

Written evidence submitted by a member of the public (GRA0067)

- The fee for a GRC should be reduced but not removed. A fee of some description eg £50 will discourage applications that are not well thought through.
- Allowing online applications should make it easier to apply
- The requirement for a diagnosis of gender dysphoria should not be removed. This is because acquisition of a GRC means that the person should be treated as their acquired gender wherever possible. A gender dysphoria diagnosis evidences that this is a reasonable adjustment for a health condition. I do not believe this is a reasonable step for people who do not have this health condition. Liking opposite sex clothing for example can be caused by a variety of motivations, including sexual fetish, and while I support the rights of individuals to express their sexuality however they see fit, that must include the consent of everybody expected to participate. It is unreasonable to ask other people to accommodate the sex games of strangers in their daily lives. However, I think it should be easier for people to legally detransition if they want to, in the understanding that it will not be possible to reapply later on. The diversity of motivations for identifying as trans accounts for the discrepancy in the numbers of people with a GRC v this who self ID as trans
- I believe that the rule regarding living in your acquired gender for 2 years should remain. This acts as a protective barrier against people who might seek to change their gender to meet a short term goal that is not about gender identity eg wanting access to a women's refuge to follow in a vulnerable partner, access to a women's shortlist or educational grant. Changing legal gender confers legal rights and applicants should demonstrate that they are committed to the idea. I personally know someone who struggles with their gender identity and lives six months in their acquired gender and then switches back, only to repeat the cycle again. Needing to live in their acquired gender for 2 years means that only people who have a stable sense of their identity will need to add in this layer of administration and commitment.
- Spousal consent should remain but needs to be reworded to best reflect the purpose. It should be renamed the Spousal Exit Clause. This makes it clear that the purpose is not to prevent a GRC. The rights of spouses to leave the marriage if they want to needs to be upheld, as should the right to an annulment as this limits the harm that their spouse's transition has on the rights of religious women to be able to marry again.
- I do not believe that a statutory declaration is enough in and of itself to protect this provision from being misused. Without a clear definition of gendered expectations, there is no way to show that someone has not acted in good faith. It obviously needs to remain, but needs the other measures of 2 years of living as their acquired gender and a gender dysphoria diagnosis to be really workable.
- I believe that a GRC should not replace a full birth certificate. Replacing all documents and completely erasing evidence of birth sex makes it harder for organisations who need to enforce single sex spaces to evidence that they are acting within the law when they exclude a trans person (for good reason). I believe that a GRC should replace the shortened birth certificate only, so that organisations who need to enforce single sex spaces are able to request the full one when they need to screen on the basis of sex.

- I do not believe the guidance re single sex spaces is clear enough. Lots of organisations have chosen to bring in self identification into these spaces, without doing an equality impact assessment, consulting women on how they feel about this and the impact on their ability to use public spaces, and I believe this accounts to sex discrimination.
- I do not believe that trans people have enough access to support services. These would be best delivered as specialist trans services that can address the unique needs that trans people have.
- I do not believe that special protections of non binary people are necessary. Sex discrimination laws should already cover gender non conforming behaviour. I think it would be respectful to add in some non binary titles to official identification eg Mx so that non binary people feel that their identity is represented in their documentation.

Please do not publish my name.

October 2020