

Title: Child Performers - Amateur sector IA No: DFE 0022 Lead department or agency: Department of Education Other departments or agencies: Department for Culture, Media and Sport	Impact Assessment (IA)		
	Date: 16 May 2012		
	Stage: Consultation		
	Source of intervention: Domestic		
	Type of measure: Primary legislation		
Contact for enquiries: : Éilish Newman 07557 846 488			
Summary: Intervention and Options		RPC Opinion: Amber	

Cost of Preferred (or more likely) Option			
Total Net Present Value	Business Net Present Value	Net cost to business per year (EANCB on 2009 prices)	In scope of One-In, Measure qualifies as One-Out?
£6.53m	£1.32m	-£0.14m	Yes OUT

What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

At present all performances by children whether professional or amateur need licensing, this can mean significant amounts of paperwork for small, local amateur productions, as all licences are provided on 'per child, per performance' basis. These unnecessary burdens in the current system can put groups off using children in their shows.

Government intervention is necessary to reduce the burdens on amateur production companies, who are more likely to be small and have volunteer staff, but retain adequate safeguarding measures to help ensure children performing are protected.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

To make it easier for small, local community productions to put on performances involving children by having in place a more proportionate process for safeguarding children without unnecessary burdens for amateur groups.

What policy options have been considered, including any alternatives to regulation? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)

- 1) Do nothing – this is not acceptable as the problems described above would continue.
- 2) Remove the amateur sector from the regulations completely – this is not acceptable as children taking part in these performances require a basic framework of protection to be in place.
- 3) Simplify the process by which amateur groups can apply for and be granted licences – this will allow a safeguarding framework to be in place for the children but ensure that it is proportionate to the non-professional, low key and voluntary nature of amateur performances. This is the preferred option.

Will the policy be reviewed? Yes. If applicable, set review date: 06/2017

Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?			Yes		
Are any of these organisations in scope? If Micros not exempted set out reason in Evidence Base.	Micro Yes	< 20 Yes	Small Yes	Medium Yes	Large Yes
What is the CO ₂ equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO ₂ equivalent)			Traded: N/A		Non-traded: N/A

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.

Signed by the responsible SELECT SIGNATORY: _____ Date: _____

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option 1

Description: Do nothing (reference case)

FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year 2011	PV Base Year 2011	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: £0	High: £0	Best Estimate: £0

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low			
High			
Best Estimate	£0	£0	£0

Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

The costs of the other options are expressed relative to this do nothing case.

Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low			
High			
Best Estimate	£0	£0	£0

Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

The benefits of the other options are expressed relative to this do nothing case.

Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks	Discount rate (%)	3.5
-------------------------------------	-------------------	-----

BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 1)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:	In scope of OIOO?	Measure qualifies as
Costs: £0	No	NA
Benefits: £0		
Net: £0		

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option 2

Description: Remove the amateur sector from the regulations completely

FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year 2011	PV Base Year 2011	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: £4.14m	High: £17.84m	Best Estimate: £10.99m

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	£0.06m	£0.00m	£0.06m
High	£0.31m	£0.00m	£0.31m
Best Estimate	£0.18m	£0.00m	£0.18m

Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

There are likely to be one-off transition costs for this policy since Local Authorities (LAs) and production companies will need to dedicate time to adjust their processes in light of the new system.

Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

The potential long term costs of increased safeguarding issues which might come about if the legislation is not in place in not monetised.

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	£0.00m	£0.52m	£4.44m
High	£0.00m	£2.08m	£17.90m
Best Estimate	£0.00m	£1.30m	£11.17m

Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

On-going benefits accrue through the reduction of resources expended through production companies and LAs in applying for, reviewing, and clearing licences. The resources involved in accommodating (production companies) and administering (LAs) inspections are also freed up.

Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

None thought to occur here.

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks

Discount rate (%) 3.5

Using estimates from production companies and LA performance and employment managers we have been able to provide estimates of the potential impacts of this option. However, it is not possible to verify all assumptions and estimates. We will endeavour to improve these estimates and assumptions in later stages of the IA.

BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 2)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:			In scope of OIOO?	Measure qualifies as
Costs: £0.0m	Benefits: £0.3m	Net: £0.2m	Yes	OUT

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option 3

Description: Simplify the process by which amateur groups can apply for and be granted licences

FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year 2011	PV Base Year 2011	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: £2.09m	High: £10.97m	Best Estimate: £6.53m

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	£0.08m	£0.00m	£0.09m
High	£0.33m	£0.02m	£0.51m
Best Estimate	£0.20m	£0.01m	£0.30m

Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

Transition costs will be felt by LAs and amateur production companies due to the time that will be required to familiarise themselves with the new licensing process (of small magnitude).

There may be a potential increase in the number of inspections carried out by LAs if the licensing process change increases the amount of time they spend on monitoring rather than the administration side of licensing. This could lead to increased burdens to LAs and production companies (of small magnitude).

Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

No key non-monetised costs thought to occur here.

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	£0.28m	£0.31m	£2.61m
High	£1.31m	£1.28m	£11.07m
Best Estimate	£0.80m	£0.79m	£6.84m

Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

There is likely to be a reduction in administration burdens to both LAs and amateur production companies from moving from licensing per child per performance to registration per organisation in the first year. After the first year registration is reviewed every 2 years, so LAs and production companies benefit from a reduction in burdens from moving from per child per performance licences to nothing every other year and a review every 2nd year.

Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

There is a potential improvement in safeguarding that could occur if LAs increase inspections due to the reduced administrative burden of issuing licences. This could mean that LAs are able to focus on production companies where they have concerns and help prevent safeguarding issues arising. It is not possible to estimate the potential benefits of this as it would depend on the type of safeguarding issue and the number of children involved, but long term it is likely to be significant.

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks	Discount rate (%)	3.5
Using estimates from LA performance and employment manager and amateur production society representatives we have been able to provide best estimates of the likely costs and benefits of the proposed change in policy. However it is not possible to verify all assumptions and estimates. We will endeavour to improve these estimates and assumptions in later stages of the IA through consultation.		

BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 3)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:			In scope of OIOO?	Measure qualifies as
Costs: £0.0m	Benefits: £0.2m	Net: £0.1m	Yes	OUT

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

At present performances by children whether professional or amateur need licensing, this can mean significant amounts of paperwork burdens for small, local amateur productions, as all licences are provided on 'per child, per performance' basis. This can put groups off using children in their shows. Some production companies currently do not complete licences, even though they should, creating a risk that insufficient safeguards may be in place to protect children. By introducing a system of organisational registration this risk can be reduced.

Rationale for intervention and policy objective:

The current system is overly burdensome but set out in law from the 1960s. Government intervention is therefore necessary to make amendments to these laws to reduce the burdens on amateur production companies, who are more likely to be small and employ volunteer staff, but retain adequate safeguarding measures to help ensure children performing are protected. This will make it easier for small, local community productions to put on performances involving children by having in place a more proportionate process for safeguarding children without unnecessary burdens for amateur groups.

Options:

- 1) Do nothing – this is not an acceptable option as the problems described above would continue.
- 2) Remove the amateur sector from the regulations completely – this is not acceptable as children taking part in these performances require a basic framework of protection to be in place.
- 3) Simplify the process by which amateur groups can apply for and be granted licences – this will allow a safeguarding framework to be in place for the children but ensure that it is proportionate to the non-professional, low key and voluntary nature of amateur performances. This is the preferred option.

Impact of Option 1:

Maintaining the status quo is not an ideal situation and would continue to lead to many of the problems described above.

Impact of Option 2:

In considering the option, the main concern was that safeguarding children is the primary purpose of this legislation. By removing the amateur sector entirely from all legislative requirements, there would be no mechanisms for standardising and enforcing a basic level of protection for child performers.

Impact of Option 3 (preferred option):

This process will allow for a LA to approve the 'organisation' as suitable for working with children rather than individually assessing each child for each performance and issuing a licence. An LA could approve an organisation for a period of two years having done an initial assessment of their policies and practices. This would mean that an amateur group could put on performances without the need to apply for any further licences, but simply adhering to the conditions of their initial approval. The LA would have powers to inspect performances throughout the period of the approval should they wish to.

Although regular data collections are not in place to show the number of licences that are issued each year by LAs, we have contacted a number of LA and amateur production company contacts to collect estimates for this impact assessment. Anecdotally, we believe that approximately 70% of all licences are for the amateur sector. Using a method of organisational approval would substantially cut down on the number of individual licences that amateur groups need to apply for and LAs need to process. This would free up a significant amount of LA officers time to focus on inspection and follow up of approvals – something which currently does not receive priority in LAs.

Costs and Benefits:

While regular data collections are not in place to provide robust estimates of the impacts of the policy, we have been able to produce best estimates of the likely impacts of the proposed policy using estimates from our LA and amateur production company contacts. Unfortunately the assumptions are not all verifiable but we will endeavour to improve these assumptions and estimates through consultation

before further stages of the IA. We have assessed the likely impacts of both option 2 and 3 (preferred) to highlight the costs and benefits of each.

Option 2	Detail	Lower	Upper
Costs: one-off	Transition costs for LAs and production companies	£0.06m	£0.31m
Costs: on-going (per annum)	Long term impacts of increased safeguarding issues	Non-monetised	Non-monetised
Benefits: one-off	Consider none to occur here	-	-
Benefits: on-going (per annum)	Reduction in admin burdens to LAs and production companies	£0.52m	£2.08m
Option 3			
Costs: one-off	Transition costs for LAs and production companies and increased costs for new registration process	£0.08m	£0.33m
Costs: on-going (per annum)	Increased burdens to production companies and LAs from increased inspections	£0.00m	£0.02m
Benefits: one-off	Reduction in burdens to LAs and production companies for move to registration	£0.28m	£1.31m
Benefits: on-going (per annum)	Reduction in burdens to LAs and amateur production companies for new process allowing more time on inspections	£0.31m	£1.28m

Option 2 (remove the amateur sector from the regulations completely)

Costs

Transition costs are likely to fall on LAs and production companies in this option. This is because even without legislation LAs are likely to continue to provide safeguarding guidelines or checks on production companies. However, we cannot know the full extent of these costs since legislation would be removed; therefore LAs would be under no obligation to provide their own guidelines. They would have to make their own judgement on whether they wished to issue/enforce guidelines and have acceptance from production companies since they would no longer have any powers to enforce. But it is still likely that some LAs would create guidelines and some production companies accept those guidelines meaning there would be costs to the LAs to amend their current guidance and training to take account of the new system. Using data from the Annual Survey of Hourly Earnings (ASHE) from ONS we can estimate that a LA administrative staff will earn approximately £13/hr. We have made a best estimate assumption that it would take between 1 and 5 days for each LA to revise its training and guidance and formulate how it would protect safeguarding in the absence of legislation. Since we know there are 150 LAs the gross wage transition costs to LAs are estimated to be between £14,000- £68,000.

For amateur production companies we know that the majority of staff are volunteers. Valuing volunteer activity is methodologically challenging.¹ Approaches commonly adopted include valuing their time using the wages earned by workers performing similar tasks in the paid private production sector or valuation using estimates of the wages that the volunteers earn in their work for pay. A lower bound estimate of the later is given by the national minimum wage (NMW) and is used here. Again we estimate the amount of time it would take for production companies to familiarise themselves with the new policy. Estimates from amateur production society representatives tell us there are approximately 3000 amateur production companies. While we have attempted to use a best estimate of the number of companies here, 3000 companies was reached using estimates from company representatives, but a number of amateur production companies may not be part of a society and we might therefore have not captured them. We hope that in the next stage of this impact assessment we attempt to find a more representative estimate. This puts gross wage equivalent transition costs at between £31,000- £174,000.

¹ See Brown, E. (1999). *Assessing the value of volunteer activity. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 28 (3).

We do not estimate there to be any monetisable on going costs for option 2. However, this is largely because we are not able to monetise the potential long term costs of increased safeguarding issues which might come about if the legislation is not in place. We cannot know the full extent of what would happen in LAs without legislation since it would not be right to attempt to test what would happen if safeguarding rules were not in place. We hope to improve quantification of safeguarding benefits at the final stage impact analysis, although the lack of data may lead to a range of costs based on assumptions informed by stakeholders.

Overall costs for option 2:

Costs	Lower	Upper
One-off	£0.06m	£0.31m
On-going (per annum)	-	-
PV of Costs over 10 years	£0.06m	£0.31m

Note: a mark up is applied to account for non-wage labour costs. It is assumed that non-wage labour costs constitute 21 per cent of total labour costs. This is based on analysis of the 2004 UK Labour Cost Survey (LCS).

Benefits

There are not likely to be any one-off benefits for option 2. However, there are a number of on-going benefits resulting from a reduction in burdens to LAs and amateur production companies. Whilst it is likely that if legislation was removed, LAs and production companies would carry on some form of safeguarding procedures, we do not have adequate data to show how many LAs would do this, so we have simply assumed that without legislation, all production companies and LAs would not complete or clear licences or have inspections.

There are likely to be reductions in administration burdens to LAs and amateur production companies to clear licences and reductions in admin burdens to LAs and amateur production companies for no longer having inspections. LA estimates from the LA employment and performance manager estimated that it takes between 2.5hrs – 2 days to clear and issue a licence. Estimates have shown that approximately 10,000 licences are issued each year. We know that approx 70% of all licences issued are for amateur production companies per child per performance.

For amateur production companies as most are volunteers we use the NMW. We also know from amateur production company contacts that it takes approx 5hrs per licence to complete, we therefore use a range of between 4 and 6 hrs.

For inspections, if legislation was removed there would be a reduction in admin burdens to both LAs and amateur production companies. LA estimates suggest approx 200 inspections per year, again approx 70% of which are for the amateur sector. LAs currently estimate that it takes between 1-2hrs to inspect and between 2-4 hrs to write up the report. We therefore use a range of between 3 and 6 hrs per inspection. ASHE data suggests that a senior local government officer would earn approx £28/hr (here we use a local govt officer rather than administration staff, since inspections are likely to be carried out by LA performance and employment managers. We estimate gross wage benefits of between £12,000 and £24,000 a year. Similarly for production companies we estimate 3-6hrs per inspection (they are likely to have to prepare for inspection or support the writing of the LA report in some way). Again with NMW and 70% of 200 inspections we get gross wage equivalent benefits of between £2,500 and £5,000 a year.

Benefits for option 2:

Benefits	Lower	Upper
One-off	-	-
On-going (per annum)	£0.52m	£2.08m
PV of benefits over 10 years	£4.44m	£14.14m

Note: a mark up is applied to account for non-wage labour costs. It is assumed that non-wage labour costs constitute 21 per cent of total labour costs. This is based on analysis of the 2004 UK Labour Cost Survey (LCS).

Comparing the costs and benefits over 10 years gives a PV of between £4m and £18m:

	lower	Upper
PV of Costs over 10 years	£0.04m	£0.24m
PV of Benefits over 10 years	£3.51m	£17.90m
NPV over 10 years	£4.14m (lower benefits less upper costs)	£17.84m (upper benefits less lower costs)

While the benefits for this option seem large, and the NPV is large, they would be more than offset with any costs resulting from poor protection of children.

Option 3 (simplify the process by which amateur groups can apply for and be granted licenses)

Costs

There are likely to be a number of one-off costs associated with option 3, the preferred option. Transition costs are likely to be felt by both LAs and amateur production companies as they familiarise themselves with the new process. As before, ASHE estimates show that admin staff in LAs earn approx £13/hr, there are 150 LAs and we assume that it may take between 1 and 3 days per LA to get used to the new process. This figure was assumed as a best estimate given that although some changes are coming in to place, each LA is likely to not take that long to amend guidance for its staff. We estimate gross wage costs of between £14,000- £41,000.

For amateur production companies, again we use the NMW as a proxy for the value of their time. Estimates from amateur production society representatives suggest there are approx 3000 amateur production companies. While this may not capture all amateur production companies it is a best estimate given available data. We also assume that between 50% and 70% of amateur production companies have children participating (best estimate using estimates from society representatives). We assume it takes between 2 hrs and ½ a day to familiarise with the new process. This gives approximate gross wage measured benefits of between £18,000 and £44,000.

The proposed change is for amateur production companies to register as an organisation, instead of using per child per performance licences. They would then be reviewed every 2nd year. We estimate that it may take LAs and amateur production companies slightly longer to complete these registrations than it would to complete a licence. We estimate that it would take between approx 1-3hrs longer for production companies and 1-5hrs for LAs (best estimates using estimates of time spent from LAs and amateur production society representatives). Using these assumptions and estimates we estimate wage costs of between £9,000-£37,000 for amateur production companies and between £20,000 and £137,000 for LAs.

For on-going costs we estimate that there could be a potential increase in the number of inspections carried out by LAs. While this may increase costs to LAs and production companies for additional administration burdens, this is seen as a positive output for this option as there are concerns that LAs are not able to make inspections a priority currently and by focusing on inspections and monitoring it may allow LAs to focus on production companies who may be causing concern to LAs and it may help LAs prevent safeguarding issues arising.

For LAs we assume that inspections could increase by between 10 and 60%. While we do not have adequate data to know how LAs will act with the change in policy, we have given a range to indicate possible changes to the number of inspections. This increases gross wage costs to LAs by between £1,200 and £14,000 a year (however, LAs will deem these costs to be recouped back if they are able to prevent a safeguarding issue from arising). Again for production companies we estimate a potential increase in the number of inspections of between 10% and 60%. Data from amateur production companies and LAs suggests an inspection can take between 3 and 6 hrs per inspection.

Overall costs for option 3 are:

Costs	Lower	Upper
One-off	£0.08m	£0.33m
On-going (per annum)	£0.00m	£0.02m
PV of Costs over 10 years	£0.09m	£0.51m

Note: a mark up is applied to account for non-wage labour costs. It is assumed that non-wage labour costs constitute 21 per cent of total labour costs. This is based on analysis of the 2004 UK Labour Cost Survey (LCS).

Benefits

Similar to option 2, there are likely to be a reduction in burdens for LAs and amateur production companies as a result of the proposed changes. One-off benefits will arise when there is a move from per child per performance licensing to registration. Beyond the BoP licences there will be savings in time due to this move. We have estimates of approx 7000 licences a year (6000 of which can get benefits on) and approx 3000 amateur production companies of which approx 50%-70% are assumed to have child performances. We therefore see a reduction in licences to LAs to issue and amateur production companies to submit of approx 3900-4500. Using estimates from amateur production society reps and LA staff we can estimate gross wage benefits of between £127,000 - £878,000 for LA staff and between £93,000 and £160,000 for amateur production companies.

For on-going benefits there are again likely to be reductions in burdens. For every other year there will be no licensing in place, so LAs and production companies will save all the time they previously spent applying for per child per performance licences. Every 2nd year there will be a review of the initial registration which will enable LAs and production companies to save part of the time for licences. Again we use LA and amateur production society representatives' data to help us estimate the reductions in burdens. For every other year we estimate a wage saving of between £195,000 - £1.2m for LAs and £142,000 to £213,000 for amateur production companies as LAs and production company staff are able to save all the time from no longer needing to licence per child per performance.

In every 2nd year they are able to experience a reduction in burdens as it moves from per child per performance licensing system to a review of each organisation's registration. This gives wage saving benefits of between £76,000 - £468,000 for LAs and £46,000 and £80,000 for amateur production companies per year. Again best estimate assumptions using data from LA and amateur company representatives have been used. We will refine these assumptions for subsequent stages of this impact assessment.

Benefits for option 3:

Benefits	Lower	Upper
One-off	£0.28m	£1.31m
On-going (odd year) (per annum)	£0.43m	£1.75m
On-going (even years) (per annum)	£0.15m	£0.69m
PV of Benefits over 10 years	£2.61m	£11.07m

Note: a mark up is applied to account for non-wage labour costs. It is assumed that non-wage labour costs constitute 21 per cent of total labour costs. This is based on analysis of the 2004 UK Labour Cost Survey (LCS).

There may also be a potential improvement in safeguarding measures if LAs are able to focus on inspections rather than administrative tasks of issuing licences. While we cannot provide an estimate of the extent of this benefit we know that it could potentially be substantial if a safeguarding issue is avoided.

	lower	Upper
PV of Costs over 10 years	£0.09m	£0.51m
PV of Benefits over 10 years	£2.61m	£11.07
NPV over 10 years	£2.09m (lower benefits less	£10.97m (upper benefits less

While we are not able to verify all assumptions and estimates due to the lack of data, the estimates from LA and amateur production company staff have enabled us to provide best estimates of the likely impacts of option 3, the preferred option. This gives a best estimate of NPV of £5.16m over 10 years. This preferred option would therefore likely reduce burdens to LAs and amateur production company staff while maintaining adequate safeguarding measures for children performing.

Risks and assumptions:

This method will obviously not scrutinise the individual circumstances of a child before making an assessment for their personal suitability for a role as an individual licence would do. More reliance will now be on an initial assessment of the overall organisational policies and practices for working with children and then a trust that the group will operate within the terms and conditions set out in their approval. However, given the small, voluntary and local nature of these groups, and also the fact that children often participate in these productions alongside friends and family, this seems a proportionate response. Overall we anticipate that safeguarding risks to children in amateur productions will be reduced through the emphasis on the initial assessment of the organisational policies and practices, which would identify any safeguarding issues, and the terms and conditions set out subsequently in their approval.

Wider impact:

This legislation will put in place equal protections for all children under 16 that are taking part in performances. We do not consider therefore, that it will unfairly disadvantage anyone in terms of age, gender, disability, race, religion or sexual orientation. In addition, the purpose of reviewing the legislation is to improve the consistency with which it is implemented across local authority areas by improving the clarity of roles and responsibilities. By reducing the burdens on amateur performance groups, it is more likely that children will be able to take up opportunities to perform in their own communities.

Summary and preferred option and implementation plan:

The preferred option is number 3; we will consult on the detail of the scheme and ask questions which seek to establish the most effective method of operating such a scheme.

The Department will provide a framework by which LAs will assess amateur groups and their appropriateness to work with children. If a group meets the criteria, they will be given an approval for a set time period and will no longer have to apply for individual licenses for children involved in their performances. The new legislation will also continue to provide LA's with discretionary powers for inspections as is the case with current law.

Small firm impact test:

We do not have an adequate estimate of the proportion of small businesses in the amateur production sector. However we estimate that small amateur production companies make up the majority of the market as they are likely to be local organisations and may employ a majority of volunteers rather than paid staff. This suggests that the reduction in burdens outlined above will benefit smaller amateur production companies greater than larger production companies, as the time saved by removing the per child per performance licence will be more greatly felt by smaller companies, as they have less administrative support to deal with the licensing process. Since small amateur production companies are likely to have to compete with other companies in the informal sector, who are not compliant, reducing administration burdens for amateur production companies may confer an even greater advantage than for larger companies.

Micro businesses exemption:

We do not envisage that micro businesses should be exempt from this legislation. The legislation exists to offer protections to children involved in performances and we consider that all children should be offered this protection regardless of the size of the organisation that they are working with. Similarly, a

condition of having a licence is that a chaperone is appointed to take care of the child during production (to ensure they are safe, work within legal framework for hours and breaks, understand what is required of them and object to anything which may harm the welfare and well being of a child), again, there is no reason that a child should be denied these safeguarding measures owing simply to the size of the organisation that they are working with.

OIOO:

This impact assessment assesses production companies as businesses, even though amateur production companies may only have volunteer staff. One-in one-out considerations show that there is a reduction in burdens for businesses as a result of the proposed changes and even with the potential transition costs and increased costs from inspections (although this will be offset by the benefits to LAs and production companies of focusing on monitoring rather than administrative tasks which could help reduce safeguarding issues) the reductions in burdens as a result of the proposals lead to an 'out' for businesses.

Post Implementation Review Plan:

<p>Basis of the review</p> <p>There is a child performance advisory group made up of industry, child welfare professionals and charities and the National Network for Children in Entertainment and Employment. We are working closely with this group through the consultation period and will continue to do so during implementation, monitoring and reviewing following the commencement of the reforms.</p> <p>There has been no commitment to conduct a post implementation review as proposals are yet to be consulted on, but we anticipate that a review would be appropriate once new arrangements have had sufficient time to bed in (5 years).</p>
<p>Review Objective</p> <p>The objective of the PIR would be to check that the new legislative framework was working effectively to ensure that appropriate safeguarding arrangements are consistently made to protect children who take part in performances, and that their opportunities to do so are not constrained by unnecessary bureaucratic processes and requirements.</p>
<p>Review approach and rationale</p> <p>The approach would be to conduct a scan of stakeholder views.</p>
<p>Baseline</p> <p>Current day practice and stakeholder views (as set out in policy review report).</p>
<p>Success criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) effective safeguarding of children who take part in performances. 2) stakeholder views.
<p>Monitoring Information arrangements</p> <p>We do not plan to collect data which would represent a new burden to LAs or production companies.</p>