

<p>Title: Registration: Single registration of multiple premises, and childminders on NDPs.</p> <p>PIR No: PIR-DfE-003</p> <p>Original IA/RPC No: RPC13-FT-DfE-1904(2)</p> <p>Lead department or agency: DfE</p> <p>Other departments or agencies: Ofsted</p> <p>Contact for enquiries: John.Trakos@education.gov.uk</p>	Post Implementation Review
	Date: 26/11/2020
	Type of regulation: Domestic
	Type of review: Statutory
	Date measure came into force: 01/01/2016
	Recommendation: Keep
RPC Opinion: Choose an item.	

1. What were the policy objectives of the measure?

To simplify the childcare registration system and remove unnecessary red tape by: expanding the range of suitable premises from which childminders can operate without registering separately as a childcare provider on non-domestic premises; and reducing the administrative burden on all providers wishing to operate from multiple premises by allowing them to make one registration application in respect of multiple settings and/or add additional premises to an existing registration without completing a separate application each time they wish to open a new site.

2. What evidence has informed the PIR?

[Ofsted](#) is responsible for the registration, regulation and inspection of childcare provision in England and its annual reports have informed this review. [Ofsted's Annual Report 2019/20](#) highlights the proportion of nurseries operating as part of a group under a single registration increased from 40% to 43% between 2018 and 2020, which suggests providers are benefitting from this change. [Ofsted's Annual Report 2018/19](#) also noted that nurseries that are part of a chain (registered under a single registration) are more likely to be rated as 'Outstanding' as strong practice and sound improvement measures can be shared effectively across the whole chain.

We also sought feedback from a number of key sector stakeholders as part of this review and received responses from two of the largest childcare organisations, which were invited to provide feedback due to the large number of childcare providers they represent and support. Due to COVID-19, we invited stakeholders to provide feedback via email or via a telephone call, and one organisation provided feedback via a telephone call whilst the other provided feedback via email. The feedback we received was supportive of these measures and was particularly useful as there is no published data or information available about childminders operating from non-domestic premises. The first organisation said: the single registration has brought a welcome reduction in admin burden; and allowing childminders to operate on non-domestic premises is seen as a key part of supporting childminder sustainability and, more importantly, providing families with greater flexibility. The second organisation said: there is no reason why people would not welcome the single registration of multiple premises and removing this would be regressive; and they agreed that allowing childminders to operate on non-domestic premises has made childminder businesses more viable or sustainable by being able to offer childcare on a wider range of premises, and they can promote this flexibility to parents looking for childcare on both domestic and non-domestic premises.

3. To what extent have the policy objectives been achieved?

The evidence demonstrates the regulations are effectively achieving the policy objectives. Removing them would increase the bureaucratic and administrative burdens on providers and put additional pressure on their budgets. This would be received negatively by the sector. The policy changes we made in 2015 (to enable childminders to operate on non-domestic premises and to enable multiple premises providers to operate under a single registration) could not be achieved in a less burdensome way and therefore the regulations (as amended in 2015) currently remain the best option for achieving this specific deregulatory change.

Sign-off for Post Implementation Review: Chief economist/Head of Analysis and Minister

I have read the PIR and I am satisfied that it represents a fair and proportionate assessment of the impact of the measure.

Signed: ***Vicky Ford MP, Minister for Children and Families***

Date: 10/12/2020

Further information sheet

Please provide additional evidence in subsequent sheets, as required.

4. What were the original assumptions?

The government believed these changes would: give greater flexibility to childminders and open up new business opportunities, which would make their businesses more viable and sustainable; and reduce the bureaucratic and administrative burden on providers to set up new (or expand existing) provision by simplifying and streamlining the registration process. The government committed to go ahead with these changes as part of its [response to the regulation of childcare consultation \(Feb 2014\)](#).

These deregulatory measures were expected to lead to a reduction in cost by making the registration process easier for multiple-setting providers and removing the requirement for childminders to hold two separate registrations. The impact assessment (published alongside the 2015 regulations) estimated the equivalent annual net cost to business (EANCB) to be -£0.033m. The EANCB is based on the best available evidence [data published by DfE and Ofsted, and views from Ofsted] and we are not aware of any other types of evidence that could be used to more accurately estimate the costs or benefits of these measures to childcare providers.

As part of this review, we have re-examined the calculations for the EANCB. Using [Ofsted early years and childcare data from Dec 2018-19](#) and updated staff wages from the [2019 Survey of Childcare and Early Years Providers \(SCEYP\)](#), we have estimated that the EANCB in 2019 would be approximately -£0.05m. This higher saving reflects the fact that in 2019 there were more childcare providers joining the Ofsted register, alongside staff pay being higher than in 2013-14. All other assumptions remained the same for the purposes of this review.

5. Were there any unintended consequences?

Nurseries that operate as part of a chain under a single registration are more likely to be rated as 'Outstanding' as strong practice and sound improvement measures can be shared effectively across the whole chain. This is set out in [Ofsted's Annual Report 2018/19](#).

No further unintended consequences were identified.

6. Has the evidence identified any opportunities for reducing the burden on business?

No further opportunities have been identified.

7. For EU measures, how does the UK's implementation compare with that in other EU member states in terms of costs to business?

Not applicable.