



Website: [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk)

Jonathan Portes  
Jonathan Portes <J.Portes@niesr.ac.uk>

**Your Reference:**

**Our Ref: Fol 5072**

Date: 18 January 2016

Dear Mr Portes,

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 4 December 2015.  
Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding. You asked:

*"I refer to the DWP publication here:*

*<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/uk-benefit-and-tax-credit-claims-by-recently-arrived-eea-migrants>*

*[in%20https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/uk-benefit-and-tax-credit-claims-by-recently-arrived-eea-migrants](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/uk-benefit-and-tax-credit-claims-by-recently-arrived-eea-migrants)>. I am copying this request to Ed Humpherson at the UK Statistical Authority, given Sir Andrew's letter on this topic and the contact between UKSA, DWP and No 10 that led to this publication.*

*I would appreciate clarification of the following points.*

*1. The publication states:*

*"This approach assesses the nationality and UK arrival data of the main claimant and then makes adjustments to account for their partners. This approach means that it is a possibility that EEA national partners who have been resident for less than 4 years but their EEA national partner claiming benefits has been in the UK for at least 4 years are not included in these statistics."*

*Please explain the "adjustments" made to account for partners. Please provide figures for the number of main claimants and the number of partners assumed to be a) UK nationals b) EEA nationals resident less than 4 years c) EEA nationals resident more than 4 years and the basis for the assumptions.*

*2. The publication states:*

*To account for EEA nationals who were not recorded as the main claimant in a UK or non-EEA led household claiming benefits or tax credits an uplift has been applied based on a HMRC analysis of EEA nationals who were not the main claimant. This uplift was estimated on the basis of HMRC analysis where the EEA national was the partner of a non-EEA national main claimant. A similar uplift has been applied to reflect the EEA national partners of EEA national main claimants.*

*Please explain the uplift - the numbers involved and the basis for the uplift applied. Please supply the HMRC analysis of EEA nationals who were not the main claimant referred to here.*

*3. The publication states:*

*"Estimates also reflect the number of children in households claiming benefits where there is an EEA adult - it is not possible to specifically identify the nationality of these children. It is estimated that a small proportion of the children in these households would have been born in the UK after their parent's arrival in the UK."*

*Please supply any available information about the age distribution of the children referred to. Please supply the basis for the assertion that "a small proportion" of these children were born in the UK.*

*Please explain why the LFS/APS was not used to calculate the proportion of children in recently arrived EEA national households who were in fact born in the UK for either the numerator or the denominator.*

*4. The publication states:*

*"between 37 per cent and 45 per cent of the EEA nationals (excluding students) who were resident in the UK having arrived in the preceding 4 years were in households claiming either an in-work or out-of-work benefit or tax credit."*

*Please explain how students have been excluded from a) the numerator and b) the denominator of this calculation.*

*5. Please explain the statement:*

*"Due to limitations in the datasets used to produce this analysis it is not possible to produce a more detailed breakdown of these statistics by any sub-national geographic level or for specific nationality groups."*

*The benefit statistics are produced using a 5% sample, while the APS has a large sample size. Why is it not possible to break down these statistics between (for example) EU15 and A8 nationals (as is done in the published statistics on National Insurance numbers)?"*

This information is exempt under Section 35 (1) (a) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The use of this exemption requires the balance of the public interest to be assessed. There is a public interest in greater transparency which makes government more accountable to the electorate and increases trust. However, there is a compelling public interest in protecting a private space in which policies can be developed without there being premature disclosure which might close off better options. Unless this private space is protected there is likely to be a negative effect on the conduct of good government.

On balance, DWP is satisfied that in this instance the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosure. Therefore, the information you seek will not be released.

If you have any queries about this letter please contact me quoting the reference number above.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew Sutton  
Migrant Access to Benefits Analysis

---

**Your right to complain under the Freedom of Information Act**

If you are not happy with this response you may request an internal review by e-mailing [freedom-of-information-request@dpw.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:freedom-of-information-request@dpw.gsi.gov.uk) or by writing to DWP, Central Fol Team, Caxton House, Tothill Street, SW1H 9NA. Any review request should be submitted within two months of the date of this letter.

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner's Office for a decision. Generally the Commissioner cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted our own complaints procedure. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at: The Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow Cheshire SK9 5AF [www.ico.gov.uk](http://www.ico.gov.uk)