The main data collection method employed was advice-led ethnography. This first-hand, action-based approach to the research was necessary, because my prior experience of advice work made it clear that it would not be possible to get much insight into the claims and appeals process just through an observational study. An observational study would have required the availability of specialist advice for EU nationals, to enable them to negotiate the claims and appeals processes under study. But there are few, and decreasing, sources of information and advice available in the UK for EU nationals seeking support in a complex area of law. I had a dual role - advising, and doing case work and advocacy for, people trying to realise their EU welfare rights in the UK. This included EU nationals seeking to claim benefits/appeal benefit decisions in the UK; EU nationals seeking to export benefits to another Member State; and UK nationals seeking to rely upon their welfare rights on returning to the UK. This advice took place under the auspices of Citizens Advice Harrogate and Districts, and the project was a collaboration between the University of York and the Citizens Advice bureau in Ripon. The advice took place face-to-face, in different Citizens Advice locations, on a set day every week, and over the phone for first-tier cases. For second-tier cases the advice would be given to, and drafting done for, advisers working on behalf of clients. At the end of each session I would record notes as required methodology used to create the data, describe the sampling procedure and studied population. I provided various Citizens Advice offices with a description of the project, and the nature of cases on which I could advise. Case supervisors identified possible cases and sent case references to the CAB in which I was based. If the summary provided was sufficient for me to make a decision as to whether I could help, (asking: did the case meet the main criteria for the project? Was there likely useful input to be made for the client? Did the summary indicate a contribution to the research questions? Did I have capacity?) I would reply with a consent form and information sheet for the client. On receipt of consent, I could access the client's case and begin advising. I also received consultations from other advice organisations, during the course of which communications were anonymised with regard to the clients, and who were recorded as anonymous Citizens Advice clients. The main constraint on sample size was capacity. The studied population was EU nationals based in the UK, or who had been recently based in the UK, and UK nationals returning from the EU, and who had sought help from a Citizens Advice Bureau. This was a limiting factor, since it meant I only saw clients who had themselves already recognised a problem with their benefit claim/appeal, for which they had sought support. I also conducted one focus group at the start of the project, with six participants, selected as case supervisors in Citizens Advice offices in the region, who had experience of working on cases with an EU welfare law dimension. I conducted a further focus group part-way into the project to test out some of my initial thoughts and findings, with four Citizens Advice supervisors drawn nationally, as they were working in particular on best practice and HMRC benefits. I further conducted five interviews with welfare specialists working in national NGOs, to gather perceptions and experiences of obstacles when advising EU nationals.