metadata linked to the process map and to a description of the data collected at various points in that process.

5. Considerably more cohort-based statistics should be produced. Where relevant, statistics showing cases dealt with and stages reached during a period should be presented as the appropriate marginal totals of tables of cohort statistics.

6. A programme of in-depth analyses should be established in consultation with users.

7. Among detailed recommendations, priority should be given to:
   - the development of more, and more detailed, statistics relating to children; and
   - the consistent inclusion, but separate identification, of dependants in all relevant statistics.
8. The relevant international organisations should be further encouraged to develop comparable statistics, and the related metadata, for different countries. The NS publications should include full references to these.

9. IRSS should seek the additional resources that would permit provision of a quality assurance service for significant statistics outside the scope of NS.

10. Other improvements to specific statistics should be pursued, prioritised according to:
   - their contribution to the development of good quality appropriate statistics in the medium term, rather than to short-term improvements;
   - the extent to which they contribute to, and move in the direction of, the longer-term improvements;
   - their contribution to the coverage of the full range of immigration controls;
   - fuller explanation of the links between the statistics of control and total immigration statistics;
   - the scale of improvement that could be achieved for a given resource input; and
   - the views of users as gathered through the recommended enhanced consultation process.

11. IRSS should encourage, and actively participate in, any exercises developing record matching so as to maximise the value that could be obtained through linking individual person-based immigration control data records to subsequent data records for the same individual.

Priority, in terms of importance, though not necessarily speed of implementation, should be given to the first five of these recommendations.

**Implications for IRSS role and resources**

None of these recommendations would involve IRSS in work not appropriate to its stated aim but these three, in particular, would involve a significantly increased focus on a particular aspect and some increase in resource in the short term.

- The strategic review of the data and data management systems (Recommendation 1) – including the development of cohort data (Recommendation 5) – would in part involve a refocusing of current work, in IRSS and elsewhere, on data quality. In addition it would require additional expert input from IRSS and elsewhere.
- The development of the use of the web (Recommendation 3) would require specialist IT resources not currently devoted to this area.
- The increased attention to the quality of those immigration control statistics not classified as NS (Recommendation 9) would require additional IRSS resources.
1 Introduction

1.1 The statistics relevant to this Quality Review of the National Statistics (NS) of the control of immigration into the UK are published in the following Home Office (HO) reports. Dates given are the most recent reports as of 14 June 2006.

- Three annual HO Statistical Bulletins:
  - Persons Granted British Citizenship – most recently Bulletin 09/06 published on 23 May 2006;
  - Asylum Statistics – most recently Bulletin 13/05 published on 23 August 2005;
  - Control of Immigration: Statistics – most recently Bulletin 14/05 published on 23 August 2005 but this report also makes reference to the previous Bulletin (12/04) where appropriate.
- Annual Command Paper Control of Immigration: Statistics – most recently Cm 6690 published in November 2005 but this review was based principally on the previous year’s publication, Cm 6363.

Thus the coverage is confined to statistics relating to the control of population flows into the country. It does not cover flows that are not subject to control and does not extend to the statistics of total immigration into, and emigration from, the UK (for which NS are the responsibility of the Office for National Statistics (ONS)).

1.2 I have conducted the review under the guidance of a Steering Group, the membership of which is listed at Annex A. I am grateful to the members of the Steering Group and the many others who have expressed their views on the statistics to me, have responded to my queries, or have assisted in the drafting of this report. The methodology used to conduct the review is described at Annex B.

1.3 This report is in eight chapters.

- Chapter 1: Introduction
- Chapter 2: Brief history of the relevant publications and some current context
- Chapter 3: Summary of user needs and comments
- Chapter 4: Broad issues ranging beyond the review’s terms of reference
- Chapter 5: Broad issues concerning the content of National Statistics publications
- Chapter 6: Specific issues arising from needs expressed by users
- Chapter 7: Frequency and format of National Statistics publications and dissemination
- Chapter 8: Recommendations.

1.4 These chapters are followed by four annexes.

- Annex A: Steering Group membership
- Annex B: Review methodology
- Annex C: Specific issues about metadata raised by users
- Annex D: Glossary

1.5 The HO is required to publish an action plan in response to this report within three months of its publication.
2 Brief history of the relevant publications and some current context

2.1 The HO has published official statistics of the control of immigration, in expanding detail, over the last 25 years. The Command Paper itself is an annual publication that has gradually increased in scope as more statistics from the HO administrative systems became available. Initially the Command Paper was a small number of tables showing the number of persons admitted and refused entry to the UK, and those granted permanent residence (settlement).

2.2 In recent years, the scope has expanded to cover almost every part of the work of the Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND). Examples include:

- persons applying abroad for visas to enter the UK (entry clearance) – although since 2003 this has been provided via a web link only as the data are the responsibility of UKvisas;
- persons given permission to enter the UK, and those refused entry (entry control);
- persons granted extensions to visas in the UK, and those granted settlement (after-entry);
- persons granted British Citizenship;
- persons detained under the Immigration Act;
- persons in violation of immigration law, and those removed from the UK;
- persons seeking asylum in the UK;
- appeals against immigration control decisions; and
- estimates of net international migration to and from the UK.

2.3 In addition, shorter and more frequent statistical Bulletins were introduced in the late 1980s to provide more analysis of the statistics in the form of charts and commentary. Three statistical Bulletins are currently published annually, covering asylum, immigration control and citizenship, and one series of quarterly Bulletins on asylum statistics. All of these publications focus on presenting the operation of the immigration control, nationality and asylum systems and have expanded in coverage and level of detail.

2.4 Increasingly in recent years, special schemes have been introduced for specific types of migrant and the HO has published statistics on these. These include statistics on the Worker Registration Scheme and European Community Association Agreements (ECAA) statistics. There seems to be an increasing desire for publication of more statistics such as this, based upon Management Information (MI).

2.5 There are publications in circulation that cover different aspects of immigration and migration; for example, ONS produces a report outlining estimates of international migration using data from the International Passenger Survey (IPS), supplemented by other sources, including the HO. There are also other sources of information not directly related to migration from which some relevant information can be obtained, such as the Labour Force Survey (LFS) and Work Permits UK (WPUK). A few attempts have been made to produce a comprehensive publication on all aspects of migration in the UK, one of them being *International migration and the United Kingdom: Recent patterns and trends* (Research, Development and Statistics Directorate of the Home Office (RDS) Occasional Paper No. 75). This report focuses mainly on extracting detailed information from the IPS, LFS and WPUK, including flows, stocks and characteristics of migrants, as well as economic activity of migrants. In addition, there are other publications that focus on international comparisons (e.g. Statistical Office of the European Commission (Eurostat): *statistics released on their website*, and United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR): *2004 Global Refugee Trends – Overview of Refugee Populations, New Arrivals, Durable Solutions, Asylum Seekers, Stateless and Other Persons of Concern to UNHCR* and others on the impacts of migration (*Migration: an economic and social analysis* – RDS Occasional paper No. 67). There is also the regular *International Migration and*
2.6 The context within which this review was conducted includes the following.

- The publication by the HO of *Controlling our borders: Making migration work for Britain: Five Year Strategy for asylum and immigration*.
- Ongoing development of the Case Information Database (CID), the main database used in the operation of immigration controls.
- The planned implementation of e-Borders.
- The possible introduction of ID cards.
- The possible introduction, perhaps linked to ID cards, of a Citizen Information Project.
- Two European Commission (EC) projects currently being developed:
  - a proposed draft Regulation on Community Statistics on migration and international protection; and
  - a review of data definitions and collection methods, including existing data availability for each Member State, relating to the May 2004 version of the draft Regulation on Community Statistics on migration and international protection.  

2.7 The implications of this context include the following.

- The control processes monitored by the statistics are changing in ways that have implications for:
  - the statistics required to monitor both those processes and the associated level and nature of immigration;
  - the potential practicality of improvements to the statistics; and
  - how any improvements might best be introduced, e.g. it may well prove to be the case that – despite any delay that might be implied – statistical improvements are most efficiently introduced not as a separate initiative in the context of the current procedures for immigration control but as part of the implementation of some of the broader initiatives.
- It was not appropriate for this review to consider in any detail the international comparability of the statistics as to do so would have involved duplicating and/or second-guessing the work of the EC projects noted at paragraph 2.6.

2.8 The statisticians responsible for these NS are located in IRSS, the aim of which is summarised in its 2005-2006 Business Plan as follows.

> “To provide information on migration, asylum, nationality and enforcement of immigration laws – information that helps:
  
  - Ministers and policymakers to take evidence-based decisions;
  - IND officials and others who carry out operations related to immigration, asylum and nationality to do their jobs as effectively as possible;
  - Parliament, citizens and interested organisations to understand and evaluate the work of Government.”

2.9 None of the recommendations in Chapter 8 of this report would involve IRSS in work not appropriate to this aim but these three, in particular, would involve a significantly increased focus on a particular aspect and some increase in resource in the short term.

- The strategic review of the data, and data management systems, supporting the operation, monitoring and development of all immigration controls (Recommendation 1) – including the development of cohort data (Recommendation 5) – would in part involve a refocusing of current work, in IRSS and elsewhere, on data quality. In addition it would, as discussed in paragraphs 4.8 and 4.9, require additional expert input from IRSS and elsewhere.

---

2 [http://www.geog.ucl.ac.uk/mru/?page=publications](http://www.geog.ucl.ac.uk/mru/?page=publications)

• The development of the use of the web (Recommendation 3) would require specialist IT resources not currently devoted to this area, to be allocated from within the HO or acquired by employing contractors.

• The increased attention to the quality of immigration control statistics not classified as NS (Recommendation 9) would require additional resources, as discussed in paragraphs 4.13 to 4.15.
3  Summary of user needs and comments

3.1 Annex B describes how users' views were obtained. This summary also reflects some of my own views as a first time reader of the statistics.

3.2 Several users, including the National Audit Office (NAO), have recognised that attempts are being made to improve the statistics and that this depends on improving the quality of the underlying data.

3.3 This chapter is formatted into the following 19 sections and sub-sections.
   • Types of use made of the statistics.
   • The range covered by the statistics.
   • Should statistics be based on persons or processes?
   • Topics on which significantly more statistics were requested:
     - children;
     - dependants;
     - enforcement;
     - support of asylum applicants; and
     - appeals.
   • Variables for which more detailed, or consistent, classifications were requested.
   • Other requests concerning the content of the statistics.
   • Possible new sections.
   • Form of publication.
   • Metadata.
   • In-depth analyses.
   • Consultation with users.
   • Importance of NS status.
   • Use of statistics other than NS.
   • IRSS service providing more detailed statistics.

Types of use

3.4 Users' responses suggest the following four main types of use.
   • Monitoring the volume and nature of immigration.
   • Monitoring the effects and efficiency of control procedures.
   • Planning and focusing the activities, services and briefing of several external agencies.
   • Input to the production of total migration statistics.

3.5 At a slightly more detailed level, significant numbers of respondents reported uses of each of the types identified in the questionnaire; viz:
   • monitoring specific immigration control, asylum or citizenship processes;
   • gaining an overview of the UK's immigration control, asylum or citizenship system;
   • informing administration and provision of services;
   • policy advice;
   • research; and
   • publication of international statistics.
3.6 Among the more detailed descriptions of uses were the following.

- Monitoring scale and type of migration including:
  - migration in relation to other countries and to the Conventions, including:
    - volumes and trends;
    - appeal rates;
    - use of humanitarian/discretionary protection;
    - scale of refugee flows to other countries;
    - changes in relative importance of source countries; and
    - numbers and nature of returns to specific countries;
  - naturalisation of refugees – i.e. the point at which someone is no longer considered a refugee under the 1951 Convention; and
  - number of asylum applicants in detention, their nationalities, the stage of the asylum process they have reached and how long they have been detained.
- Assessing the impact of policy changes.
- Putting controlled flows of different types in context of scale of other categories of migration.
- Contributing to a better informed public debate, including:
  - disseminating information and responding to requests; and
  - monitoring accuracy of political statements.
- Monitoring the control process and its effectiveness, including:
  - speed of the process;
  - effectiveness of initial decisions as indicated, e.g. by the scale and outcome of appeals; and
  - removal rates.

3.7 It was also noted that different ranges of data were of most interest for different types of applicant or immigrant. For example, topics such as industry, occupation and skill were of more central interest for those coming to the UK to work whereas for those coming for family reunion there was interest in the status – current and on arrival – of the family member being joined.

3.8 Users within the HO generally attached less importance to the published statistics than did the external users. This, of course, reflects the fact that:

- the published statistics are too late and non-specific for use in the day-to-day management of immigration control, for which purpose current management information is used; and
- the detailed data on which the statistics are based, more so than the statistics themselves, are important for policy appraisal and evaluation, assessment of the socio-economic impact of migration, and the supporting modelling work.

They did, however, identify the following uses of the published statistics.

- Starting point for work on policy appraisal and evaluation and assessment of the socio-economic impact of migration.
- Source for briefing and for responding to external requests.
- Useful to be able to point to the provision of independent official information.

3.9 In all of these contexts there were concerns about the quality of the data and the need to take a more strategic approach to data development and management. These are considered in more detail in the early paragraphs of Chapter 4.

Range covered by the statistics

3.10 The publications under review do not cover the full range of immigration controls or related activity.
3.11 Considering first the immigration control procedures, the NS publications do not include statistics on the following topics.

- Entry clearance (visa) applications and decisions.
- Work permit applications and decisions.
- Registration of those coming to work from new Central and Eastern European Member States.
- Allocation of National Insurance (NI) numbers to immigrants.

3.12 Hence, an incomplete picture of immigration control activity is given. It was felt to be particularly important following the implementation of the changes proposed in *Controlling our borders: Making migration work for Britain: Five Year Strategy for asylum and immigration* that the control stages equivalent to the current visa and work permit procedures are monitored by the statistics.

3.13 Other possible increases in the range of the statistics raised by users included the following.

- Regular and timely reporting on resettled refugees (Mandate Refugee Programme, Gateway Protection Programme and Ten or More), to include information on sex and country of origin.
- Entry, length of stay and purpose of visit for European Economic Area (EEA) nationals and their dependants travelling to the UK under EU free movement rules.
- The extent of local authority financial support for asylum applicants under all possible categories, and the income that local authorities receive from government specifically in relation to asylum applicants.
- Information about expenditure on different parts of the system.
- Statistics monitoring what happens to those removed or returned once they leave the UK to enable an assessment of the sustainability and safety of returns/removals pertaining to each country.
- Categories of individuals subject to, or likely to become subject to, immigration control, e.g.:
  - foreign nationals serving sentences for criminal convictions (who may at some stage receive a notice of intention to deport); and
  - detained immigrants who have completed a criminal sentence and been court-recommended for deportation.
- Statistics of the refugee stock by characteristics.
- Number of failed asylum applicants currently in the UK.
- Departures by category of immigration status with a comparison of length of stay granted by visa type/permit with actual length of stay.
- Estimates of illegal migration.
- Statistics based on data sources other than those related to immigration control – e.g. Department for Education and Skills (DfES)/Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data might be used to illustrate the types (e.g. short-stay language students or post-doctorate university researchers) of students entering the UK.

**Person or process**

3.14 Users would value more statistics based on monitoring people rather than counting processes. A significant element of this would be more statistics based on cohorts, that is, tracking the progress of individual persons before, through and beyond IND migration control procedures showing the time spent in each stage and the next stage moved to.

3.15 Such statistics – which would supplement rather than replace statistics based, like most of the current NS, on statistics relating to a point in time (e.g. numbers detained on 25 December) or cases processed in a period (e.g. those granted citizenship in a year) – would give considerably more insight in the following areas.

- How the control processes are operating, including:
  - the location in the system and scale of any bottlenecks;
  - the relationship between decisions at one point and activity at other points;
- the scale of the impact of particular aspects of the process on the eventual outcome; and
- consistent presentation of statistics covering all stages of the process, e.g. all positive
  decisions issued at any time for those applying in a period, not just those at the first instance.

- The experiences of applicants to enter the country, including:
  - the proportion of different categories of applicant who eventually enter and the proportion of
    those who subsequently settle and/or become citizens;
  - the times taken from application to subsequent status at all stages of the process (including
    various appeal stages and applications for extension or settlement as well as entry); and
  - the proportions experiencing detention and/or enforcement action and the periods involved.

- The impact of different classes of entrant on the size of the resident and visitor populations of the
  UK.

3.16 If the data tracking individuals’ progress could be extended beyond the scope of current
immigration controls, further useful information could be provided. For example:

- if the data on those allowed into the country were matched, e.g. through e-Borders, with
  information about their departure, the monitoring of the effect of controlled migration on the size of
  the UK population would be much improved as would information about the number and
  characteristics of over-stayers; and

- if the data were matched with subsequent data for the same individuals from other – e.g. benefit,
  health, education – data systems, a more robust and detailed assessment of the socio-economic
  impact of different immigration streams would be possible.

3.17 Users recognise that a substantial development of such statistics would require significant
enhancement of the underlying data systems. This is one of the broad issues considered in Chapter 5.
Specific examples of cohort-based statistics which users would value include the following.

- Analysis by previous nationality, immigration category (in particular, identifying refugees) and time
  in the UK of those becoming citizens (and, for asylum applicants, identifying date asylum sought
  and whether, and when, refugee status was granted).

- Regular statistics – showing the size, duration, distribution and characteristics of the individuals
  involved – on any backlogs in the control processes.

- A cross-tabulation of country of origin and immigration category by settlement category.

- Statistics showing whether, and when, the granting of a visa of a particular category leads to (a) a
  visitor and (b) an immigrant. For example, this would support an assessment of how many high
  skill work permits result in a high skill visitor or immigrant and for how long they stay.

- Statistics of those changing status (or seeking to change status) – e.g. by extension or grant of
  settlement to:
  - cross-classify old status (including discretionary leave, humanitarian protection and refugee)
    and new status (including indefinite leave and separately identifying extension and settlement);
  - show numbers of applications, grants, rejections, and reasons for rejection for each cell of the
    transition matrix;
  - identify those changed from short (less than 12 months) to long term;
  - identify whether application for change of status was made in the UK or if the applicant had to
    travel abroad to apply for entry clearance under new status;
  - separately identify extensions and settlement – the introduction of statistics on settlement was
    said to be particularly important;
  - analyse by age, sex and year of entry; and
  - analyse by time from application to decision.

Such statistics would make significant contributions to understanding the socio-economic impact
of different entry flows and to improving the estimation of the impact of controlled entry on the
scale of immigration.

- More informative statistics on detention showing, for example, the status before and after
  detention, the reason for and duration of detention, and the eventual outcome (see paragraph 5.5).
• An information base – particularly if further behaviour predictive variables could be added to the information about individuals – for the strategic planning and management of control processes.

• Tracking asylum appellants through the appeal processes in greater detail than the current cohort statistics to give, for example:
  - greater detail on the outcomes for yearly cohorts of asylum applicants, including outcomes at all stages of the appeal process;
  - total numbers, and percentage of applicants, granted each entry status, including those granted on appeal; and
  - analysis by reason for withdrawal of appeal.

• Total number and percentage of applicants for different types of non-asylum entry who are granted some form of status, including those granted status on appeal (these would be analogous to the cohort-based figures published for asylum applicants).

• Percentage of successful/refused asylum claims out of those who have been arrested under a Section 2 offence (Immigration and Asylum Act 2004).

Topics that users would wish to be more prominent in the statistics

3.18 There were five topics that a substantial proportion of responding users wished to see more prominently and/or clearly reflected in the statistics. These were children, dependants, enforcement, support of asylum applicants, and appeals. These are considered in turn below.

Children

3.19 Users wanted more statistics about children to reflect concerns about how immigration controls impact on children and their human rights. These concerns are, in turn, reflected in the creation within IND of a Children Asylum Policy Team. Users request statistics showing numbers of children for all stages of the immigration control process, separately identifying unaccompanied asylum seeking children, accompanied asylum seeking children (otherwise known as applicants in own right), and dependants (aged under 18 or claiming to be under 18 where the age is disputed) of principal applicants. More specific suggestions included statistics in the following areas.

• Children experiencing detention – the improvements to the detention statistics discussed in Chapter 5 are of significance in this context as, for example, the current basis of the NS cannot show how many children are detained or for how long.

• Number and outcomes of age-disputed cases, numbers receiving formal age assessments by social services or the Children’s Panel and their outcomes, and numbers treated as adults (on the basis that there is evidence which strongly suggests they are over 18) during the period of dispute.

• Children removed – voluntarily and, separately, enforced.

• Number of children believed to have been trafficked or at risk of trafficking.

• Number of children whose status is revoked upon turning 18.

• Number of children’s cases referred to the Minister for authorisation at 28 days.

• Children’s status (i.e. separated into Convention status, humanitarian protection, and discretionary leave).

• Numbers of children refused leave with reason for refusal.

• Individual years of age.

• Sex.

Dependants

3.20 For dependants, one area of user concern is their inconsistent treatment in the NS, i.e. they are variously:

• included, but not identified, in a total;

• excluded; or

• included and separately identified.
This can lead to confusion and the erroneous use of incomplete figures, or comparison of inconsistent figures. Users would welcome, in all cases where the statistics relate to principals and dependants, the consistent inclusion, but separate identification, of dependants.

3.21 The other area of user concern relating to dependants is that – in the interests of more fully describing the nature of immigration and the subsequent implications of particular types of controlled immigration – more detail should be available about the nature of dependants (a) coming with entrants and (b) subsequently joining entrants. More specific suggestions include the following.

- Greater classification by type of dependants, including unmarried partners.
- Numbers and characteristics of dependants of principal applicants split between those recorded:  
  - with the principal applicant; 
  - after the initial decision but during an appeals process; or 
  - after a grant of settlement.
- Dependants admitted for family reunion analysed by:  
  - age; 
  - type of dependence; 
  - category of entry of person being joined; and 
  - current immigration status of person being joined.

Enforcement

3.22 Several users felt that enforcement was a significant element of the control process that is under-represented in the statistics with the result that they give an incomplete picture of the effect on the immigration controls. One aspect of this concern, considered in Chapter 5, was the need for more informative statistics of detention. Other suggested specific additions include the following.

- Numbers, and outcomes, of prosecutions under a wider range of immigration offences – e.g. offences under Section 2 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 2004 relating to the destruction of documents, and prosecutions for illegal working.
- Persons intercepted at EU borders (juxtaposed controls) and prevented from entry into the UK.
- Persons prevented from travelling to or entering the UK as a result of Airline Liaison Officer (ALO)/Immigration Liaison Officer (ILO) advice outside the UK.
- Persons found seeking to enter clandestinely:  
  - outside the UK and prevented from travelling; or 
  - at ports or elsewhere in the UK and removed.
- Statistics of reporting including:  
  - numbers required to report; 
  - frequency of reporting required; 
  - compliance rates; and 
  - numbers tagged.
- Asylum seeker absconding rates.
- More detailed analysis of persons removed, separately for asylum applicants and others (separately for deportation and removal) to show how many are:  
  - voluntary (separately identifying each of the programmes and those independently leaving entirely voluntarily); 
  - forced; 
  - transferred to another State using the Dublin II Regulation; 
  - transferred to another State using other safe country agreements; or 
  - removed to home country in conjunction with EU partners;
and for each of these categories separately to identify:
- people in families and single adults;
- dependants and their characteristics;
- demographics;
- third country or country of origin removal;
- country to which removed;
- purpose for which admission sought (or where relevant granted); and
- reason for refusal of entry or type of breach (e.g. overstaying), or other reason, for removal after entry.

- Statistics to illustrate the scale of immigration enforcement activity, including:
  - numbers of operations and:
    - numbers and type (e.g. illegal worker, overstayer, illegal entrant) of immigration offenders found;
    - category of entry of those who entered legally;
    - sectoral analysis of workplaces visited; and
    - action taken – e.g. numbers deported, employers prosecuted – and outcome;
  - immigration offenders found by police and action taken.

- Unsuccessful asylum applicants who have come to the end of the asylum process but who the Government cannot remove, categorised according to the reason why removal is impractical.

### Support of asylum applicants

3.23 A number of users sought more statistics on the support of asylum applicants. This major element of the control system is of particular concern to local authorities and some of the interest groups. Specific requests include the following.

- Age, sex and nationality of National Asylum Support Service (NASS)-supported asylum applicants and dependants.
- Numbers of those whose NASS support has been officially terminated but who have not been evicted from their accommodation.
- Statistics of cases at the end of the process – in particular, those in receipt of Section 4 ‘Hard case’ support – by nationality.
- Statistics showing the numbers and characteristics of those refused support under Section 55 of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002.
- The numbers of persons applying for statutory review and whether they are single or have dependants.
- Numbers, characteristics and location of those supported by local authorities under interim arrangements, the Children’s Act, or social care responsibilities (in addition to the statistics on NASS support).

3.24 There was a particular interest in local area statistics because of the impact which asylum applicants and their support can be perceived to have on localities and local authorities.

### Appeals

3.25 There was a range of user requests for more detailed data on appeals. These included statistics:

- covering entry clearance appeals in more detail;
- recording reason for withdrawal of appeal and, in particular, when the HO has conceded the case prior to hearing;
- showing HO decision outcome on status given, where applicable, following appeal determination (e.g. Convention status or other temporary protection);
• covering appeals from the Tribunal to the Court of Appeal and onwards to the House of Lords;
• covering statutory reviews and whether those applying for statutory review are single or have dependants;
• analysing appeals – at every stage and for each immigration category – by nationality and outcome;
• of non-suspensive appeal cases showing, in particular, how many persons:
  - are certified as being subject to these rules;
  - are returned;
  - make their appeal from abroad; and
  - appeal successfully;
• giving a court-by-court breakdown of appeal outcomes;
• identifying appeals where people represented themselves, and the outcomes of those appeals; and
• showing the number of people at different appeal stages in Scotland.

More detailed classification

3.26 There were a number of variables for which users requested more detailed and/or consistent classifications to give a fuller and clearer picture of the operation of the control systems and their impact. These include some which are dealt with elsewhere in this chapter, viz:
• consistent inclusion and identification of dependants (including unmarried partners);
• classification of unsuccessful asylum applicants who have come to the end of the asylum process, but the Government cannot remove, by the reason why removal is impracticable;
• classification of children by category and age; and
• classification of removals.

3.27 There was a widespread wish to see improvements to the classification of the categories under which people are given leave to enter. More specifically it was suggested that this classification should:
• clearly identify short-term (less than 12 months) and long-term entrants;
• have a much smaller “Others given leave to enter” group; and
• separately identify the following groups:
  - Working Holidaymakers;
  - self-employed workers and business owners, under ECAA;
  - Highly Skilled Migrants Programme;
  - Ministers of Religion;
  - retired persons of independent means;
  - Seasonal Agricultural Workers;
  - Sectors Based Scheme participants; and
  - voluntary workers.

3.28 Furthermore, it was suggested that:
• there should be greater consistency in the classifications used in the analyses of:
  - passengers given leave to enter (Table 2.2 of Cm 6363);
  - passengers given leave to enter (Table 1.2 of Bulletin12/04);
  - grants of extension of leave (Table 4.1 of Cm 6363); and
  - grants of settlement (Table 5.3 of Cm 6363);
• refusals of leave to enter, extension or settlement should be classified by the category under which application was made; and
• statistics of approval of entry, extension or settlement for family reunion/formation should be sub-divided by the reason for which the initial entrant was given leave to enter.

3.29 More specific points on the classification of settlement include:
• dependants granted settlement on basis of relationship to a British citizen should be identified separately from those related to someone settled here; and
• there should be greater clarity, and consistency over time, in the reasons for settlement.

3.30 A number of users requested statistics on the reason for refusal of entry, or asylum, to give a fuller picture of how the controls are operating. Specific requests include:
• asylum applications refused should be classified in as much detail as possible by reason (including, where relevant, nature of non-compliance, and identifying Dublin II [transfers both to and from the UK] and safe country cases); and
• refusals of entry (non asylum) should be classified by reason.

3.31 A number of users requested the use of more up-to-date and/or more detailed country and nationality classifications, for example:
• replacing former Yugoslavia and former USSR by statistics for all countries included under these descriptions;
• providing totals for larger regional areas, e.g. West Africa, East Africa, South East Asia, etc.;
• a further breakdown of nationality, particularly Africa Other and Asia Other, in the quarterly asylum statistics; and
• fuller nationality analysis of admissions than in the control Bulletins.

Other

3.32 There were various other requested improvements including the following.
• A split of asylum statistics – for all relevant stages – between claims at port and in country, e.g. to test the claim that the latter is more likely to be unfounded and/or comprise different types of claimant.
• More analysis by sex, marital status, age, race/ethnicity/religion, UK region.
• Statistics on the skills, special needs and languages of new arrivals.
• Statistics relating to the factors influencing individual migration decisions, both for immigrants to and emigrants from the UK.
• A more prompt reflection in the statistics of new features of control processes.
• Statistics monitoring the reception centres which are being introduced.
• The extension of active review for all those granted Humanitarian Protection (HP) or Discretionary Leave (DL) and for refugees should lead to additional statistics monitoring that process from the first significant quantity of such reviews in April 2006 (for HP/DL) and from summer 2009.
• Reorganisation of the statistics to reflect the implementation of the Five Year Strategy.
• The need to monitor the process of segmentation, being introduced under the New Asylum Model (NAM). Statistics should include, for example, how many cases are assigned to each segment and with what result.
• Fuller information about reconsidered asylum cases.
• A cross-tabulation of country of origin by settlement category.
• The presentation of asylum recognition rates calculated using UNHCR standards.

New sections

3.33 Users’ responses raised the possibility of adding a number of new sections to the NS publications – in addition to the more fundamental changes in format considered in Chapters 5 and 7.
3.34 Additional sections suggested by users’ comments include the following.

- Some of the topics considered in paragraphs 3.18 to 3.25 (or fuller sections on these topics if they are already the subject of a section).
- Comparative international data, using selected UNHCR and EU statistics, developing as far as possible a consistent picture from UK and other countries’ migration statistics and giving prominence to any remaining definitional differences.
- A considerably fuller section putting the size of particular flows – especially asylum – in the context of overall gross immigration flows, including a table showing the explicit link between ONS’s international migration statistics and the control of immigration statistics and an explanation of precisely how HO data are used to adjust IPS figures.
- Analyses relating immigration trends (e.g. purpose of journey) to trends in estimated UK population by country of birth and employment outcomes for non-UK-born, from the LFS.
- Census data on country of birth by local area giving regional and local pictures of the immigrant population.
- LFS data on the size and characteristics – in particular the labour market activity – of immigrants.

Form of publication

3.35 While there is some user demand for monthly statistics, users generally would support prompt quarterly publication of immigration control statistics. Users, and others, identified significant scope for greater use of the web and a need for clearer explanations of the control system that the statistics are monitoring and of the contribution controlled entry makes to total immigration into the UK.

3.36 It was suggested that it would be useful for the annual and quarterly migration control statistics, or the IRSS website, to include a list of all the parliamentary questions (PQs) and answers relating to asylum and refugee statistics, as these often generate useful data that otherwise remain unpublished, other than in Hansard, and such a list would assist users in finding this information.

3.37 It was also suggested that a record of PQs – including those that could not be answered – could indicate areas for development of statistics or of statistical publications.

3.38 Two users objected to the use of figures rounded to the nearest five, especially without consistent health warnings and explanation as to why rounding is necessary.

3.39 These issues are addressed in more detail in Chapters 5 and 7 which reflect, inter alia, views expressed by users.

Metadata (including footnotes and explanatory notes)

3.40 Generally, the responding external users – who were almost all expert users of these statistics – were content with the metadata in the publications. However, one said “it would be useful to have more information about how the statistics are gathered and how they relate to administrative processes within the immigration system … For the non-specialist reader, the statistics certainly need to be contextualised in a more detailed explanation of the asylum and settlement process”.

3.41 IND users generally agreed that a description or map of the control processes would be a useful accompaniment to the statistics, aiding understanding and reducing the excuse for misuse of the statistics. As one user said, “one has to be an expert to understand the statistics as presently published”.

3.42 In the light of user comments, this issue is considered in more detail in Chapter 7. Some detailed comments made by users are shown in Annex C.
In-depth analyses

3.43 There was considerable user support for continuing to supplement the routine statistics by periodic publication of more in-depth analysis drawing on other data sources (statistical, research and administrative, from the HO and elsewhere). Such analyses were seen as, valuably, providing substantial contributions to public debate about immigration and its consequences. The relevant previous publications include:

- the OECD publication *Trends in International Migration*;
- RDS Occasional Paper 75 *International Migration and the UK: Recent Patterns and Trends*;
- RDS Occasional Paper 67 *Migration: an Economic and Social Analysis*;
- RDS Occasional Paper 77 and the more recent Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) report *Paying Their Way: The Fiscal Contribution of Immigrants in the UK*; and
- RDS Online Report 29/05 *Sizing the unauthorised (illegal) migrant population in the UK in 2001*.

3.44 While there were mixed views as to the relative priority to be given to such work and to the improvement of the routine statistics, the balance would seem to favour priority being given to the former.

3.45 Topics suggested by users for such analyses include the following.

- Patterns and trends in international migration in the UK and other countries; an analysis drawing on all available sources.
- Comparative international data using selected UNHCR and EU statistics.
- Economic and social analysis, including effect on fiscal balance, of the impact of different types of migration and of the experience of different types of migrants.
- The size and nature of the illegally resident population in the UK.
- The net contribution to the UK economy by migrants.
- Migration from particular countries and the effect of various policies on migration from particular countries.
- The effect of the opening/closing of other immigration channels on asylum flows.
- The nature and duration of the impact of migration on different local communities, including local areas experiencing substantial immigration.
- The nature and socio-economic impact of emigration from the UK.
- The nature of temporary migration for the purposes of sending remittances to countries of origin and an assessment of the impact of those remittances on the receiving economies.
- Relationship between immigration trends (e.g. purpose of journey) and:
  - UK population by country of birth; and
  - employment outcomes for non-UK-born.
- The degree to which length of stay or citizenship leads to integration.
- The long-term experiences and socio-economic contributions of refugees.
- Analysis of the reasons for which individuals decide to come, or decide not to come, to the UK and the factors which affect – and might be used to predict or influence – flows; and similar analysis of why people emigrate from the UK.

3.46 It was suggested that extensive analyses – for example, of the scale of Occasional Paper 75 – should be accompanied by a collection of short briefing papers summarising the information in the full report, thereby maximising the uptake of the findings by different audiences.

3.47 It was proposed that some of these analyses might lead to the identification of additional series for inclusion in the regular statistics.

3.48 It was also suggested that – to support monitoring of integration and the effect of immigrants on communities, services and the economy (and hence inform policymaking) – one should include data
on migration/refugee/asylum status in mainstream social (including education) and labour market statistics by developing migration status into a monitoring category similar to race/ethnicity. If this enabled robust data for local areas to be produced it would support the implementation of the National Refugee Integration Strategy and the monitoring for relevant areas of the recommended integration indicators.

3.49 One user pointed out that one might usefully see the points where immigrants subsequently interact with the HO as opportunities to obtain information about such things as labour market participation and earnings.

3.50 There is seen to be a need for greater liaison with other departments about research and statistics including adding value to surveys – for example, through the identification of immigrants. A current concern is the MI on key customer segments, for example about type and duration of education/training undertaken by those coming in as students from different countries.

User consultation

3.51 External users have a clear wish, consistent with the NS Code of Practice, for fuller and more formal consultation with users about the content and presentation – and perhaps also the interpretation – of the statistics. The most favoured approach to providing this is the establishment of an annual Users’ Forum meeting involving IRSS and others from IND with an open invitation to external users.

3.52 Other approaches suggested included:
- increased IRSS outreach – making presentations at meetings, etc.;
- a regular report identifying the additional or improved data required in order to develop further useful, or better quality, statistics;
- a research subgroup to, inter alia, advise on the development of statistics;
- closer working between individual users, IRSS and other IND Directorates; and
- the inclusion of designated contact officials for asylum and immigration statistics, in line with the principles of the NS Protocol on Customer Service.

3.53 There were varying views about the adequacy of consultation between IRSS and colleagues in IND about the form of the NS and their publications. Some expressed themselves satisfied, others not (e.g. “I don’t know of any existing arrangements for consulting, so explaining how would be a good start”). There clearly is scope for more consultation.

Importance of NS status

3.54 Users were asked if they attached importance to the statistics under review being NS. The great majority of external users thought, some very strongly, that this was important. Reasons included the following.
- The statistics should be improved and made more robust, not downgraded.
- At a time of an apparently increasing lack of public confidence in both official statistics and immigration control procedures, NS accreditation provides an important quality assurance.
- Quality, independence, credibility and neutrality would be concerns if NS status is withdrawn.
- For the public to have confidence in statistics they need to be subject to known quality controls with reviews.
- Immigration and asylum are issues of major political significance. It is extremely important that the management and performance of this system is fully reported and subject to regular parliamentary scrutiny.
- Statistics produced free of political interference are essential if we are to have a rational debate and make good policy for the future.
3.55 Internal users were, in general, relatively unconcerned about whether the statistics had NS status and, in some cases, relatively uninformed about NS.

3.56 Some users felt that IRSS overemphasises empirical robustness against user relevance and timeliness, in determining which statistics should be published, and that it may be possible to publish more as NS by including alongside the statistics a description of the nature and scale of quality factors affecting the data used.

Use of non-NS statistics

3.57 Users reported using a range of other immigration control statistics including the following.

- UNHCR.
- Local Authority (LA), asylum and refugee consortia, and Inter-Agency Partnership of NASS contracted organisations statistics about asylum applicants they are supporting.
- UKvisas website Entry Clearance Statistics.
- Replies to PQs.
- Amnesty International statistics.
- Scottish Refugee Council client data.
- Statistics released by Refugee Council’s Children’s Panel.
- British Red Cross statistics on resettlement/family reunion.
- The Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) statistics given by the Home Office to the people attending the UASC stakeholder meetings.

3.58 Users felt that various of these could usefully be subject to NS standards and that readier access should be provided, for example, through the website, to a range of such statistics – even though they do not have NS status.

Provision of more detailed statistics

3.59 Users were asked if they needed, and asked IRSS/IND for, more detailed statistics than were published and, if so, invited to comment on the service provided.

3.60 The user responses gave evidence of patchy awareness and use of the possibility that IRSS could provide more detailed statistics and analyses from the data underpinning the published NS.

3.61 Other comments included:
- “patchy but seems to be improving in past two years”;
- “excellent communication”;  
- “useful and prompt service but concern that not widely known about within refugee sector”;
- “requests are generally responded to but there is no consistency in the time taken to respond, or in the degree of detail provided in the responses”;
- “in the past it has proved difficult to track down the correct officials”; and
- “requests are not always met and can take what appears to be a disproportionate amount of time; however we wish to stress that this appears to be due to the lack of information available/being recorded rather than any delay/unhelpfulness on the part of the staff team”.
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4 Broad issues ranging beyond the review’s terms of reference

4.1 The review has identified three significant issues that range well beyond its terms of reference but are nevertheless fundamental to the development and production of good quality NS addressing the needs outlined in the previous chapter.

4.2 The first, and most important, is the low profile given to any strategic consideration of the data, and data systems.

4.3 Statistics adequately addressing the main uses identified in Chapter 3 need to be based on data that are:
   - reliable as to quality – with continual data quality assurance processes;
   - clearly and consistently defined;
   - able to track individuals through all stages of all the control processes;
   - readily accessible by a user-friendly system which supports the production of statistics:
     - using any combination of the variables collected;
     - showing the process (routes and times taken) of cohorts of those applying for entry; and
     - showing the numbers of individuals passing any particular point, or experiencing any particular intervention during a period; and
   - managed in a manner which is secure against both the unauthorised release of confidential data and the unauthorised changing of data.

It is, of course, equally important that the data system provides for efficient data input (e.g. user friendly and avoiding any unnecessary duplicate data collection or input) and, more importantly from a specifically statistical perspective, is able readily to be amended to accept additional variables or classifications, which it may be decided need to be collected, or to reflect changes to the control processes.

4.4 This is not a description of the current data and system; examples include the following.
   - The inability of the data systems to provide data tracking for individuals has precluded the publication of cohort-based statistics except for a limited range of asylum statistics. For example:
     - there are no statistics on the take-up of visas or work permits (i.e. actual entry into the UK);
     - the statistics of extension and settlement cannot show the previous status of the individuals concerned;
     - statistics showing the prior status, length of detention and status on release of those detained (other than fast-track asylum applicants) cannot be produced; and
     - statistics showing time between application and current status or final decision are not provided.
   - There are examples of statistics (not NS) being too inaccurate to publish, and the production of other statistics being delayed because the data system did not allow for data reflecting new aspects of control procedures to be input sufficiently quickly.
   - Different IT packages have to be used to extract different subsets of the data.
   - HO statisticians have to devote significant resources to quality assuring and cleansing data before they are used to derive NS. The scale and variability of the cleansing needed is such as to cause some doubt about the practicality of producing quarterly statistics for some non-asylum aspects of the control to a consistent and timely timetable.

4.5 A data system with features such as those listed in paragraph 4.3 would – in addition to supporting more relevant high quality NS – have considerable benefits in the areas of efficient and effective development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of immigration control policy and its effects. The implementation of the changes announced in the Five Year Strategy provides an
opportunity to take a more strategic approach to data and its collection, management and use. The changes include, for example, the development of e-Borders which, importantly to the monitoring of the impact of immigration control policies (and in particular the effect of controlled migration on the size of the UK population) should provide data identifying when individuals subject to immigration control procedures leave and – re-enter – the country). This opportunity should be seized, ideally in the form of a fundamental review, or audit, under the auspices of the IND Corporate Change Board.

4.6 Such a review should, *inter alia*, take the following steps.

- Consider the full range of control processes as a coherent whole, regardless of the location of responsibility for particular aspects of those controls.
- Identify from first principles the data needs for all purposes, considering in particular the needs for:
  - efficient and effective operation of the controls;
  - development and evaluation of control policies and procedures; and
  - satisfying the legitimate interests of the users of relevant statistics.
- Design the processes and systems – physical (e.g. data capture at different stages of the control procedures) and IT – required to meet those needs.
- As part of the design, give particular attention to the achievement of data quality, to include evaluating:
  - the relative merits for different data items of quality assuring the item on entry (e.g. refusing to accept input by an immigration officer of an item which, by comparison with pre-existing data for the same case, appears invalid and requiring the officer either to correct that data or to explain either how the pre-existing data is in error or why the item is correct despite the apparent conflict with pre-existing data) or subsequently;
  - as part of the above issue, the extent to which the input of valid data should be required as part of the control process (e.g. permission or refusal of entry cannot be given without such input);
  - the appropriate degree of centralisation, for different data items, of responsibility for ensuring data quality; and
  - the appropriate timeliness – real time, continual, periodic (e.g. quarterly or annual) – for quality assurance of different data items.
- Assess the benefits and costs of different aspects of the needs for data and the processes and systems required to meet those needs and hence determine which, if any, of the expressed needs should not be met.
- Consider what may be learnt from other countries with efficient, coordinated data systems.
- Ensure that the systems introduced achieve the flexibility described at the end of paragraph 4.3.
- Ensure that data aspects of individual process developments (e.g. e-Borders, Project Semaphore) are designed and implemented within a coherent strategic approach, and are taken forward separately only when that is clearly appropriate.

4.7 The objective of such a review should be that:

- the data needs (and the need to reflect the likelihood that those needs will develop) for operational, policy, statistical and research purposes are fully taken into account; and
- there is identification of the most efficient ways of collecting data, sharing it across the full range of immigration control processes, and ensuring its accuracy.

This needs to apply from the outset in the planning of the developments, and the supporting IT, envisaged in the Five Year Strategy.

4.8 The success of such a review will depend crucially on the active involvement of people with an intimate knowledge of the development of immigration control policy, the operation of immigration control procedures, and the production and use of relevant statistics, research and evaluative analyses. It would also benefit from the active participation of external experts with expertise in, and wide experience of, (a) data processes and systems for administrative systems and (b) the supporting IT systems.
4.9 Substantial resources would be needed to conduct such a review and to develop the resulting systems. However, in the medium term, considerable benefits and savings could be sought in the efficient operation of the controls, the effective development and evaluation of policies and processes, the avoidance of the need for largely independent development of data systems for particular aspects of the controls, and inefficient (but currently necessary) work on data quality by IRSS and others in IND.

4.10 Those responsible for the NS should encourage, and participate fully in, any such review or any more fragmented approach to developing appropriate data systems for the new control procedures including e-Borders. As part of their involvement IRSS should develop suitable detailed statistical table formats, in parallel with the development of the detailed processes for implementing the strategy.

4.11 In view of the fundamental importance of this to the future quality and efficiency of the statistics it can produce, IRSS should give this high priority. If resource constraints prevent it playing a full part in such work while simultaneously improving its statistics in ways proposed elsewhere in this report, those other improvements should be delayed.

4.12 Paragraphs 4.2 to 4.11 are relevant to Recommendation 1.

4.13 The inadequacies of the data system lead to a second issue outside the formal scope of this review. The inadequacies impact on other statistics outside the scope of NS – for example, those produced for publication by the HO other than under the NS banner or for release in response to requests under the Freedom of Information (FOI) Act. Despite being outside the formal scope of this review, they are in some ways relevant, for two reasons.

- With a more reliable database, more of these statistics might be included among the NS to the benefit of both the efficiency and consistency of their production and the quality of service to users.
- As the NS Code of Practice Statement of Principles says, “It can be difficult for citizens to distinguish between different types or standards of official statistics. Building trust in NS depends on building trust in all other government statistics, and vice versa. The National Statistician will therefore work with [senior statisticians in Departments] to promote the use of the [NS] Code as a model for all public sector statistical work. This will focus on … quality processes, transparent release practices …”.

4.14 Furthermore, most of the external users responding to the invitation to contribute to the review indicated that:

- a wider range of immigration control statistics could usefully be subjected to NS standards; and
- those standards gave users important reassurance as to their quality, independence, credibility and neutrality.

4.15 This implies a role for IRSS in helping users obtain information on the quality of IND statistics released outside the scope of NS, and assisting in the improvement of such statistics. This role, for which IRSS is not currently resourced and which has to take lesser priority than maintaining and improving the NS, might involve a mixture of:

- ensuring that the data and methods are developed to meet NS standards and protocols and releasing the statistics as NS – in either:
  - a one-off ad hoc NS release;
  - a new additional NS regular publication; or
  - as an addition to the relevant one of the existing regular statistical tables;
- reviewing the data and methods, and providing a description and commentary for inclusion alongside the statistics in a non-NS publication;
- encouraging IND to ensure that non-NS IND management information statistics/reports are quality assured by IND to standards agreed with IRSS;
- encouraging IND to implement processes to ensure:
  - consistency of reporting methods (common definitions, etc.);
  - quality assurance of the data design; and
- quality assurance of data input and processing; and
- providing an advertised service to external recipients of non-NS IND statistics to assess, and report on, the quality of the statistics they have received.

Statistician input to such work might be undertaken by IRSS staff and/or consultants engaged by IRSS for the purpose. In prioritising within such work, higher priority should be given to statistics which:
- have widespread user interest;
- are intended for formal publication;
- monitor some feature of significant and continuing interest such as a published target; or
- would, if adequately developed, significantly enhance the NS’s coverage of the immigration control systems.

Given resource constraints, the advertisement of the third option, in particular, would have to include the possibility that a particular request may have to be rejected on resource grounds.

4.16 Paragraphs 4.13 to 4.15 are relevant to Recommendation 9.

4.17 The third of the significant issues which range well beyond the review’s terms of reference is the value that could be obtained, particularly in assessing the socio-economic impact of different types of migration, if individual person-based immigration control records were matched to subsequent – for example, NHS, benefits, tax, etc. (and survey, e.g. LFS) – records for the same individual. While the current research project seeking longitudinal data for a sample of immigrants might lead to a survey-based approach to obtaining data of this type, IRSS should also encourage, and actively participate in, any exercises developing record matching. This paragraph is relevant to Recommendations 1 and 11.
5 Broad issues concerning the content of National Statistics publications

5.1 The main uses identified in Chapter 3 have three broad implications for the existing NS and the way in which they are presented. The points made in this chapter are relevant to Recommendation 4 and those in paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5 to Recommendation 5.

5.2 First, in order to provide effective monitoring of the relevant immigration streams and of the effects and efficiency of the control procedures, it is essential that the statistics are put in context and accompanied with an explanation of just what they are monitoring. To quote a user’s comment, to give a “greater explanation as to how a proper reading of the statistics can give an insight into what is actually happening” there is a need for the statistical publications to include a process or route map, supported by a textual description, of the immigration control systems. This will:

- assist the intelligent, interested layman in understanding the implications of the statistics – at present, the publications can be very dense and confusing for those who are not especially expert in the control processes which they monitor; and

- provide a framework for the design of some of the statistical tables, an overview commentary, and improved metadata.

5.3 Second, the scale of controlled immigration should be put more clearly in the context of total immigration. The inclusion, in Section 8 of the Command Paper, of a table showing net total immigration by nationality does not succeed in doing this. It should be replaced by a table – supported by necessary explanation and description of method – showing how the relevant flows reported in the control statistics contribute to, and are reflected in, total gross immigration. If the timing of the Immigration Control Statistics publication and the availability of the Total International Migration statistics do not allow the inclusion of such a chapter, the current section should be replaced by a reference to ONS publications showing the international migration statistics, the methodological explanation of precisely how HO data are used in producing those figures, and the contribution of the various controlled flows to the estimated gross immigration into the UK. The description of the ONS sources should be fuller than the simple titles included in the related publications section of Bulletin 13/05. The Immigration Control NS website should include a direct link to the ONS documents with a description of the nature of those documents.

5.4 Third, there is a need for considerably more statistics based on monitoring the progress of cohorts of people through the control processes. Statistics relating to a point in time (e.g. persons in detention solely under Immigration Act powers) or to numbers of cases processed in a period (e.g. passengers given leave to enter) provide a useful monitoring of levels of immigration control activity and numbers of immigrants or visitors reaching a particular stage in the control process. However, a much more informative picture of the efficiency and effectiveness of the procedures, the scale and nature of controlled immigration, and the experience of those subject to the controls would be given by cohort-based statistics.

5.5 This is recognised in the limited cohort statistics for asylum applicants provided in, for example, Bulletin 13/05 for principal asylum applicants on p19, and for Harmondsworth Fast Track in Table 10.3. However, a far wider range of cohort-based statistics is desirable including statistics showing the following.

- Whether and when visas issued are used to enter the country, and whether those entering leave within the time prescribed by their visa.

- For those changing status (and those refused a change of status, and those with an outstanding application for a change of status) – e.g. by extension or by grant of settlement – a cross-classification of old and new status.

- A tracking of asylum appellants through all stages of the appeal processes.

- A more informative monitoring of the use of detention for asylum applicants (with those on the fast track separately identified) and, separately, other immigration detainees, including:
  - place of detention;
- duration;
- stage in the immigration process when detention commenced – including whether detained on arrival;
- age (including whether age disputed and the outcome of such disputes), sex and nationality;
- reason for detention; and
- status at end of detention (e.g. release with type of immigration/entry status, removal, and bail).

Some more detailed examples are given at paragraph 3.17.

5.6 The development of such statistics is, of course, closely linked to the improvement of the data system considered in Chapter 4. In particular, if a data system supporting such a cohort-based analysis can be developed for the immigration control processes, it would provide a basis for:

- further matching of those data, e.g. through e-Borders, with information about the departure of the individuals concerned as envisaged in paragraph 4.5; and
- further matching of the type envisaged in paragraph 4.10.
6 Specific issues arising from needs expressed by users

6.1 This chapter considers those issues raised by users that are not dealt with in Chapters 4, 5 and 7 and follows the same structure as Chapter 3.

Range covered by the statistics

6.2 UKvisas publishes a range of statistics on visas applied for, issued and refused. These include some breakdown by entry category (visitors, work permits, students, au pairs and working holidaymakers). The underlying data could, in principle, give a more detailed breakdown (identifying, for example, the Highly Skilled Migrants Programme or Ministers of Religion). Dependents can be identified but not linked to the category of the main applicant. The data can, in principle, support analyses by age, sex, nationality and period of leave to enter granted. Numbers of appeals are included in the published statistics; UKvisas is exploring a possible source of data on appeal outcomes.

6.3 The inclusion of visa statistics in the NS would provide useful and relevant further statistics on the control processes – especially if they included:

- a fuller breakdown of entry category;
- analysis by period of leave to enter granted;
- analysis by age; and
- analysis of appeal outcomes.

6.4 Visa data should be included in any development of cohort data and statisticians should be actively involved in consideration of the implications of the implementation of the Five Year Strategy for visa data; UKvisas advises that these implications have not yet been fully addressed.

6.5 There is a range of data for work permits which shows, for work permits issued or refused (and extensions issued or refused) in a period:

- duration (but for some permits this is an end date, while for others it is duration from employee’s arrival in UK);
- industry – but not Standard Industrial Classification (SIC);
- occupation – but not Standard Occupational Classification (SOC);
- age, sex and nationality; and
- approval date.

These data are split between applicant out of the UK and applicant in the UK (in which case the visa stage is replaced by a leave to remain application). The data for extensions cannot link an approved extension back to the record for the approval of the original permit and, in particular, cannot identify whether the extension takes the duration above 12 months (thus creating an immigrant). Those refused can appeal up to twice; the same data are available for each appeal (both refused and granted) but not linked to the record for the original application.

6.6 Similar data are available for the Sector Based Scheme and the Highly Skilled Migrant Programme. Less detailed data are available for the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme.

6.7 Work permit data are not routinely published by government. The inclusion, subject to appropriate checks on data quality, of such statistics in the migration control NS would usefully both contribute to an extension of the statistics to reflect the full range of controls and provide a more

---

standardised and efficient means of releasing them than the current approach of releasing in response to FOI requests.

6.8 Work permit statistics based on these data are included in the statistics used by Professor John Salt for the OECD publication *Trends in International Migration*. Subject to confirmation of quality, the inclusion of some of these statistics in the NS publications may initially be the least resource-intensive way to cover this aspect of controls.

6.9 As part of the development of cohort data in the context of implementation of the Five Year Strategy, data on work permits (or their equivalent) should be included in the record for all relevant persons. Hence, data on an individual’s work permit application would be linked to data on when, and if, they entered and any subsequent immigration control events. In the interests of standardisation and comparability with other sources (e.g. LFS), consideration should be given to using the SIC and SOC in place of the non-standard classifications of industry and occupation currently used.

6.10 Detailed statistics of the registration of applications to the Workers Registration Scheme for those coming to work from the new Central and Eastern European Member States, and of the allocation of NI numbers to these people, are published quarterly as *Accession Monitoring Reports*.

6.11 The coverage of the control procedures by the NS would be enhanced if – subject to confirmation (a confirmation which would be desirable in its own right) of the quality of the data (described in the *Accession Monitoring Report* as “provisional Management Information”) – some key statistics for this area were included. It could reasonably be argued that this might take less priority than the extension to cover visas and work permits as it relates to a group who, as nationals of EU States, are not covered by the entry controls currently covered by the statistics.

6.12 The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) publishes *National Statistics of National Insurance Number Allocations to Overseas Nationals Entering the UK*. As a minimum, a reference to this should be included in the HO NS publications; if the timing of the availability of the statistics can be sufficiently synchronised some key summary statistics from the DWP publication should be reproduced in the HO publication.

6.13 Statistics of resettled refugees (Gateway Protection Programme, Sunrise and Ten or More) could usefully be included, at least annually, in the NS publications (the numbers hitherto are small: 150 for Gateway Programme in 2004).

6.14 Estimates of numbers of EEA nationals entering the UK and the length and purpose of their visits are provided by the IPS and published by ONS. The free movement rights of EEA nationals preclude the production of such information from the current control procedures. The possibility of producing such statistics (and the implications for the IPS) should be kept in mind in the development of e-Borders and of the arrangements for managing the resulting data.

6.15 Financial data of the type referred to in paragraph 3.13 are relatively rarely included in NS publications describing levels of activity and outcomes. They are more appropriate to local and central government accounts and the publications derived from those accounts. In some cases, they would require agreed accounting procedures to allocate funds for the general provision of services between that part spent on various categories of immigrant or visitor, and that part spent on the remainder of the population. IRSS should draw the relevant user requests to the attention of those responsible for the preparation of accounts and derived material.

6.16 It is unrealistic to envisage a systematic monitoring of the subsequent experiences of all (or a substantial random sample of) those removed, or returned, of the type that would be necessary to produce NS monitoring of the sustainability and safety of returns/removals to each country. Other forms of information – for example, from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) and HO country information reports – are more appropriate.

6.17 The groups of individuals subject to a criminal conviction listed in paragraph 3.13 could be reported in the NS publications but the development of a comprehensive list of those likely to become subject to immigration control could be both time-consuming and controversial. The underlying issue might be addressed by including notices of intention to deport and court recommendations for
deportation in the recommended cohort database. However, I would not recommend giving this any priority that might detract from the focus on the mainstream development of the database from IND (and visa, work permits and e-Borders) data.

6.18 Users recognised the difficulty of producing estimates of the refugee stock by characteristics but it was suggested that the development of an NS model would improve on the UNHCR estimates. There are no robust sources of data to produce regular statistics of this type, and no reasons to expect such sources to be developed in the near future. Such estimates are, therefore, more appropriate to periodic in-depth analyses and not routine statistics.

6.19 The same is true of the estimation of the number of failed asylum applicants in the country and of illegal immigration.

6.20 Statistics showing departures by category of entry status, with a comparison of length of stay granted with actual length of stay, cannot be produced from the current data. The possibility of producing such statistics, including monitoring the numbers of overstayers, should be kept in mind in the development of e-Borders and in the arrangements for managing the resulting data.

6.21 There is a case for extending the scope of the NS publications on immigration control to use other departments’ data sources to give a fuller description of categories of controlled entry – for example, DfES data on foreign students as suggested in paragraph 3.13. However, linking the statistics and underlying definitions sufficiently closely to confidently achieve this is likely to consume significant amounts of professional time which, in my judgement, would be better devoted to other more central aspects of the improvement of immigration control statistics. A useful initial, and less resource intensive, step could be to provide links to relevant statistics as part of the development of the use of the web considered in Chapter 7.

6.22 Paragraphs 6.2 to 6.12 are relevant to Recommendation 4 and paragraphs 6.13 to 6.21 are relevant to Recommendation 10. In addition, paragraphs 6.18 and 6.19 are relevant to Recommendation 6.

**Person or process**

6.23 As is noted in Chapter 5, the asylum statistics do include some cohort analyses. Improvement of these may be the least resource-intensive initial step towards a fuller set of cohort-based statistics. More specifically:

- the quarterly Bulletins could include cohort-based statistics for Oakington Reception Centre and Harmondsworth Fast Track for more than the most recent quarter, thus:
  - providing quarterly statistics covering initial decisions, appeals and appeal outcomes more comprehensively than at present (e.g. the second quarter 2005 statistics for Oakington show 13 per cent of cases with an unknown decision and no statistics can be provided on appeal outcomes); and
  - allowing, by summation of the figures for different cohorts of decisions, etc. taken in a particular quarter, an explicit reconciliation between cohort and period-based statistics (the latter would in effect be the marginal totals of tables showing the action in each quarter for each cohort); and
- the estimated cohort analysis of asylum applications made in recent years in the annual Asylum Statistics Bulletin could be supplemented by tables showing actual figures – without estimation – including numbers in various stages at the end of each year.

6.24 Many of the other desirable cohort statistics depend crucially on significant improvement to the underlying data that is likely to be most efficiently addressed through the recommended strategic consideration of data issues.

6.25 While accepting that this means that many of the user needs for cohort statistics cannot be addressed in the short term, these two points are made.

- The available data on the timeliness of decision processes (used, for example, in PQ responses) could usefully be investigated to see if they could support more detailed, and more extensive, NS
on timeliness than those currently provided (percentage of new substantive asylum cases with
decisions served within two months; and percentage of new substantive asylum cases with final
decisions up to and including appeal at the Immigration Appeal Tribunal (IAT) within six months).

- It may be possible to make a first step towards a cross-classified presentation of statistics on those
seeking extension or settlement by splitting the settlement refusal rate in Table 4.2 of Cm 6363
between categories of the types used in Section 5 of Cm 6363.

6.26 There is a particular concern with statistics of detention that, ideally, would be addressed by full
cohort statistics of the type outlined in Chapter 5. However, pending the production of such statistics
an interim improvement is necessary. The current statistics, based on numbers in detention on a
particular day and the time they have been in detention, do not give a valid picture of either the
number of applicants to enter the country who are detained, or the distribution of durations of
detention. Following the emerging initial findings of this review, IRSS is investigating whether the
available data can support more informative statistics on these matters. If this does not prove possible,
the existing tables should be prominently noted to the effect that they do not give such a picture and
with any available information on the extent and nature of the differences between such cross-
sectional statistics and that picture.

6.27 Paragraphs 6.23 to 6.26 are relevant to Recommendation 5.

Topics which users would wish to be more prominent in the statistics

Children

6.28 A new Table 2.4, giving statistics of age-disputed asylum applications, was included in Bulletin
13/05. Asylum applications and initial decisions for unaccompanied children are already published.

6.29 The strength of user interest would indicate that further extension of the statistics relating to
children – and possibly bringing together key statistics about children in a separate section of the
publication – should be given some priority in the short term. Within that it seems both likely and right
that priority will be given to developing statistics:

- consistently and separately identifying – within the range of statistics currently published –
  unaccompanied, applicants in own right (otherwise known as accompanied children) and
dependants;
- reporting the outcome of age disputes;
- reporting numbers of children whose status is revoked upon turning 18; and
- increasing further the range of statistics for unaccompanied children.

Dependants

6.30 There is no good reason for not consistently including, and identifying, dependants in all
relevant statistics (as is already done in a considerable proportion of the relevant statistics). To do this
would reduce the scope for confusion and it should be given some priority in the short-term further
development of the NS.

6.31 With lesser priority, the quality and detail of the available data on type of dependence should be
investigated to see if more detail could be provided.

6.32 Figures for the numbers and characteristics of dependants joining principal asylum applicants
after the initial decision (i.e. during the appeals process) are available on request. The numbers are
very small, are already included in dependants-inclusive totals, and are quantified in the explanatory
notes of the annual Asylum Bulletin. A full cohort analysis would identify them; meanwhile they might
usefully be quantified in a footnote to an appropriate table.

6.33 Statistics relating to dependants admitted for family creation or reunion are considered in
paragraph 6.65.
6.34 Offences under Section 2 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 2004, relating to the destruction of documents, were not included in Cm 6363 because the offence did not exist in 2003 – the reference period for Cm 6363. It is planned that statistics for this offence should be included in future editions. Meanwhile, some statistics relating to this offence have been made available via the Asylum Process Stakeholders’ Group. As part of the increased use of the web proposed in Chapter 7, consideration should be given to using the web to give wider access to statistics made available in such a way.

6.35 Users also suggested that the statistics should include the percentage of successful/refused asylum claims out of those who have been arrested under Section 2. With the current data systems, the production of such analysis would require resources disproportionate to the small numbers involved; however, if prosecutions under the relevant Immigration Acts could be included in the proposed cohort database, such statistics could then be produced relatively easily.

6.36 At present, the statistics about those proceeded against for immigration offences cover only England and Wales; this should be extended to cover the UK. Users also suggested the addition of the offence of working illegally; this could usefully be added, and a check made that all relevant offences are covered by this table.

6.37 Users also requested statistics about three aspects of the control system which were not covered in the NS:

- juxtaposed controls;
- persons prevented from travelling; and
- persons found seeking to enter clandestinely.

6.38 The Control of Immigration Bulletin (14/05) published during the course of this review included those rejected by juxtaposed controls among passengers refused entry – these had previously not been included in the NS which were confined to those refused entry and removed, which is defined as being limited to those arriving at a UK port. Consideration should now be given to explicitly identifying those rejected at juxtaposed controls and producing statistics about their characteristics. In presenting such statistics consideration should be given to referring to the possibility that individuals may make more repeated attempts to come to the UK through juxtaposed controls than if they have to travel to a UK port on each attempt.

6.39 While persons prevented from travelling to, or entering, the UK as a result of ALO/ILO advice outside the UK are excluded from the NS, the number of such cases is quoted in Controlling our borders: Making migration work for Britain. The available data should be investigated in detail to see if it could support the production of:

- a number of such cases to NS quality standards (the discussion in paragraph 6.93 of the relative importance to those standards of numerical precision and a clear statement of data quality is relevant here); and
- NS about the characteristics of such persons.

The point in the last sentence of the previous paragraph would also apply to such statistics.

6.40 Attempted clandestine entrants found before they reach the UK are not covered by the NS. Those found in the UK (at a port or elsewhere) are not included in either the passengers refused entry at port and subsequently removed or passengers refused entry at border control points. Nor, where relevant, will they be included among those given leave to enter. They are, however, where relevant, included (but not separately identified) in persons removed from the UK as a result of enforcement action. The available data should be investigated in detail to see if it could support the production of statistics of:

- number of such attempted entrants found before they reach the UK;
- the characteristics of such attempted entrants; and
- the numbers of clandestine entrants found (a) at port and (b) later and the actions taken.
Ideally, these latter statistics would result from the inclusion of these individuals in the cohort database described elsewhere in this report.

6.41 An initial consideration suggests that statistics on the numbers required to report at different frequencies, and numbers tagged, could be derived from available data but that these data could not support data on the compliance rate (defined, e.g. as the proportion of required reports made) of individuals. Further investigation of whether statistics of NS quality (the discussion in paragraph 6.93 is relevant here) could be produced and how the data could be improved to support the calculation of compliance rates is desirable.

6.42 While, as some users noted, the HO has previously acknowledged the need for statistics on asylum applicant absconding rates, there are difficult definitional and measurement issues. For example, one needs to consider how to classify those who miss one report but make contact again on (or before) the next occasion, and those who are not required to report regularly. Also, the validity of the data is difficult to check. IRSS report that work is ongoing to see if relevant statistics of sufficient quality can be produced. This report endorses this work.

6.43 Users wished to see statistics giving a fuller and broader description of removal activity. Some of this depends on the development of cohort data as discussed elsewhere and should be pursued through that development. This would apply, for example, to linking removals of overstayers (and within that identifying those prosecuted for overstaying as recorded in Table 6.5 of Cm 6363) to the original entry category.

6.44 Some additional NS were introduced during the course of this review – for example, Table 11.2 of the latest Asylum Statistics Annual Bulletin (Bulletin 13/05) classifies removals according to whether the destination is:

- the person's country of nationality;
- an EU Member State (where this is not the country of nationality); or
- other or unknown;

in each case also showing the nationality of the asylum applicant removed. Further developments of these statistics would be desirable; as would an extension to identify those cases to which, for example, the Dublin II Regulation would apply, so as to be able to compare the number of cases to which a procedure could apply and compare it with the number to which the procedure was applied.

6.45 Yet further aspects – notably the identification in the statistics of reason for refusal of entry – present significant data difficulties. For example, they would require the identification, and consistent coding, by Immigration Officers (IOs), of main reasons. These should be addressed, and a judgement formed as to practicality and value in relation to cost, as part of any data audit.

6.46 Subject to these points, statistics on persons removed (in the detail set out in paragraph 3.22) should be taken as a desirable objective. The speed and extent of progress to that objective should be determined by the feasibility, cost and value to non-statistical users of the data developments needed. The full detail specified in paragraph 3.22 would be appropriate for a drill-down facility on the web, not for a paper publication.

6.47 Some of the user requests for statistics on enforcement activity – for example, numbers of operations, sectoral analysis of workplaces visited, action taken in respect of immigration offenders found by the police – are of a rather different character to the NS produced on other aspects of the Immigration Control processes (and, indeed, in many other contexts). They relate more to the resources allocated to, and operational decisions in the context of, different activities rather than to the impact of those activities. In addition, it has been suggested to me that the routine availability of extensive statistics on some of these aspects could change offenders’ behaviour patterns in ways that would reduce operational capacity or effectiveness. Any developments in these aspects of the statistics should have low priority.

6.48 However, there are at present no NS of the numbers of people found who are believed to be in breach of immigration law or rules, the nature of that breach, the category under which they entered,
and the outcome. Some of the outcomes are shown (proceedings taken; initiation of illegal entry, deportation, or administrative removal action; and persons removed as a result of each of these types of action) and in only the first of these is the type of breach (or, more strictly, the type of proceeding) shown. Ideally, one would wish to see cohort-based statistics showing progress from identification by enforcement activity to eventual outcome but in the short term, statistics showing the numbers of people found who are believed to be in breach and the nature of that breach might be the most useful addition to the current range of NS in this area. In the context of seeking to develop cohort statistics in this area, which include the original entry category (and, in relevant cases, the status of an asylum application) it needs to be recognised that the creation of the necessary cohort data may be particularly difficult – if, for example, the individual concerned has been out of touch with IND for a significant period, has changed his/her name and is uncooperative.

6.49 It would be very difficult to produce statistics presenting the numbers of unsuccessful asylum applicants who have come to the end of the asylum process but who the Government cannot remove, and analysing them by the reason for removal is impracticable. Individuals move in and out of the potentially removable pool of failed asylum applicants depending, for example, on individual circumstances, whether they have lodged appeals, the situation in source countries, and the availability or not of relevant papers. Hence, quite extensive cohort data would need to be maintained. However, such statistics could, in principle, illustrate an important aspect of the control processes. There is a clear link to the issue of statistics on absconding referred to in paragraph 6.42 (in that having absconded could be seen as an overriding reason for removal being impractical, and hence those having absconded would be excluded from these statistics unless and until they were re-contacted). If a way is found to produce statistics of absconding, attention could then usefully turn to the development of statistics of reasons for removal not being practical (and, to complete the coverage, statistics of those awaiting removal).

Support of asylum applicants

6.50 The NS for asylum applicants supported by NASS are published by local authority area; the fact that they are also available by constituency might usefully be mentioned in a footnote to the relevant table. These statistics are not currently split by age and sex; such analyses might usefully be added – perhaps through web-based drill-down – as resources permit.

6.51 The numbers of those whose NASS support has been officially terminated but who have not been evicted from their accommodation is relatively small and reducing. Considerable resources would be needed to develop reliable NS for this group and the review concludes that other areas of development should have a higher priority.

6.52 Numbers applying for, and numbers in receipt of, Section 4 Hard case support are published in the text of the asylum Bulletins. Statistics including dependants and split by reasons for eligibility – and perhaps by nationality in more detail than the current identification of the top ten nationalities – would provide useful additional monitoring of the operation of this stage of the controls.

6.53 Total numbers of refusals of asylum support and other forms of support under Section 55 of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 are published in the text of the asylum Bulletins. Splits between family cases and single adults, and between the three grounds for approval (claim made as soon as reasonably practical, dependants aged under 18, refusal of support may lead to a breach of the European Charter of Human Rights (ECHR)) would provide useful additional monitoring of the operation of this stage of the controls.

6.54 Some limited information about numbers supported by local authorities under interim arrangements, the Children’s Act, or social care responsibilities are included in footnotes (e.g. to Table 8.1 of Bulletin 13/05). While there is some user interest in more detailed statistics (including the location of those being supported where that differs from the local authority (LA) providing the support) the review has found no suitable reliable source of data to support such statistics and such support is not clearly within scope for statistics of the control of immigration. The development of information on this area could be considered as a possible in-depth analysis. A National Register of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children supported by LAs has recently been set up; the possibility of using this to support NS should be considered in the context of developing a wider range of statistics monitoring the impact of immigration controls on children.
Appeals

6.55 Users are essentially requesting a full cohort analysis of appeals, including more detail on entry clearance appeals as well as asylum appeals. There is a good case for this in terms both of adequate monitoring of the immigration control processes and of ensuring that the statistics show the eventual outcomes of applications to enter the UK. These statistics, and the data on which they would depend, should be provided in the context of the new Appeals Process under the AIT; it would not be an efficient use of resources to attempt to provide them for the previous appeal processes.

6.56 Some aspects of the users’ requests warrant more specific comment as below.

- There may be multiple reasons for withdrawal of an appeal and this would make statistics identifying the reason difficult to develop; research investigation of a sample of cases may be more appropriate. However, from Bulletin 13/05 (Table 1.1) the net effect (on numbers of cases granted asylum, numbers granted ELR, HP or DL, and numbers refused asylum, ELR, HP and DL) of cases reconsidered is now recorded in the statistics. A further development – to identify in the appeals statistics those determinations recorded as “withdrawn by the HO” within the total of determinations recorded as withdrawn – would contribute to a fuller and clearer picture of the operation of the appeal process.

- Some data on non-suspensive appeal cases are published in the Certification Monitor’s annual report; these might usefully be included in NS intended to provide an overall monitor of the operation of immigration controls.

- A court-by-court breakdown of appeal outcomes would not be appropriate for a NS paper publication but – as the court is a natural classificatory variable for the data – might be provided through a drill-down facility on the web.

- Statistics separating appeals where people represented themselves could be appropriate for an NS paper publication if the outcomes differ significantly from cases where the appellant is legally represented; otherwise they, too, might be provided by a web-based drill-down service if such data are readily available from the data provided by the courts.

- Statistics for appeals in Scotland would be provided via those for individual courts from the drill-down facility. They should be provided in an NS paper publication only to the extent to which differences between the legal systems in Scotland and elsewhere in the UK preclude the presentation of cohort analyses showing UK totals.

6.57 Paragraphs 6.28 to 6.56 are relevant to Recommendations 7 and 10.

More detailed classifications

6.58 After the initial emerging findings of this review, IRSS introduced, in Bulletin 14/05, Table 1.2, a more detailed classification of purpose of journey. This identified some of the categories listed in paragraph 3.27. This is welcome and it is recognised that the statistics are limited by the classifications coded from the landing card data.

6.59 However, further improvements are desirable. In the short term, these include the following.

- Use of the same full classification in the Command Paper – while the annual publication of both the Bulletin and the Command Paper continues.

- Further addition to the detail of the classification, e.g. identification of retired persons of independent means and any others of the categories listed in paragraph 3.27 which can be identified from the coded landing cards data; and splitting in the Bulletin (as is done in the Command Paper) work permit holders between those given leave to enter for 12 months or more, and those for less than 12 months.

- Full specification of the definition of the classification – showing how each of the codes used for landing cards data is defined and allocated to the classes presented in the statistics. This could include, for example, specifically recording the treatment of unmarried spouses – e.g. are those of diplomats included under “diplomats etc.” and others under “admitted as spouse or fiancé(e)”?
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Providing a description of how the asylum applications received at port, and the decisions taken about them (e.g. Table 3.1 of Cm 6363), are reflected in the statistics of passengers given leave to enter or refused entry (e.g. Table 2.2 of Cm 6363).

6.60 In the longer term, as part of any strategic review of data or through the development of the Five Year Strategy and e-Borders, attempts should be made to achieve a fuller classification (reflecting the amended procedures for approving leave to enter) in the coding of landing card data. This should include identification of the length of stay approved and a reduction in the number coded as other or unknown purpose (of the 196,000 recoded as others given leave to enter in Table 1.2 of Bulletin 14/05, 180,000 are coded as “others” or “unknown” in the landing card data).

6.61 Not all of the categories under which entry is granted apply to extensions and/or the granting of settlement and vice versa. A full definition of the categories used in the statistics – showing how each of the relevant categories coded in the basic data are defined and allocated to the classes used in the statistics – should be published with the statistics and any practicable increase in the detail of the classification used in the NS introduced.

6.62 In principle, the available data could support statistics showing the numbers of applications, grants and refusals of extension and settlement under each category. However, considerable work would be needed to extract and quality assure these data and they could only be produced on a number in a time period – as opposed to cohort of applicants – basis. Given limited resources, priority should be given to seeking to ensure that good quality cohort data of this type are readily available in the longer term.

6.63 The data do not support a cross-classification of previous status (e.g. purpose for which entry granted) by status under which extended leave to remain or settlement is granted, nor whether the grant extends the total period of permission beyond 12 months. Again, this should be considered in any strategic review of the data systems.

6.64 As is noted in the Explanatory Notes to Bulletin 14/05, the numbers of grants of extension and settlement recorded in the statistics as “category unknown” reflect shortcomings, believed to be temporary, in the coding in the database. Work to remove these shortcomings should be supported.

6.65 It would be possible for the statistics to split those granted settlement on grounds of family formation or reunion between those on the basis of relationship to a British citizen and those on the basis of relationship to someone settled here. This should be done if it can be achieved without preventing an improvement of higher priority. The current data would not, however, support an analysis of these grants of settlement by the purpose for which the family member being joined was originally granted entry. As such statistics would cast useful light on the longer-term impact of different types of entry flow, the possibility of developing such data should be considered as part of any strategic review of the underlying data.

6.66 The provision of statistics giving reason for refusal (in the case of asylum applications in more detail than is given in Tables 4.2 and 4.3 of Bulletin 13/05, and for other applications any classification of reasons) depends on consistent codifying and recording of the main reason. This aspect of the data should be addressed in the proposed strategic consideration of data and its management.

6.67 The extensive nationality detail provided in the publications is one of the difficulties faced by those wishing to use the tables to obtain an overview – the wood can be hidden by the trees. As part of the restructuring of the publications, tables showing detailed nationality – as opposed to identifying the most important nationalities – could usefully be presented as annexes or available via the web. The latter could give user flexibility as to how countries were grouped (if at all). IRSS is considering the provision of downloadable Excel tables giving the full nationality breakdown in advance of any more sophisticated development of the website. In providing summary nationality analyses, consideration should be given to using the NS standard classification currently being developed.

6.68 The points in this section are relevant to Recommendation 10. In addition, paragraphs 6.60, 6.63, 6.65 and 6.66 are relevant to Recommendation 1 and paragraph 6.67 is relevant to Recommendation 4.
6.69 The statistics of asylum applications are split between claims at port and in country in the Bulletins. A similar split for initial decisions is available on request. If this split of statistics for initial decisions is not added to the Bulletins, it should be made available as a drill-down option through the website. If a cohort database is successfully developed it would be relatively straightforward to split statistics for later stages (either in the paper publications or through the web drill-down facility) of the asylum process in the same way.

6.70 Further analysis by age could be provided. However, apart from the increased statistics for children discussed elsewhere in this report, it is probably more appropriate for a web-based drill-down facility than the paper publications. Further analysis by sex could similarly be provided. Marital status is not routinely recorded and its provision would not seem to be a high priority. Race/religion/ethnicity would be very difficult to collect – in practice, there can be difficulty with the relatively simple nationality – and in many cases there is no administrative reason to collect race, etc. This is an important point as there is a requirement to advise the claimant why questions are being asked. Given the mobility of asylum applicants and other immigrants, the first address stated on arrival (which would be the only basis of a regional analysis except for those supported by NASS for which a detailed geographical analysis is already provided) would not provide meaningful statistics. Other sources, such as the Census and LFS, are more appropriate for regional analyses.

6.71 The routine production of statistics on skills, special needs and languages of new arrivals is not practicable at present. The future collection of such data on a routine basis would not be justified on statistical grounds alone. However, any fundamental review of data and data systems should consider the value of such data for operational and evaluation, as well as statistical, purposes and compare this value with the cost and practicality of collecting the data. For example, it has been suggested that early data on applicants’ languages might be used to avoid operational delay at later legal stages, and data on applicants’ skills could be used to support evaluation of the success of the Points Based System in achieving immigration with an appropriate skills mix. In the absence of routine data, these topics could be the subject of periodic in-depth analyses – see HO Online Report 37/04: Skills Audit of Refugees.

6.72 Users made various points about the need for the statistics promptly to reflect changes in the control processes. Statistics are being developed or planned for all the specific issues of this type listed in paragraph 3.32. IRSS involvement in a more strategic approach to data and its management should facilitate the prompt introduction of appropriate statistics in such circumstances and the ability to outline the types of statistical monitoring envisaged as part of the announcement of an intended change to the procedures.

6.73 More detail about reconsidered cases has been included in Table 1.1 and the Commentary text in Bulletin 13/05.

6.74 The definition of asylum recognition rates is not a simple matter of following internationally agreed detailed standards or definitions. At least three different bases are currently used for the calculation of these rates.

- UNHCR excludes withdrawals (applications withdrawn by the applicant) and also those refused on grounds of non-compliance (e.g. failure to attend an interview or to provide required information).
- The NS exclude withdrawals but include those refused, on the grounds that:
  - withdrawals occur prior to initial decisions occurring, and are therefore not an outcome of the initial decision process (whose outcomes the rate is intended to describe);
  - withdrawals may not necessarily represent substantive casework by IND and have therefore not been counted within initial decision totals by IND or (historically) in the published statistics; and
  - refusals on grounds of non-compliance are similar to other refusals in respect of quality assurance processes, and in terms of administrative processes and legal interpretation (appeal rights, etc.) and do not imply that the case was not substantively considered by the caseworker.
- The rates calculated by the EU include both groups.
I have found no clear evidence as to which basis maximises international comparability; this is not a simple clear-cut matter as different countries classify outcomes in different ways. Until the detailed investigation necessary to determine which approach maximises international comparability is undertaken, and demonstrates that this approach is not that currently used in the NS, I see no reason to change the method used for the NS. However, the NS publications might usefully draw prominent and clear attention to the use of different measures by different organisations and to the uncertainty about which gives maximum comparability. It should also be noted that:

- the NS publications present statistics in sufficient detail to support the calculation of recognition rates using all three methods; and
- in addition to the period-based rates, as used in the international publications, the annual NS Bulletin presents rates based on the more robust cohort approach.

6.75 This section is relevant to Recommendation 10. In addition, paragraphs 6.70 and 6.71 are relevant to Recommendation 6 and paragraph 6.74 to Recommendation 8.

New sections

6.76 As the range of statistics about children is developed, as proposed above, the benefits of adding a section to the publications drawing together all those statistics should be carefully considered. The asylum element of such a section might be based on the statistical report of unaccompanied asylum seeking children prepared for the External Stakeholders Group; meanwhile, that report could usefully be mentioned in the bibliography at the end of the Statistical Bulletins. If it is decided not to introduce such a chapter, one of the standard sets of web-based tabulations proposed at paragraph 7.18 should take this form.

6.77 Consistency and coherence in comparisons between UK and international statistics are important to users and are not always automatically achieved (e.g. removals can mean different things in the statistics of different countries). The current consultations about EU statistics in this area should be, and are being, used to attempt to increase such consistency. The prime responsibility for presenting coherent and comparable statistics for a range of countries can reasonably be taken to rest with the relevant international organisations – such as UNHCR and EU (specifically Eurostat). When both the EU consultations are complete Eurostat should be in a better position to provide such statistics. IRSS should continue to encourage them, and the other relevant bodies, to continue to provide and improve the quality of such statistics. In particular, it should encourage the presentation, with the statistics, of as full and clear as possible a description of the nature, and likely impact on the statistics, of differences between the bases of different countries’ statistics. The NS paper publications should provide full references to those statistics and the web version of the NS should include full links to sites carrying the international statistics in a form that draws explicit, and prominent, attention to differences of definition and any other inconsistencies. There is little case for NS publications to duplicate international comparisons of a satisfactory quality provided by international organisations. Thus, if an additional section on international comparisons were added to the NS publications it should be limited to:

- a few key indicators – and related commentary;
- full references to the international sources; plus
- any important comparable statistics and/or descriptions of inter-country differences of definition or basis not provided by those organisations.

6.78 The need for the size of controlled flows – especially asylum – to be put in the context of overall migration flows is addressed in paragraph 5.3.

6.79 The other sections suggested in paragraph 3.34 are probably more appropriate to periodic in-depth analyses rather than routine annual and quarterly statistical publications, though, as is considered elsewhere in this report, there may be a case for including some key LFS-based tables.

6.80 This section is relevant to Recommendation 4; additionally, paragraph 6.77 is relevant to Recommendation 8 and paragraph 6.79 to Recommendation 6.
Form of publication and metadata

6.81 Most of the points made by users on these areas are reflected in Chapters 5 and 7.

6.82 It is claimed – e.g. page 2 of Home Office Statistical Bulletin 13/05 – that the rounding of various statistics to the nearest five is necessary because the statistics are not necessarily accurate to the nearest one and to protect statistical confidentiality; that is, I am advised by IND, to avoid any risk of individual confidentiality being breached. A number of users found this rounding inconvenient and it is not necessary for these purposes. It is routine for statistics to be published to more significant figures than one can be sure are accurate; what is needed to reflect uncertainties is not rounding but a proper description of the uncertainty (in the metadata and referenced in the footnotes). Preserving confidentiality does not require the rounding of relatively large numbers; the concern should be addressed by merely replacing all numbers less than some cut-off value (say, five) with a symbol and ensuring that the actual number is not derivable by deduction.

In-depth analyses

6.83 There is a clear user interest in periodic in-depth analyses of aspects of migration and its impact. Users have welcomed the analyses of this type that have been provided. These often involve bringing together data from a wide range of sources, including some not used for NS and some – for example, population censuses – which are updated relatively infrequently. Such analyses can provide valuable insights into the nature and effect of migration and its control of a type not provided by regular statistical series.

6.84 This should, for the foreseeable future, be given less priority than the improvement of the NS. However, there is not necessarily a direct competition for the same resources – for example, the analyses may be produced by staff or consultants not equipped to work on the improvement of the basic statistics.

6.85 IRSS should consider using the consultation meeting proposed elsewhere to seek advice on the prioritisation between the different analyses proposed in the in-depth analysis section of Chapter 3 plus:

- refugee stock by characteristics (paragraph 6.18);
- the number of failed asylum applicants in the country (paragraph 6.19);
- the scale of illegal immigration (paragraph 6.19);
- numbers and characteristics of asylum applicants and other immigrants supported by local authorities (paragraph 6.54);
- skills, special needs and languages of new entrants (paragraph 6.71); and
- several of the topics suggested by users for additional sections in the NS publications (paragraph 6.79).

These analyses, although suggested by users as possible additions to the routine statistics are, it is argued above, more appropriate to occasional in-depth treatment.

6.86 The suggestion that some of these analyses might lead to the identification of additional series for inclusion in the regular statistics should be borne in mind as in-depth analyses are produced. The possibility of using the work permit statistics from the OECD publication Trends in International Migration has already been mentioned; LFS statistics of the type presented in International Migration and the United Kingdom: Recent patterns and trends is another possibility.

6.87 The suggestion that, to support the development of these in-depth analyses, one might investigate the practicality of introducing migration status into a range of mainstream socio-economic statistics, is an important one. There are two particular contexts in which it should be pursued:

- the development of the Continuous Population Survey for which questions designed to identify migration status should be developed and tested; and
- the matching of individuals’ immigration control records to other records about the same individual – as is discussed elsewhere in this report.
6.88 This section is relevant to Recommendation 6.

User consultation

6.89 There is a clear need – and not only to meet NS standards – for fuller and continuing consultation with users. An annual meeting involving IND and external users should be established. The action plan – ideally in draft – in response to this review could be a useful basis for the first meeting. This meeting could also usefully consider the basis for future meetings; for example, whether they should be based on:

- regular reports from IRSS outlining draft plans for developing the statistics and identifying the additional or improved data required in order to develop further useful statistics or improve the quality of those currently produced;
- papers prepared by users on desired developments; and/or
- a programme developed by an advisory group established at the first meeting.

6.90 IRSS might usefully also consider the following.

- Advertising, internally and externally, its willingness to consider proposals for improving the NS and their presentation.
- Advertising its willingness to make presentations, and participate in discussions, at meetings organised by users.
- Revising the reference at the end of the NS publications to enquiries about the content of the Bulletin (or figures in the Command Paper) to make it explicit that the same contact point can be used to initiate discussions about the practicability of extending, or otherwise improving, the published statistics or providing more detailed supplementary statistics.

6.91 As an additional contribution to the identification of users’ unsatisfied needs for statistics, IRSS might maintain a record of PQs that could not be answered by reference to statistical publications.

6.92 This section is relevant to Recommendation 2.

Importance of NS status

6.93 Users’ confidence in NS is welcome and needs to be sustained. It also confirms the importance of clearly labelling NS as such. However, sustaining this confidence need not conflict with giving, as some users suggest, greater weight to user relevance – relative to empirical robustness – in determining which statistics should be published as NS. Where the inclusion of figures is in doubt on grounds of empirical robustness, consideration should be given to including the figures with as full as possible a description of the cause, nature and scale of the doubt. There need be no requirement for statistics based on administrative sources – such as the operation of immigration controls – to be more empirically robust than statistics based on sample surveys (which are subject to sampling and, usually, other errors). What is important is that the description of those errors, or uncertainties, is at least as open and full as one would expect for survey-based statistics.

Use of non-NS statistics and provision of more detailed statistics

6.94 Points made by users on these areas are reflected in Chapter 7.
7 Frequency and format of National Statistics publications and dissemination

7.1 While there is some user demand for monthly statistics, users generally would support prompt quarterly publication of immigration control statistics. This would seem to give an appropriate balance between, on the one hand, providing up-to-date statistics about a situation which can change relatively quickly and about which there is considerable user interest in having the most up-to-date statistics and, on the other hand, giving undue prominence to short-term fluctuations which can occur in monthly figures. It would also facilitate the use of references to forthcoming publication in responding to FOI requests.

7.2 There seems little value in having two annual paper publications (Bulletins and the Command Paper) and, indeed, some users appeared unaware of tables available in one but not in the other.

7.3 The production of three separate annual Bulletins, as listed at paragraph 1.1, militates against putting asylum applicants, in particular, in the broader context. However, the production of a single series of quarterly Bulletins presenting statistics for the same quarter for all aspects of immigration control would involve significant, and unacceptable, delay in the publication of those statistics, primarily relating to asylum, which are available most promptly.

7.4 Against this background, I recommend that the web should be seen as the prime dissemination vehicle for timely detailed statistics. While it should cover the full range of controls and put each strand in the context of the overall total, each strand should be updated quarterly as the statistics become available, with the broader context being added subsequently to those strands for which the statistics are produced relatively quickly. Each update should be simultaneous with a brief (probably no more than four pages and certainly considerably shorter than the current Bulletins) paper publication of the key summary statistics for the strand being updated. These publications should include references to the web address for the detailed statistics, the tabulation service (see paragraph 7.18), the descriptions and maps of the control processes, and other metadata, to be found in the annual publication and on the web. Consideration will need to be given – taking account, in particular, the timescales in which different statistics can be produced – to whether the extension of the range of controls covered by the statistics should lead to more than the current three separate strands (asylum, other controls, citizenship) being treated in this way (e.g. whether visas should form a separate strand or be part of an extended other controls strand).

7.5 This should be supplemented by an annual paper publication, covering the full range of controls and presenting detailed statistics as a document of record. Earlier chapters, and in particular Chapter 5, have clear implications for the format of this annual NS paper publication.

7.6 To aid understanding it should begin with a process map, and supporting description, of the control procedures the statistics are monitoring. This, like the statistics themselves, should cover the full process including non-IND aspects. It is likely that it will be appropriate for the map to be layered – that is, for there to be a broad overview map followed by more detailed maps of particular stages.

7.7 This should be followed by summary tables, as far as possible cohort-based, and a commentary showing the main flows through the process map during the reference period and the numbers at each intermediate stage at the end of the reference period. In order to provide a clear overview, any details of nationality, country of origin, age, etc. in these tables should be very limited. For nationality and country of origin, the details would be the minimum necessary to highlight any significant changes in the reference period; this would probably most often mean no classification by these variables in the tables but some appropriate reference, drawing on tables available elsewhere in the publication (or on the web) in the commentary. For age, the publication could simply identify the three categories of children: unaccompanied, applicants in own right (otherwise known as accompanied children) and dependants.

7.8 There should follow tables and commentary putting the controlled flows in the context of total gross UK immigration and showing, in as much detail as is practicable, how the statistics of controlled
flows are reflected in the estimates of total immigration. The timing of the availability of immigration statistics, and the need for the production of this analysis to be a joint HO/ONS activity, may prevent this information being available for inclusion in the statistics of immigration control publications. In that event, this analysis should be included on the website at the earliest possible date and the intention to do this, the web reference, and the likely date, prominently included in the publication.

7.9 The subsequent chapters should deal, in turn, with specific aspects of the control process – much as do the chapters of the Command Paper though a wider range of processes would be covered (e.g. visas would be included) and many of the tables would be cohort based. These tables would, in essence, provide increased detail for the summary tables in the first chapter. An increased use of graphs and charts should be considered together with a reduction in the scale of detailed tables in favour of a web-based service as described below. The possibility of adding a specific chapter on children should be considered.

7.10 While the expert users who responded to the invitation to contribute to this review were generally fairly content with the metadata, the introduction of the process map should also be used to review the metadata provided with the statistics. Such a review would both respond to the comments of some expert users and significantly aid the understanding of the less expert. The maps should be used to identify, in a metadata or explanatory notes chapter of the publication, what data are collected and how at each stage in the process. The description of the data should include a list, and definition, of the categories used for each variable for which data are collected.

7.11 One approach to developing such metadata could be to build on the diagram on p15 of NAO Report HC625 Asylum and migration: a review of Home Office Statistics. This would involve linking the data collection points identified in that diagram to the relevant points on the process map and providing more detail about the data collected and categories and definitions used.

7.12 Where the published statistics consistently use particular groupings of the detailed categories collected through the administrative process, these groupings should be defined in the metadata chapter. If different groupings are used in different tables, these definitions should appear in footnotes and different titles should be used for each grouping.

7.13 While, as noted above, the expert users who responded to the invitation to contribute to this review were generally fairly content with the metadata, they did raise some detailed points. These are listed in Annex C and should be taken into account in the review of metadata recommended above.

7.14 The web should be the prime vehicle for disseminating the detailed NS. At present, the web is an almost totally unexploited tool, providing only access to the paper publications:

- without any index of what they contain;
- in PDF format only; and
- without any clear signposting from the IND or RDS home pages.

For example, the possibilities of providing the following are totally unexploited:

- ready links to other relevant websites;
- drill-down facilities to investigate statistics in increasing detail;
- tables downloadable in formats supporting further analysis;
- facilities to search for tables on specific topics; and
- facilities to analyse microdata.

7.15 While development of the use of the web for immigration statistics may have to be coordinated with wider development of the HO use of the web – and this may have implications for the speed with which progress can be made – the web should be developed to provide the following:

- A searchable index to the content of the paper publications.
- Excel versions of the publications tables (if, for any reason, this cannot be achieved quickly an Excel tables service should be provided through the NS site) and Word, as well as PDF, versions of the text.
A high-level version of the immigration control process map with a drill-down facility giving greater detail of the processes and links from the process chart to relevant statistical tables and to the relevant metadata as described in paragraphs 7.10 to 7.12; this process map should be continually updated as necessary (i.e. updates should not await the next annual paper publication).

More detailed tables – including a drill-down facility from key summary statistics and from the web copy of the tables in the paper publications, and a tabulation facility producing tables to user specification – than in the paper publications; and a facility to download these tables in Excel.

Well laid-out graphics showing trends in volumes and composition of flows over recent years.

A graphics facility allowing users to produce their own graphics from the tables.

Links to other relevant government websites (e.g. ONS for international migration, census analyses relating to the socio-economic activity and geographic concentration of immigrants, and relevant LFS analyses; DfES for data on international students; DfID for analysis of the links between development and migration); EU and other sites giving comparable statistics for other countries; and sites giving more detailed statistics on non-IND processes covered by the increased range of immigration control NS recommended elsewhere in this report). It should be clear where the linked statistics are not NS and in these cases it would be highly desirable for the link to provide some information about the quality of the statistics.

Links to analyses of broader aspects of migration and its socio-economic impact such as those considered in the in-depth analysis sections of Chapters 3 and 6.

7.16 It might also provide the following.

- Automatic links from any table to the relevant metadata.
- Access to anonymised microdata for use in research analyses.
- Short factual briefing notes, using the latest statistics and in the style of the topic-based summaries available on the NS website, on key topics to provide authoritative information on issues of current interest.
- Information about IRSS with contact details for particular statistics.
- Access to census and LFS data on, e.g. country of birth by local area and region.
- Greater explanation of how to use the statistics.
- Necessary revisions to the statistics between paper publications.
- Parliamentary answers, and responses to FOI requests, giving immigration control statistics.
- An overview analysis of migration and its effects calling on a wider range of sources than addressed by this review.

7.17 In addition, access to the relevant part of the RDS website should be:

- faster; and
- more prominently flagged from the IND website and RDS and NS home pages.

7.18 While many users would welcome such an increased use of, and reliance on, the web, some would lack the expertise to exploit it and some of these would doubtless regret any reduction in the detail of tables in the paper publications. For this reason, the introduction of the use of the web should be accompanied by a service to provide hard copy of Excel tables from the web for those unable, or unwilling, to do this themselves. This should include both a standard set of tables and an ad hoc tabulation service and might be provided on a cost recovery basis by IRSS or by a commercial, or not for profit, organisation authorised by IRSS. The bulk of the HO Report *UK Migration – Overview and Trends* might be produced in this way.

7.19 It has been suggested that the comprehensive production of quarterly statistics would represent a significantly increased workload: this should not be the case. The production of statistical tables from quality assured data should be a largely straightforward computing operation while continual, rather than annual, data validation and correction – and updating of table formats, and the required computing routines, to reflect changes in policy or control procedures – should reduce the current fluctuations in workload. Furthermore, continual data cleansing is likely to reduce the total work required as data problems can be found relatively quickly and dealt with while the data are relatively recent.
7.20  Wider advertising of the email service alerting recipients to new statistical reports, and its extension to cover relevant parliamentary replies, could also be useful in assisting users to be fully aware of statistics in a timely manner.

7.21  This chapter is reflected in Recommendations 3 and 4.
8 Recommendations

8.1 The above is distilled into 11 recommendations below.

8.2 A substantial priority should be given to the first five of the recommendations.
- Recommendation 1: The conducting of a data audit
- Recommendation 2: Improving user consultation
- Recommendation 3: Exploitation of the web
- Recommendation 4: Restructuring of the publications’ formats
- Recommendation 5: Development of cohort-based statistics

8.3 However, in the context in which this review is being conducted, priority and first to be done may not be synonymous. This is for a number of reasons including the following.
- Resources are not necessarily interchangeable, e.g. the people most able to take forward the first three may not be interchangeable.
- The timetable for some may not be determined by IRSS – which has the lead in preparing and implementing the action plan following this report; for example:
  - the data audit needs the full involvement of a much wider range of constituencies; and
  - the web development will probably need to be coordinated with a wider development of the HO’s use of the web, though if that causes delay one would hope that some developments (e.g. user-friendly links to other relevant sites, and downloadable Excel tables) could proceed ahead of the full development.
- It may be inefficient to proceed with some ahead of other developments, for example:
  - it is unlikely to be resource efficient to fully develop the process maps, related summary tables and commentary, and revised and fuller metadata linked to those maps for the aspects of the current controls which are to be substantially revised in the implementation of the Five Year Strategy; and
  - it may well not be efficient to very substantially extend the range of cohort-based statistics in advance of the data audit and consequent improvement to the underlying data.

8.4 Among the other recommendations, priorities should be determined in the action plan by reference to the following.
- Priority – all else being equal – being given to ensuring good quality appropriate statistics in the medium term rather than to short-term improvements which will be overtaken by other developments in the medium term.
- The extent to which they contribute to, and move in the direction of, the longer-term improvements (as a counter example, it would not be appropriate to devote resource to a radical improvement of statistics of appeals shortly before the appeal processes were simplified).
- The completion of the coverage of immigration controls (notably the inclusion of statistics on visas, work permits, Worker Registration Scheme, NI Number Allocations to Overseas Nationals Entering the UK and, data quality permitting, the types of control referred to in paragraphs 6.37 to 6.40).
- Fuller explanation of the links between the statistics of control and total immigration statistics – though this, too, might be achieved in the shortest term by prominent references to the relevant ONS websites and/or publications.
- The scale of improvement that could be achieved for a given resource input.

They should also be subject to reconsideration in the light of the views of users, for which purpose the action plan (or a draft of it) should be an agenda item for the first of the recommended user consultation meetings.
Recommendation 1
IRSS should encourage, and fully participate in, as full as possible a strategic review or audit – under the auspices of the IND Corporate Change Board – of the data, and data management systems, supporting the operation, monitoring and development of all immigration controls.

The scope of such an audit should include the points raised in paragraphs 4.2 to 4.11 and should be seen as a key element in the implementation of the Five Year Strategy. In summary it should:

- consider the full range of control processes as a coherent whole, regardless of the location of responsibility for particular aspects of the controls and processes;
- fully take into account the data needs (and the need to reflect the likelihood that those needs will develop) for operational, policy, statistical and research purposes;
- identify the most efficient ways of collecting, sharing across the full range of immigration control processes, and ensuring the accuracy of, data; and
- design the processes (physical, e.g. data capture at different stages of the control procedures, and IT) and systems required.

In participating in it, IRSS should bear in mind all the desirable improvements to the statistics raised (e.g. in Chapter 6) in this report – so that those that are not supported by any resulting improved data system are unsupported by conscious decision for, for example, practicality or cost-benefit reasons. This should include, but not be limited to, those – such as the coding of reasons for refusal of entry, or the various cohort statistics such as a cross-classification of previous status by status under which extended leave to remain or settlement is granted – for which the relevance of such an audit is specifically mentioned. The audit should also reflect the desirability of avoiding placing any difficulties in the way of longer-term developments (using other government data sets) of the type described in paragraph 4.17.

Recommendation 2
IRSS should significantly extend its consultation with users about the development, and limitations, of statistics of immigration control.

In particular, IRSS should arrange an annual meeting open to all users at which IRSS plans, and possible future ideas, for improvement to the NS should be presented for comment and debate; and users are able to present their suggestions. The first of these meetings should consider:

- the action plan, if possible in draft, prepared in response to this review;
- possible other ways of improving user consultation (paragraphs 6.90 to 6.91);
- plans for statistics to reflect upcoming changes in control procedures (paragraph 6.72);
- the prioritisation of in-depth analyses (Recommendation 6); and
- a proposed list of linked websites (paragraph 6.21).

Recommendation 3
The web should be exploited for the presentation of the NS in the ways described in paragraphs 7.14 to 7.20 of this report.

In particular, the web should be seen as the prime vehicle for disseminating the detailed NS (paragraph 7.4) and, inter alia, should provide:

- downloadable Excel format tables together with tabulation and graphics facilities;
- the ability to drill-down from a summary table to provide more detailed statistics;
- a high-level process map and description with a drill-down facility to provide more detail for specific aspects of the controls;
- links to other relevant sites; and
- links from any table to the relevant metadata.

This should be supplemented by a table production service for those unable or unwilling to use the web.
Recommendation 4

The paper publications of NS should be revised in the ways described in Chapter 5 and paragraphs 7.1 to 7.13 of this report.

The main features of this are the following.

- **Brief quarterly releases for each strand with detailed statistics simultaneously released on the web**, in a manner that presents a coherent picture of the full range of controls up to the most recent quarter for which this is possible, and more up-to-date statistics for those strands for which this is possible.

- **An annual document of record presenting detailed statistics for the full range of controls and:**
  - leading with a process map, and supporting description, describing the routes which can be taken through the full range of immigration control procedures;
  - followed by summary tables and commentary showing the main flows through all aspects of the controls and numbers at key intermediate points at the end of the reference period (if full coverage of the controls identified in paragraphs 6.2 to 6.12 cannot immediately be achieved, full references to sources of other statistics – e.g. for visas – should be prominently included);
  - tables and commentary putting the controlled flows in the context of total gross immigration – or, if issues of timing and/or departmental responsibility prevent this, a prominent reference to other documents doing this;
  - subject chapters;
  - clarified and more detailed metadata linked to the process map and the data collected at various points in that process; and
  - to the maximum extent possible, presenting cohort-based statistics with period-based statistics derived from the marginal totals of cohort based.

Recommendation 5

Considerably more cohort-based statistics should be produced. Where relevant, statistics showing cases dealt with and stages reached during a period should be presented as the appropriate marginal totals of tables of cohort statistics.

While much of this – for example, most of the user requests reported at paragraph 3.17 and the analyses discussed at paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5 – will depend on data developments that may be most efficiently and effectively achieved through the strategic review (Recommendation 1), others should be progressed more quickly. In particular, early action should be taken in the following areas.

- **In view of the potentially misleading nature of some of the NS relating to detention, priority should be given either to introducing cohort-based statistics (even if less extensive than those proposed for the longer term) or developing an alternative source of statistics covering the whole period rather than a single day (paragraph 6.26).**

- **Extension of the cohort analyses for fast track asylum applicants to cover stages occurring after the quarter in which asylum was first sought (paragraph 6.23).**

- **The estimated cohort analysis of asylum applications made in recent years in the annual Asylum Statistics Bulletin could be supplemented by tables showing actual figures – without estimation on the basis of past patterns – including numbers in various stages at the end of each year (paragraph 6.23).**

Recommendation 6

A programme of in-depth analyses should be established in consultation with users (paragraphs 6.83 to 6.87).

In doing this opportunities should be looked for and exploited to:

- improve the identification of different groups of immigrants, and visitors, in other data sources (paragraph 6.87); and
- derive additional NS series from some of the sources used (paragraph 6.86).

Possible topics are identified in paragraphs 3.45, 6.18, 6.19, 6.70, 6.71, 6.79 and 6.85.
Recommendation 7
Among the more detailed recommendations, priority should be given to two items.

- The development of more, and more detailed, statistics relating to children. This is because of the extensive user interest (paragraphs 3.19, 6.28, 6.29 and 6.54).
- The consistent inclusion, but separate identification, of dependants in all statistics relating to stages which can involve both principals and dependants. This is because of the scope for relatively easily reducing the scope for confusion (paragraphs 3.20 and 6.30).

Recommendation 8
The user interest in the coherent presentation of comparable statistics for different countries should be met primarily by encouraging the further development of the statistics produced by the relevant international organisations.

This should include the further development of the metadata presenting clear descriptions of the nature, and likely impact on the statistics, of differences between the bases of different countries' statistics. The NS publications and website should include full references (and for the website links) to the comparable statistics provided by the international organisations; these should include descriptions of the available statistics and explicit references to the metadata. Any additional section on international comparisons should supplement rather than duplicate international organisations’ presentation of statistics. The priority, relative to that for in-depth analyses of other topics, to be given to periodic analyses comparing international evidence on aspects of immigration control of particular interest in the UK context, should be considered with the proposed users’ forum (paragraphs 2.5 to 2.7, 3.34, 6.74 and 6.77).

Recommendation 9
IRSS should quantify, and seek, the additional resources that would – pending improvement of the underpinning data in ways which will enhance the quality of all statistics derived from it – permit provision of QA for significant statistics outside the scope of NS derived from data produced from immigration control processes (paragraphs 4.13 to 4.15).

Recommendation 10
A range of other improvements should be pursued via a prioritisation process taking account of the factors listed in paragraph 8.4.

These are considered in Chapter 7 and include:

- further development of statistics about dependants (paragraphs 6.30 to 6.33);
- development of the statistics relating to relevant offences (paragraphs 6.34 to 6.36);
- development of various statistics relating to enforcement (paragraphs 6.37 to 6.48);
- development of statistics analysing the numbers of unsuccessful asylum applicants that have come to the end of the asylum process but who the Government cannot remove by the reason removal (paragraph 6.49);
- further development of the statistics of support of asylum applicants (paragraphs 6.13 and 6.50 to 6.54);
- extension of statistics of appeals pending development of full cohort analysis (paragraph 6.56);
- further extension of, and clarification of the metadata for, purpose of visit classifications (paragraphs 6.59 to 6.60);
- provision of full metadata for the, if possible, enhanced classification of extensions and settlements (paragraph 6.61);
- possible development of statistics showing the numbers of applications, grants and refusals of extension and settlement under each category (paragraph 6.62);
- improvement of the underlying data on the categories under which extensions and settlement are granted (paragraph 6.64);
• introduction of statistics splitting those granted settlement on grounds of family formation or reunion by whether they are on the basis of relationship to a British Citizen or to someone settled here (paragraph 6.65);
• provision, in advance of full exploitation of the web, of downloadable Excel tables giving full nationality detail (paragraph 6.67);
• publication of a fuller range of asylum statistics split between applicants at port and applicants in country (paragraph 6.69);
• provision of further analyses by age (paragraph 6.70); and
• introduction of an improved way of reflecting uncertainty about the accuracy of the figures and concerns about individual confidentiality in presenting the NS (paragraph 6.82).

Recommendation 11
IRSS should encourage, and actively participate in, any exercises developing record matching so as to maximise the value that could be obtained, particularly in assessing the socio-economic impact of different types of migration, through linking individual person-based immigration control data records to subsequent data records for the same individual (paragraph 4.17).
Annex A  Steering Group membership

Chair:
Patrick Collier  
Programme Director, IRSS, HO
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Annex B  Review methodology

The review began on 14 March 2005 and the Project Initiation Document (Terms of Reference) for the review can be found at www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs05/immigpid.pdf and http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/data/methodology/quality/reviews/downloads/Control-PID.doc

During the course of the review I have, in varying degrees of detail, reviewed the documents listed in Annex B1.

The user questionnaire at Annex B2 was agreed with IRSS and was made publicly available on both the HO RDS and NS websites. IRSS specifically drew the attention of about 350 people, including policy makers, immigration pressure groups, international contacts and academics, to the questionnaire and issued reminders to about 60 key users and second reminders to about a dozen.

I held meetings with the following.

External users/producers
Simon Hewitt, UKvisas
Judith Jones, ONS
Simon Lever, UKvisas
John Salt, University College, London

IRSS
Ann Barber
Barry Bardwell-Snow
Patrick Collier
Philip Danzelman
Jill Dudley
David Matz
Nick Wyatt

Home Office other than IRSS
Nick Baird
Grant Beresford
Alan Bucknall
Freda Chaloner
Brodie Clark
Robin Edwards
Jackie Fowler
Graeme Hart
Paula Higson
Liz Kane
Jeremy Kempton
Neil Parkin
Joanna Place
Brian Pollett
David Ramsbotham
Mark Rigby
Dave Roberts
Lorraine Rogerson
Jon Simmons (RDS)
Mark Wilson

Others contributing to the review, including the return of a completed questionnaire, are listed in Annex B3.

A paper outlining initial provisional findings was placed on the website on 23 August 2005 and drawn to the attention of some 140 users including all those who had contributed to the review before then. Comments were received from two users.

The Steering Group met on 13 July 2005 when it reviewed a progress report including some emerging findings and on 24 October 2005 when it reviewed a draft of this report.

During the course of the review, I participated in a meeting of the e-Borders Management Information and Statistics Working Group, and provided a note for that group on the implications that the e-Borders project and this review have for each other.
Annex B1  Documents considered

- HO response to HC 625 above and actions on statistics as at 7 April 2005 (internal Home Office document).
- IND – Overview of Migration Routes published by IND (internal Home Office document).
- IND web pages on caseworking at http://www.ind.homeoffice.gov.uk/applying/generalcaseworking/ and hard copies of the caseworking documents on: work permits; arriving passengers; right of abode; adopted children; EEA Nationals; relatives; returning residents; sponsors of visitors; husbands, wives, fiancés, fiancées; students; UK ancestry; visitors; au pairs; doctors and dentists; domestic workers; investors; and Working Holidaymakers.
- Controlling our borders: Making migration work for Britain: Five Year Strategy for asylum and immigration – Cm 6472 February 2005.
- Sizing the illegally resident population in the UK: Salt and others: RDS Online Report 58/04.
- The Home Office National Statistics publications.


• EU documents.


• **Towards Harmonised European Statistics For International Migration questionnaires** (unpublished), completed in draft UK response.
  - General questionnaire on data collection in the field of asylum applications and asylum decisions.
  - General questionnaire on the relation between asylum statistics and migration statistics.


• **UNHCR Statistical Yearbook 2003** – UNHCR.


• Information about work permits at [http://www.workingintheuk.gov.uk/working_in_the_uk/en/homepage/work_permits.html](http://www.workingintheuk.gov.uk/working_in_the_uk/en/homepage/work_permits.html).


• **IND management and monitoring statistics** (unpublished).

• **Landing card entry codes** (internal Home Office document).

• Statement of Evidence Form for asylum applicants (internal Home Office document).


Annex B2    Consultation questionnaire

The questionnaire referenced the publications that were current at the time. Where appropriate, the
text of this report has been updated to reflect more recent publications.
This questionnaire is designed to be completed electronically, using Microsoft Word. If you need to complete it by hand, you may need to expand some of the response boxes before printing the questionnaire, to provide enough space for your responses. You do not have to answer all the questions in order to contribute to the review: please feel free to respond to only those questions on which you wish to express a view. You may continue your answers on a separate sheet and/or attach supporting documents. If you do so, please label the additional material with the question number to which it refers.

This questionnaire relates to the statistics released in the following Home Office publications.

**Annual Command Paper**
- Control of Immigration: Statistics, United Kingdom – most recently Cm 6363 published on 16 November 2004.

**Annual Home Office Statistical Bulletins**

**Quarterly Home Office asylum web pages**
- Asylum Statistics: 4th Quarter 2003 – most recent edition relates to the fourth quarter of 2004 and was released on 22 February 2005.

These publications can be found at [http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/immigration1.html](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/immigration1.html)

**Information about yourself**

If you do not wish the information on this page to be passed to the Home Office, please put a cross in this box.

Name

Please provide an email address and/or telephone number, in case we need to clarify any points.

Email address

Telephone number

Are you representing a group or organisation? *Put a cross in one box.*

- Yes
- No – I am providing my personal views → If no, go to question 1 (next page)

Organisation represented.

Your title/role in the organisation.

Type of organisation (this will assist us in monitoring the range of users the consultation has reached). *Put a cross in one or more boxes.*

- Central Government department
- NGO/NDPB
- Government Agency
- Local Government
- Higher/further education
- Private/commercial organisation
- Independent institution
- Charity
- International organisation
- Other category (please specify below)
1. Approximately how often do you use statistics from the publications listed on page 1? Put a cross in one box.

- [ ] Daily
- [ ] Weekly
- [ ] Monthly
- [ ] Quarterly
- [ ] Annually
- [ ] Less often
- [ ] Too new a user to be able to say

2. What is your main use for the statistics in the listed publications? Put a cross in one or more boxes.

- Monitor specific immigration control, asylum or citizenship processes
- Gain an overview of UK’s immigration control, asylum or citizenship system
- Inform administration and provision of services
- Policy advice
- Research
- Publication of international statistics
- Other (please specify below)

3. For your uses, how would you rate the overall importance/usefulness of the statistics? Put a cross in one box.

- [ ] Essential
- [ ] Very important
- [ ] Fairly important
- [ ] Useful
- [ ] Interesting background

4. Please describe - under each of the headings below - the uses to which you put (or would wish to put) these statistics. In each case, please record which of the published statistics you use.

(a) Monitoring, research, administrative or policy purposes relating to the volume and nature of immigration.

(b) Monitoring, research, administrative or policy purposes relating to the effectiveness and efficiency of immigration control procedures.

(c) Other.

5. For each use to which you put (or wish to put) the statistics, please:

- describe any potential areas for improvement in the statistics, which would significantly improve their usefulness to you, and
- explain how these improvements would impact on your work.

You might wish to comment on, for example, issues such as the coverage and accuracy/precision of the statistics, timeliness (speed of publication), presentation, accessibility, clarity, relevance, comparability (e.g. with international statistics), coherence or completeness.

To help the review further, you may highlight up to three improvements (in total, for all uses) in bold type, to indicate that they are your highest priority changes.

(a) Monitoring, research, administrative or policy purposes relating to the volume and nature of immigration.

Suggested improvements

How would the improvement impact on your work?
(b) Monitoring, research, administrative or policy purposes relating to the *effectiveness and efficiency of immigration control procedures*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested improvements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would the improvement impact on your work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested improvements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would the improvement impact on your work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do you foresee any needs for further or different statistics? If so, please describe the statistics that are likely to be needed and the uses to which they might be put.

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Which specific tables/charts in each of the publications do you mainly use?

*Please refer to charts/tables by number. We will assume this is the table number in the most recent publication (as shown below) unless you tell us otherwise.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Tables/charts used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Command Paper Control of Immigration Statistics United Kingdom – 16 Nov 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Granted British Citizenship – 25 May 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum Statistics United Kingdom (Annual) – 24 Aug 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum Statistics (Quarterly) – 22 Feb 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please note any tables/charts in the current publications that you think could be omitted, and briefly say why. *Please refer to tables/charts by number. We will assume this is the table number in the most recent publication (as shown below) unless you tell us otherwise.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Tables/charts that could be omitted (and why)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Command Paper Control of Immigration Statistics United Kingdom – 16 Nov 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Granted British Citizenship – 25 May 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum Statistics United Kingdom (Annual) – 24 Aug 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum Statistics (Quarterly) – 22 Feb 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Please note any tables/charts in the current publications that you think should be amended, and briefly say how and why. Please refer to tables/charts by number. We will assume this is the table number in the most recent publication (as shown below) unless you tell us otherwise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Tables/charts that could be amended (and how and why)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Command Paper Control of Immigration Statistics United Kingdom – 16 Nov 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Granted British Citizenship – 25 May 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum Statistics United Kingdom (Annual) – 24 Aug 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum Statistics (Quarterly) – 22 Feb 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Would you find it useful to have a periodic deeper and broader analysis of patterns and trends in migration and its control – for example, along the lines of International migration and the United Kingdom: Recent patterns and trends published by the Home Office as RDS Occasional Paper 75 in 2001 [http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/adhocpubs1.html]? Put a cross in one box.

- Definitely
- Maybe
- Unlikely
- No

→ If no, go to question 12

11. Please identify the types of analyses that would be most useful and how frequently such a publication should be produced; explain the uses that would be supported by those analyses with that frequency.

12. Do you have any comments on any of the following aspects of the publications? If you suggest any changes, please give reasons and any specific uses that the changes would allow or facilitate.

(a) Publication medium, e.g. any preferences between hard copy, web copy as Word document or similar, PDF file, web copy with tables downloadable in format facilitating further analysis (e.g. Excel).

(b) Frequency of publication.

(c) Combined or single topic publications, e.g. would you wish to see the annual Bulletins combined into a single publication, or the Command Paper split into different aspects of the controls.

(d) Content, e.g. are there sections of the Command Paper, or Bulletins, that could be dispensed with or are there other statistics (for the UK or other countries) that could usefully be added (e.g. to provide a more useful ‘narrative’ of migration and its control).

(e) Are there any further metadata about the statistics that should be added?
13. Please comment on how users should be able to contribute their views on priorities for the development of the content and format of the statistics and publications.

(a) Are you content with the means you have to inform Home Office decisions about the content and format of the publications? Put a cross in one box.
- Yes
- No

If yes, go to question 13(c)

(b) How should existing arrangements be improved and/or what new arrangements, if any, would you propose (and why)?

(c) If any of the following changes were feasible, what would be your preference? Please put them in rank order, with the highest priority ranked 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing a users' forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual invitation to comment on the publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding the 'further information' section of the Bulletins explicitly to invite comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify below, referring to your own suggestions above if appropriate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. National Statistics are statistics produced to the high professional standard set out in the National Statistics Code of Practice. They undergo regular quality assurance reviews to ensure they meet customer needs and are produced free from political influence.

(a) Do you use other statistics, not part of the National Statistics, relating to the control of immigration into the UK? Put a cross in one box.
- Yes
- No

If no, go to question 15

(b) Please describe them and their source.

(c) Do you think there would be a significant advantage if these other statistics were to become part of National Statistics? Please explain the reasons for your answer.

15. Would you have any concerns if the statistics currently released as National Statistics were to continue to be produced but were no longer treated as National Statistics? Put a cross in one box.
- Yes
- No

If no, go to question 16

Please describe those concerns.
16. Do you have any comments on the service that the Home Office gives in making statistics available on the web?

17. Do you ever have a need for more detailed statistics, or analyses, than are included in the National Statistics publications? *Put a cross in one box.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

→ If no, go to question 20

18. Do you ever request more detailed statistics or analyses from the Home Office? *Put a cross in one box.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

→ If no, go to question 20

19. Do you have any comments on the service that the Home Office gives in providing more detailed statistics or analyses on request?

20. Please provide any other information or comments on the statistics and publications that you think may be of use to the review.

That is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your help with this review.
Annex B3 People who completed questionnaires or provided other input

Note: those with whom I have had meetings are listed elsewhere and therefore not included here.

People from outside the Home Office

Keith Best, Immigration Advisory Service
Laura Brownlees, Save the Children
Mike Coombes, Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies, University of Newcastle
Sarah Cutler, Bail for Immigration Detainees
Andrew Dennis, MigrationWatch UK
Harald Friedrich, Inter-governmental Consultation Group
Clare Graham, UNHCR (London)
Simon Hodgson, Scottish Refugee Council
Bela Hovey, UNHCR
Deri Hughes-Roberts, Refugee Legal Centre
Immigration Law Practitioners Association
Clyde James, Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner
Kat Lorenz, Refugee Action
Richard Lumley, Refugee Council
John O, National Association of Anti-Deportation Campaigns
Nick O’Rourke, ONS, Migration Statistics Unit
Esme Peach and Kim Ward, Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees in the UK
Ambrose Quashie, London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Spencer, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society at University of Oxford
Richard Stanton, Office of Mayor of London
Ross Young, House of Commons Library

People within the Home Office

Colin Allars
Rebecca Baumgartner
Mike Gallagher
Rachel Hosking
Peter Newman
Tim Woodhouse
Annex C Specific issues about metadata raised by users

Users raised the following specific points about the metadata provided with these statistics. These should be taken into account in implementing the broader recommendations about metadata in this report:

- The statistics on enforcement would benefit from clearer definition of the categories used.
- There should be greater clarity of data descriptions (e.g. whether the numbers are cases or head-counts). This may be as much a matter for table headings as for the metadata.
- More clarity is needed in the explanatory notes over reconsidered cases and the manner in which they affect the overall numbers of asylum applicants granted leave to remain to the UK – and, hence, clearer explanation of differences between the figures (e.g. for granting of asylum) in Tables 1.1 and 1.2 of the Asylum Bulletin.
- An explanation is needed of the difference between abandoned and withdrawn appeals (see pages 14 and 16 of Asylum Statistics United Kingdom (Annual) – 24 August 2004).
- There needs to be a better explanation of what certain definitions mean, e.g. in the enforcement area; and the detailed treatment of Dublin cases in the relevant asylum statistics.
- It remains unclear whether unmarried partners are included among dependants or not.
- A fuller explanation of settlement and how it is granted would be useful; in particular Table 13.1 of the Asylum Annual Bulletin needs clarification as to whether the results of appeals are reflected.
- Data on asylum applications made in other countries should be accompanied by more detailed discussion of the problems of cross-national comparisons in relation to asylum data.

It should be noted that in some of these instances the explanatory notes have been extended in the Bulletins produced since these comments were received from users.
## Annex D  Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALO</td>
<td>Airline Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>Case Information Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfES</td>
<td>Department for Education and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>Discretionary Leave to remain in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>Department for Work and Pensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECAA</td>
<td>European Community Association Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHR</td>
<td>European Charter on Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>European Economic Area: Members of the EU plus Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELR</td>
<td>Exceptional Leave to Remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>Economics and Resource Analysis Group of RDS in the Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurostat</td>
<td>Statistical Office of the European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCO</td>
<td>Foreign and Commonwealth Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOI</td>
<td>Freedom of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>Higher Education Statistics Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAT</td>
<td>Immigration Appeal Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>Immigration Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Immigration and Nationality Directorate of the Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Immigration Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organisation for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPR</td>
<td>Institute for Public Policy Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS</td>
<td>International Passenger Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRSS</td>
<td>Immigration Research and Statistics Service (of the Immigration and Nationality Directorate of the Home Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFS</td>
<td>Labour Force Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Management Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAM</td>
<td>New Asylum Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAO</td>
<td>National Audit Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASS</td>
<td>National Asylum Support Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>National Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>National Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONS</td>
<td>Office for National Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>Parliamentary Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDS</td>
<td>Research, Development and Statistics Directorate of the Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC</td>
<td>Standard Industrial Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Standard Occupational Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPEMI</td>
<td>An OECD working group on international migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UASC</td>
<td>Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKvisas</td>
<td>The joint Home Office and Foreign and Commonwealth Office unit that runs the UK’s visa service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPUK</td>
<td>Work Permits UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>