

# PPI payments and asylum seekers



Written by Peter Bates, [peter.bates96@outlook.com](mailto:peter.bates96@outlook.com)

Summary .....	1
Asylum seekers .....	1
Conclusion.....	1
How this paper is being written .....	2

## Summary

Health research should be coproduced with people who have lived experience and nonsalaried Public Contributors should be offered a payment in recognition of their contribution<sup>1</sup>. The offer of funds is known as a Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) payment<sup>2</sup>. This paper investigates whether PPI payments can reach a group of citizens who are at risk of being excluded from the process – asylum seekers. Further groups may be added as this exploration continues.

There are many other issues that arise in conducting research with this group of citizens, who may have difficulties in accessing the usual advertising<sup>3</sup>, live in such straitened circumstances that their ability to give free and informed consent may be doubted, and who may find staff acting as gatekeepers while opposing the principles of coproduction and payment. This paper focuses narrowly on the practice of making payments for coproducing research. It is one of a suite of resource guides<sup>4</sup> that consider niche topics in coproduction of research.

## Asylum seekers

UK government guidance on what is included in the ‘no recourse to public funds’ list does not mention research<sup>5</sup>, so there appears to be no justification here for refusing to offer PPI payments to people in the immigration system. However, in the absence of a clear statement granting permission, asylum seekers will be too afraid of jeopardising their asylum claim to participate.

## Conclusion

In practice, making payment to this group of citizens may be possible in the future, albeit in vanishingly limited and restrictive circumstances. There appears to be few pioneers willing to discuss the inequalities between this group and the general public, perhaps because their research plans rely on the goodwill of the gatekeepers they privately criticise.

## How this paper is being written

The investigation that generated this paper is driven by simple curiosity. The work is unfunded and is conducted as a piece of citizen science rather than under the control of any organisation.

Accountability is achieved by following the *Writing in Public* framework<sup>6</sup>. The companion paper *PPI payments and prisoners* is being prioritised, so further work on this paper will follow. People have not yet been approached for advice<sup>7</sup>, and I will be grateful to the people<sup>8</sup> who contribute to this evolving resource<sup>9</sup>. Please send me your suggestions for further improvements.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Payment guidance for researchers and professionals | NIHR](#)

<sup>2</sup> See [Payment-guidance-for-members-of-the-public-considering-involvement-in-research.pdf](#). Also [https://peterbates.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/how\\_to\\_make\\_sense\\_of\\_our\\_payments\\_offer.pdf](https://peterbates.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/how_to_make_sense_of_our_payments_offer.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> [Home - People in Research](#). For an evaluation of the adverts found on this site, see <https://peterbates.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Going-cheap-on-expenses.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> See [How To Guides – Peter Bates](#)

<sup>5</sup> [Public funds](#)

<sup>6</sup> Bates P (2024) [How-to-write-in-public.pdf \(peterbates.org.uk\)](#).

<sup>7</sup> Inquiries have been sent to the following people – posted to LinkedIn 22/08/2025.

<sup>8</sup> Comments and advice have been gratefully received from – nobody yet.

<sup>9</sup> All errors and omissions are the sole responsibility of the author. The information is provided in good faith, and so readers engage with the contents at their own risk and undertake not to hold the author liable for any injury, loss, or damage arising through reading or acting on its contents.