# Simplification Plan

**December 2007**

# Contents

# The Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS)

Britain can only succeed in a rapidly changing world if we develop the skills of our people to the fullest possible extent, carry out world class research and scholarship, and apply both knowledge and skills to create an innovative and competitive economy. Only an inclusive society that creates opportunities for all its people will have the strength and resource to be at the leading edge of the world economy or meet the global challenges of the 21st Century.

For the period covered by the current spending review, we will work with partners from the commercial, public and voluntary sectors to:

- accelerate the commercial exploitation of creativity and knowledge, through innovation and research, to create wealth, grow the economy, build successful businesses and improve quality of life;

- improve the skills of the population throughout their working lives to create a workforce capable of sustaining economic competitiveness, and enable individuals to thrive in the global economy;

- build social and community cohesion through improved social justice, civic participation and economic opportunity by raising aspirations and broadening participation, progression and achievement in learning and skills;

- pursue global excellence in research and knowledge, promote the benefits of science in society, and deliver science, technology, engineering and mathematics skills in line with employer demand;

- strengthen the capacity, quality and reputation of the further and higher education systems and institutions to support national economic and social needs; and,

- encourage better use of science in government, foster public service innovation, and support other government objectives which depend on our expertise and remit.

To enable the delivery of these objectives, we will strive to add value across the whole delivery chain, be innovative in the way it works internally and with others, and be mindful of the intrinsic value of the pursuit and application of knowledge as a worthwhile activity.

## Further Education (FE)

The FE system is responsible for developing in both young people and adults the skills that are necessary for a productive and competitive economy. To do this, the FE system must be fit for purpose:

- fully meeting the needs of learners and employers;

- offering a wide choice of high quality learning; and,

- operating effectively and efficiently so that the maximum level of resource is focused on frontline delivery.

## Higher Education (HE)

HE is critical to the development of a modern knowledge-based economy, and it can provide opportunities for personal fulfilment, economic competitiveness and, social inclusion. The Government's responsibility is to ensure that the HE sector is well-placed to respond creatively to the challenges and opportunities of the global economy, and that HE institutions play their central role in developing a learning society, with the right blend of high-level skills essential to a 21st Century economy. Our policies therefore aim to ensure access to a world class higher education system for all those with the potential to benefit, with a sector that is high-performing, diverse, improving and economically sustainable, and with the capacity and funding to respond to present and future challenges. Key stakeholders are individuals and employers.

## Intellectual Property Rights

The UK Intellectual Property Office (UK-IPO – formerly known as the UK Patent Office) is an Executive Agency of the Department. A key objective of the Department is to contribute to government goals concerning economic growth and quality of life by accelerating the commercial exploitation of creativity and knowledge, through innovation and research. The provision of an effective intellectual property system is crucial to this.

A major function of the UK-IPO is to examine and grant applications for registerable intellectual property (IP) rights (patents, trade marks and designs). It also provides policy advice to government on the UK's IP framework (which also includes non-registerable rights such as copyright), including the appropriate levels of IP protection required to provide the necessary incentives (in the form of monopoly rights) that may encourage businesses to be more creative or innovative and to grow.

The UK-IPO is, through the provision of IP rights, an enabler of business activity. The IP legislation that is administered sets out criteria that must be met before a right can be granted, for example, when inventions are patentable, and when a business has the exclusive right to use a trade mark. In granting rights, the UK-IPO needs to be sure that these criteria are satisfied. If not, there is a risk that exclusive rights are granted for products or processes that are not novel or original, and should therefore be available to all, including for the purpose of follow-on innovation. There is also a risk of preventing the public from making socially desirable uses of inventions or works, for example for education and research purposes.

IP laws and rules therefore require a certain amount of information to be supplied before a right is granted (in the case of patents, trade marks and design rights), or, can be asserted (in the case of copyright). These information obligations (for example the requirement to describe the invention being claimed), are essential to the effective functioning of an IP system, and many are prescribed by international and European law.

The rights administered by the UK-IPO are optional private rights in the sense that businesses choose whether they wish to apply for them. Once a right is granted, enforcement of it is generally a matter for the right owner. Where a third party is alleged to have infringed a right, the owner can take civil action through the courts or use the UK-IPO tribunal service. In some cases, criminal sanctions are available and these are enforced by Trading Standards Officers and the Police, not the UK-IPO.

## Weights and Measures

The National Weights and Measures Laboratory (NWML) is an Executive Agency of the Department. Its mission is to provide world-class legal metrology and enforcement services.

The provision of these services will drive forward innovation to promote trade, and to protect consumers, health and the environment. With more than one billion pounds worth of goods sold by weight or volume at the retail level in the UK every week, the availability of trustworthy measuring equipment is an essential requirement for a fair market, in which competition can flourish. Without this knowledge, there can be no consumer confidence, and no competition, on the basis of price per litre or per kilogram.

NWML also works with businesses, and particularly with manufacturers of measuring equipment, to ensure that adequate consumer protection in the field of weights and measures is not unnecessarily burdensome on manufacturers and traders.

## Science and Innovation

The Research Councils work collectively as Research Councils UK (RCUK) to optimise the way in which they work together to enhance their overall performance, and to provide better and more efficient services. Improving the Councils operational performance, promoting a culture of efficiency and continuous improvement, and, making efficiency gains, all help to improve the impact of the Science Budget investment.

Research councils implement a joint plan to ensure that peer review, the principal means by which research funding is allocated, remains efficient, effective and excellent value for money, and does not impose unnecessary burdens on grant applicants. The UK's peer review system is regarded as an international benchmark of excellence in research funding and provides a guarantee of the quality of UK research. The Research Councils maintain a competitive, project-based peer review system to support the UK research endeavour, whilst enabling efficiency across the research sector as a whole. Alongside the continuation of the RCUK Assurance Unit and continued improvements to the Joint Electronic Submissions (Je-S) system, this will contribute to the wider service transformational government agenda.

# The Department's better regulation strategy

The Department brings together the functions from two former departments:

- science and innovation responsibilities from the former Department of Trade and Industry (DTI); and,

- skills, further and higher education responsibilities from the former Department for Education and Skills (DfES).

We have, therefore, inherited a programme of work to reduce regulatory burdens in the following areas: intellectual property rights; the regulation of weights and measures; and, the regulation of further and higher education provision.

The Department's range of stakeholders is significant, covering private businesses through to education bodies in the private, public, and, third sectors. The Simplification Plan sets out what we are doing to lift the burden of unnecessary bureaucracy across all the sectors for which we have responsibility.

The first part of the Simplification Plan sets out some background information, together with some information on specific measures. The second part, the Simplification Grid, includes a progress report on the measures and commitments that were included in the Simplification Plans of the two former departments, and identifies a number of new measures.

Overall, the Simplification Plan demonstrates clear successes in delivering better regulation in the areas for which the new Department has responsibility. Against a cross-government target to reduce the administrative burden of regulation on businesses by 25% by May 2010, we have:

- already delivered savings of £121.7 million per annum – equivalent to 22.4%;

- identified specific simplification measures that will enable us to exceed our target – delivering a total saving of £176.2 million by May 2010 – equivalent to 32.5%; and,

- identified a number of further areas where we hope to deliver further savings.

Moreover, this Simplification Plan sets out a range of measures to reduce the burden of regulation on the public and third sectors.

If you have any suggestions that can help us to reduce further the level of unnecessary bureaucracy, we would like to hear from you. You should, in the first instance, submit them to the Better Regulation Executive (BRE) at: http://www.betterregulation.gov.uk They will be passed to us for consideration.

# Reducing burdens on the private sector

In their report Regulation – Less is More: Reducing Burdens, Improving Outcomes, published in 2005, the Better Regulation Task Force (now the Better Regulation Commission) recommended to government that administrative burdens on businesses, associated with central government regulations, should be systematically measured, and subsequently reduced. An exercise to measure the administrative burdens was completed in 2005. Following the recent machinery of government changes, the Department has taken over the work in this area as it affects three policy areas: intellectual property rights; weights and measures; and the repayment of student loans through payroll.

## Table 1: DIUS administrative burdens baseline

| Policy area (legacy department) | Baseline |
| --- | --- |
| Intellectual Property Rights (DTI) | £264.4 million |
| Weights and Measures (DTI) | £258.7 million |
| Repayment of student loans through payroll (DfES) | £19.6 million |
| **Total** | **£542.6 million** |

## Table 2: DIUS progress against administrative burdens reduction target

| | |
| --- | --- |
| DIUS baseline (as at May 2005) | £542.6 million |
| Reduction target (25% by May 2010) | £135.7 million |
| | |
| Measures already delivered as at December 2007 | £121.7 million |
| % of DIUS baseline | 22.4% |
| | |
| Measures Identified to be delivered by May 2010 | £54.5 million |
| % of DIUS baseline | 10.0% |
| | |
| Incoming new burdens identified | 0 |
| % of DIUS baseline | 0% |
| | |
| **Total net reduction by May 2010** | **£176.2 million** |
| **% of DIUS baseline** | **32.5%** |

### Intellectual Property Rights

The UK-IPO has been working with its customers for many years (and predating the simplification exercise) to ensure its processes are as simple and efficient as possible, including through the automation of processes, which has led ultimately to web-based filing. Its simplification efforts in 2006 (when part of the former DTI) included: simplification and consolidation of UK-IPO forms; streamlining litigation rules; modernisation of the design registration system; and, reduced translation costs and simplified procedures for businesses seeking patent protection in Europe. The coming into force of the London Agreement should save UK businesses up to £15 million per year by reducing the number of languages that a European patent application must be translated into.

The proportion of the Department's administrative burden baseline attributed to UK-IPO is £264.4 million. These burdens are found in 19 sets of IP-related regulations (Acts and Rules) administered by the UK-IPO.

We have identified £55,972,166 in administrative burden reductions. £1,941, 923 of these reductions have been delivered. The delivery of the remainder will be take place between now and 2010, and in a number of cases, the timetable is subject to the applicable policy and legislative processes. The outcome of certain policy processes may result in some proposed simplification measures not being delivered, where the costs would outweigh the benefits of doing so. In some cases, we have not yet been able to quantify the level of administrative burden reduction, but will do so as the relevant policy processes and projects come to fruition.

Looking ahead to 2010, the UK-IPO has further changes planned that will make the IP system more efficient and user friendly. These include:

- the reduction of formalities, introduction of web-based filing, greater use of electronic communication technologies and refined examination processes will reduce administrative burdens on users of the IP system by reducing the time spent dealing with the UK-IPO and complying with other legal requirements;

- a number of policy initiatives will reduce compliance costs on business by reducing official fees; and,

- changes to internal procedures will contribute to overall efficiency and constitute savings to government.

### Weights and Measures

The proportion of the Department's administrative burden baseline attributed to NWML is £258.7 million. NWML has already undertaken some reform of the Weights and Measures Act, resulting in a significant reduction of burdens. For example, Part V of the Weights and Measures Act and the Weights and Measures (Packaged Goods) Regulations 1986 have been replaced by new shorter and simpler regulations – the Weights and Measures (Packaged Goods) Regulations 2006 (SI2006/659), which remove some particularly prescriptive requirements, while maintaining the same levels of consumer protection. The total estimated savings from this reform are £119 million per year (cf. April 2006).

Further savings have been delivered through the implementation of two European Directives: the Measuring Instruments Directive (MID); and, the earlier, Non-Automatic Weighing Instruments (NAWI) Directive. Instruments complying with either Directive can obtain a single approval that will allow them access to markets in all EU Member States for that instrument, further saving business an estimated £750,000 per year.

Simplified regulations on labelling of fuel pumps came into force on 30 October 2006, resulting in an annual estimated saving of £25,000. Additional savings through a Deregulation Order (SI 1999/503), which enables manufacturers, installers and repairers to 'self-verify' equipment instead of paying a Trading Standards Officer, and through a newly simplified NWML website have resulted in further savings, taking the total to just under £120 million per year.

In addition, more work is underway in NWML to further reduce the burdens imposed by weights and measures legislation.

There is a proposal to amend the Non-automatic Weighing Instruments (NAWI) Regulations 2000 to allow installers and repairers as well as manufacturers to re-verify instruments, with a potential saving to business, for which the figure is currently being finalised.

Work is underway to extend the scope of the national approved verification scheme, by allowing manufacturers, installers and repairers to re-verify instruments following adjustment, which will result in estimated fees savings of £300,000 – £1 million per year.

We intend to consolidate and simplify the existing weights and measures legislation dealing with quantity labelling and prescribed (or specified) quantities for food. The UK law will be simplified by consolidating these nine orders into one, and modelling the new order more closely on the relevant EU Directives. There are some 88,000 retailers in the affected sectors, who, according to PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) figures, would realise savings of £500,000.

NWML is conducting a 'Prescription Review', which is a review of its existing secondary legislation relating to measuring instruments. The consultation should identify projects where existing legislation relating to measuring instruments can be revoked or where the legislation needs to be amended/simplified. Each legislative change identified will be subject to a full consultation at a later date, at which point potential savings will be identified.

NWML is looking more broadly at the whole body of weights & measures legislation, engaging with stakeholders to identify whether there is scope for further reform, to reduce burdens on business and address longstanding criticisms that the legislation is outdated and complex. We will look at whether the legislation is outdated; whether the enforcement process could be updated to reduce the need for inspection by permitting businesses alternative ways of demonstrating compliance whilst safeguarding standards of consumer protection; what scope there is for flexibility within the enforcement infrastructure; what simplification can be achieved as a result of the European Directive on Unfair Commercial Practices; whether there is scope for greater flexibility in the traceability of standards; and, what impact EU discussions on accreditation, market surveillance and conformity assessment will have on UK regulatory activity in relation to measuring instruments.

# Reducing burdens on the public sector

In June 2007, the Government launched a strategy for reducing the level of unnecessary bureaucracy in frontline public services. Whilst accepting that much work had already been done to free public sector frontline workers from the burden of demands made upon it by government departments and their agencies, it was also acknowledged that more needed to be done. The strategy included four main strands:

1. to make fewer and better co-ordinated requests for data from the frontline by identifying what data is being asked, and accepting a target for reduction;

2. a reduction in the stock of unnecessary bureaucracy in the areas the frontline cares about most, by identifying and tackling major irritants;

3. better engagement with frontline workers to identify and remove bureaucracy through stakeholder groups, surveys, and avenues to prompt ideas for simplification; and,

4. better regulation that is understood and mirrored through the public sector delivery chain, by working with intermediate bodies to spread best practice and better regulation principles.

We have identified all the significant datastreams that exist between the Department, its Non-Departmental Public Bodies (NDPBs) and front-line public sector organisations, so that, for the first time, we have a complete picture of what we are asking the front-line to provide, how often, and why. The list is included as part of this Simplification Plan as Annex 1.

The Department has agreed to a 20% target for reduction by May 2010, subject to determining the balance of this reduction target against the significant work that we have already completed, and the further work that we are committed to in reducing the overall burden of unnecessary bureaucracy on the front line, particularly the existing target in HE to reduce burdens by 20%.

The quality of information that we obtain from datastreams is something that we review on an on-going basis with our sector, and the sector itself has an important role to play in finding the right balance in the level of burden that also provides an appropriate level of assurance, both in terms of performance, and regularity and propriety.

## Further Education (FE)

Our ambition is of a more simple and de-regulated FE system, with greater autonomy and ownership by colleges and providers of their own improvement. We want a system that is focused on delivering more effectively to learners and employers, rather than on unnecessarily complex requirements from other organisations. This requires the FE landscape to be as simple as possible. A landscape, where organisations can work effectively together, and there is no overlap in roles. It also requires streamlined processes and ways of working so that efficiencies are created and bureaucracy reduced.

The first FE Simplification Plan was published in December 2006. The Simplification Grid sets out progress made over the past year, and details of further action planned in 2007/08. The key highlights in 2006 were:

- the establishment of robust challenge functions to scrutinise bureaucracy and communications within the sector. In addition, the sector is now responsible, through an independent Information Authority, for agreeing data collection and reporting;

- the introduction of light touch inspection, along with the merger of Ofsted and ALI, is delivering a 30% reduction in inspection activity against 2003-04 budgets, worth £13 million. A lighter inspection regime will enable providers to spend more time on teaching and learning and free up resources to the front line; and,

- the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) has achieved and exceeded the administrative efficiency savings set for them, and are on target to achieve their full £40 million efficiency savings by 2008/09 at the latest.

Key developments planned in 2007/08 are:

- ensuring new 16-18 and adult funding arrangements are streamlined, including tackling the bureaucracy in Train to Gain;

- streamlining of qualifications through 14-19 diplomas and the Qualifications and Credit Framework; and,

- realising opportunities for improved ways of working eg. shared services, streamlined procurement, a cross sector information service etc.

### Higher Education (HE)

A key strength of universities in this country is their autonomy. They are largely independent of government; with legal protections for academic freedom. Ensuring effective accountability for the large sums of public money that go into the sector is essential, but it is equally vital this is done with the absolute minimum of government-imposed bureaucracy, to prevent the stifling of their autonomy, and enable the sector to continue to flourish and remain innovative.

Good progress has been made with taking forward the steps set out in the first Simplification Plan covering HE, published by DfES in December 2006. In particular, the re-establishment of a new chair and refreshed membership of the Higher Education Regulation Review Group (HERRG: the independent gatekeeper group of senior managers and practitioners from the HE sector) has helped it to improve its profile within the sector, and make good progress with developing its HE Concordat on data collection and quality assurance, which it launched in the middle of last year. A successful workshop mid-2007 reviewed progress made over the first twelve months, shared good practice, and encouraged other potential signatories to commit to the HE Concordat process.

Indeed, the chair of HERRG, Steve Bundred, was able to report in September that it is 'a tribute to the efforts of Ministers, the work of HERRG, and the supportive response of the principal regulatory bodies within the HE sector that concern within universities about the burden of regulation, at least in respect of that imposed by the principal regulatory bodies, does not appear to be as great as it once was.'. While there are exceptions, which HERRG was seeking to address, he said he believed 'the onus now lay with the sector, and especially Universities UK, to demonstrate that serious problems remained and were not being tackled.'.

Key developments planned for 2008 are:

- the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) will introduce a new Financial Memorandum in 2008, supporting implementation of its 'single conversation', to ensure financial monitoring of HE institutions is proportionate to risk;

- HERRG will continue to review progress made by signatories to the HE Concordat, and will steadily increase the number of organisations who have signed up to the HE Concordat; and,

- the new centralised, and, fully integrated, student finance service will be established.

The new accountability framework evolved in a consultative way as the better regulation message spread through the sector. In 2000 and 2004, HEFCE commissioned independent assessments of the regulatory burden, and the burden on HE institutions was seen to be reducing dramatically over that period.

There are three main elements to the new framework. Firstly, the annual submission of finance, audit and accountability returns by institutions to the HEFCE is now to be concentrated into one exchange, in December of each year. These returns used to be spread across the year and there used to be more of them. The information contained in these returns is critical in HEFCE's risk aswsessment of each institution and so long as the institution delivers its information, HEFCE undertakes to notify its confidential risk assessment to the institution by March in the year following submission.

Secondly, HEFCE has dropped its own layer of audit work in institutions, which was seen to be a duplication of the work undertaken by the institutions own internal and external auditors. HEFCE auditors will instead make a one day visit to each institution every five years to confirm that reliance can be placed on the institution's reports and returns.

Finally, there will be a programme of data audit undertaken by HEFCE, which in terms of better regulation is justified as a proportionate requirement because of the reliance placed on institutional data for funding and performance measurement.

## Science and Innovation

Research Councils provide 'services' to a multitude of customers. These include: government departments; charities; academics applying for research funding; research collaborators and users from business; and, the general public. Such services are largely IT-enabled and designed around customer needs.

The Research Councils are working jointly with the academic community and other funders to provide more effective and efficient services for the research community, reducing the level of bureaucracy on researchers and university administrators. Through the Je-S and joint grants processing initiatives, the Councils are transforming and harmonising their business processes, employing best practice from within and outside the Councils, including government standards, in order to make it easier for researchers to apply for funding and for applications to be administered more effectively through the use of IT. Since 2003, the number of major IT systems shared between Research Councils has doubled from 21% to 45%. With the implementation of planned grants processing systems, this proportion will increase further in the next five years.

The Research Councils have made significant progress in harmonisation and integration of human resource, finance and other corporate resources. In a major restructuring exercise, the Medical research Council (MRC) has established a Shared Service Centre (SSC) in Swindon. This covers finance, human resources and procurement services for the whole of MRC, including its institutes. Annual administrative savings from 2006 of £1.3 million per annum were estimated, with a payback period of 6 years. The next phase of the MRC project will involve reviewing other administrative service functions. MRC policy is to reduce London-based Head Office staff to 150 by 2010 (cf. 270 in 2004).

In February 2006, the Research Councils took a significant step towards shared service provision, deciding that by 2009 most support services will be delivered to the Councils and their institutes on a shared basis. In October 2006, RCUK agreed a vision for a Shared Service Centre to provide an integrated, efficient & responsive single organisation administrative support service giving greater value for money and a clearer consistent customer focus.

RCUK has established a cross-Council programme to deliver overall improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of the peer review system.

RCUK is driving forward the implementation of agreed opportunities for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of their peer review via a coordinated cross-Council programme addressing the final reporting process, greater use of outlines, controlling re-submissions, and consolidation. This will deliver £30 million of savings over the period, most of which will accrue to HE Institutions, whilst maintaining the quality and effectiveness of peer review.

The Research Councils are making significant amendments to their collaboration on the peer review and funding of research projects that straddle their remits. The aim is to ensure that no gaps develop between the Councils' subject domains. This will ensure equality of opportunity for proposals at the interface between traditional disciplines, where many of the major research challenges of our time are located.

In its investment framework for science and innovation, the Government has highlighted the need for an enhanced culture of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research in the UK, and for a Research Council peer review and funding infrastructure that is supportive of such work. In this context, the Councils have substantially revised their protocol for assessing and funding research that straddles their remits, which will build upon their collaborative working to date.

The protocol aims to:

- ensure that the Councils' structures provide no discouragement to research at the interface between disciplines;

- ensure that there are no gaps between Councils' remits, and that interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research is effectively supported by the Councils, either independently or in partnership;

- ensure that peer review is fair, appropriate and avoids 'double jeopardy' for projects that straddle disciplinary and Council remits;

- minimise consideration by applicants of Council remits; and,

- neither advantage, nor disadvantage, single discipline research.

All responsive-mode research grant applications that extend beyond a single Research Council's remit will be assessed by peer reviewers from across the relevant domains, thereby ensuring fair and rigorous assessment. Beyond this stage, decisions will be made through a single Council's peer review process, but any significant element residing within another Council's remit will be funded by the Council(s) concerned. This will avoid the 'double jeopardy' of additional review, whilst ensuring that funding allocations reflect Research Councils' different missions, imperatives and approaches.

### Stakeholder irritants

We have worked with many of our stakeholders (including the gatekeeping groups listed below) to identify their top irritants, including those that were identified previously.

## Table 3: Stakeholder Irritants

| Current problem | Proposed solution |
| --- | --- |
| Communication: in 2006, the FE sector raised a major concern about the quality of communication with the frontline. | The setting up of a single gateway, and an FE Communications Gateway Panel to review communications, aims to address these issues. |
| Bursaries (data sharing): administrative impact of delivering bursaries. | The Education (Supply of Student Information to Governing Bodies) Regulations 2006 enables the Student Loans Company, local authorities and the Secretary of State to share with a student's HE institutions (with the student and/or sponsor's permission) information that the student or their sponsor provide in connection with an application for support, specifically for the purpose of administering bursaries or scholarships. The HE institution is informed when a student has given permission on their application for financial support that their information can be shared. This reduces the administrative impact of delivering bursaries by giving HE institutions the option of accessing from the student support system information they need to administer their bursaries and avoiding the need to approach students directly. |
| Leasehold Reform Act: the need for government consent to the imposition of restrictive covenants by universities when they sell land. | A clause in the Education Bill will remove the requirement for university bodies to seek the consent of the Secretary of State to the imposition of restrictive covenants under Section 29 of the Leasehold Reform Act 1967. This will reduce the bureaucratic burdens placed on university bodies, as well as the burdens and expense placed on tenants of making representations to the Secretary of State as to why consent should not be given. |

| Current problem | Proposed solution |
|---|---|
| University governance: universities need government approval to make minor changes to their instruments of governance. | Currently, all changes to Charters and Statutes or Instruments and Articles of Governance have to be approved by the Privy Council. However, institutions are now being encouraged to simplify their governing documents and remove provisions with no public interest into Ordinances, Rules or Bye-Laws. This will give institutions more autonomy to change their own governance arrangements. The Government has set the parameters for what are key public principles that must remain in governance documents, and which may be removed. |
| Duplication between statutory regulators and professional bodies: some professional bodies are being overly prescriptive and inflexible in exercising their regulatory functions. This can result in duplication between their work and that of the statutory regulators, leading to an increased burden for HE institutions. | Government is taking forward HERRG's recommendation in their Autumn 2007 Annual Report that they should conduct a review of the regulatory role of professional bodies and the interaction between this and the role of statutory regulators. It is currently considering exactly how to do this. |
| Transforming the student finance service in England: currently, customers express dissatisfaction with the service in end-to-end surveys. The service is inconsistent, with average processing times, promotion activities, and assessment practices varying between local authorities. Accountability is unclear because of blurred ownership of responsibilities between the four delivery partners (DIUS, Student Loans Company, HM Revenue and Customs and 150 separate local authorities. | The Customer First Programme has been set up to manage the successful introduction of the recommendations from the review of the existing student finance administrative arrangements (*Improving the Student Finance Service* – report of the review of higher education student finance delivery in England – January 2006). The new student finance service will provide affordable funding to help people achieve their potential, through participation in higher education. All customers will experience an efficient, streamlined service, that is designed and delivered around their changing needs. |

# Reducing burdens on the third sector

## Further Education (FE)

In line with other government departments, we are looking at how to reduce the burdens of regulation on the third sector, including the administrative burdens associated with contracting.

In 2005 the Better Regulation Commission produced a report, Better Regulation for Civil Society, which made a number of recommendations for specific improvements to regulation that would benefit third sector organisations. This report specifically identified the 'quasi-regulation' associated with government funding streams (for example the monitoring and reporting requirements set out in contracts) as a major concern for the third sector.

One recommendation (which was accepted by government) was that the LSC should systematically measure the administrative burdens of its contracts with the third sector, develop plans to reduce these burdens, and set appropriate targets and incentives for reductions.

The Better Regulation Executive (BRE) is working closely with the Office of the Third Sector (OTS) to support LSC in delivering this commitment, and recognises that developing a single 'baseline' figure is not straightforward. The OTS have therefore agreed to fund a research project to be carried out by New Philanthropy Capital (NPC) which will work with a sample of third sector organisations to discuss their experience of government contracts, quantify the costs they incur in meeting their requirements, and identify suggestions for reducing these costs. NPC has commenced the project, and the LSC has agreed to be a member of the steering group, and has identified some organisations which could be good case studies.

Evidence from this project will help LSC assess the overall scale of the costs of monitoring and reporting requirements in its contracts, and set targets for further reductions accordingly.

Over the past few years, LSC, Ofsted and the Quality Improvement Agency (QIA) have already done a great deal to reduce the bureaucratic burden on providers, including those in the third sector. Key highlights have been:

- E-tendering: the LSC has introduced a single e-tendering process, which is internet based and made up of two stages; Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) and Invitation to Tender (ITT). This process is compliant with both EC and UK procurement legislation and allows the LSC to open and competitively tender its provision in one approach across the whole of England. This is a significant improvement on previous approaches where at one point each local areas would have their own process which would include different timetables, forms etc. This single process links to a significant move for the LSC towards ensuring that more of its provision is both demand led and that more of its 'mainstream' delivery is fully contestable;

- support through the Quality Improvement Agency (QIA): the QIA for lifelong learning has agreed to fund a project to support third sector organisations that have either applied to become, or are considering applying to become, approved LSC providers through the new e-tendering process. In other words, third sector providers that are considering completing the PQQ during the next round, or that might welcome help at the second stage, the ITT. Support will be provided by the QIA's Improvement Adviser Service (IAS), which is managed by Tribal. The main focus of the support will be voluntary and community sector consortia (and their members), and therefore the Consortia+ national network will be the means of distributing information about the service. NIACE (which facilitates Consortia+) has agreed to receive all applications for support and to refer these directly to the IAS. The IAS will then assign advisers to work with the third sector providers to help develop or strengthen their systems in order to meet LSC criteria, and also to advise about completion of both the PQQ and ITT;

- new lighter touch contracting, monitoring and compliance: as detailed in the LSC Annual Statement of Priorities, the LSC is driving forward an approach to contract management, monitoring and compliance where high quality provision and management earns a very light touch from the LSC and poor quality provision and management would see a set of swift and robust interventions from the LSC; and,

- New approach taken by Ofsted with European Social Fund (ESF) contractors: the LSC, Job Centre Plus and Ofsted have worked together to adapt the standard inspection framework to fit ESF-only providers through co-financing. This approach was primarily targeted at third sector providers, often small,

who access only ESF-funded provision. All other providers of ESF with existing mainstream contract are inspected once for both their ESF and mainstream delivery. The ESF-only inspection process recognises that a small provider reaching out to the hardest to reach needs appropriate systems for quality provision, which would be different to those maintained by mainstream qualification delivery providers.

More generally, the LSC, Ofsted, QIA and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), supported by DIUS, have introduced a range of measures aimed at simplifying arrangements for FE providers, which will also support third sector providers. These include:

- introduction of a new relationship between the LSC and FE providers;

- new inspection arrangements;

- radical changes to information management;

- a single set of standard performance indicators; and,

- a coherent, rational and integrated framework for units and qualifications.

The LSC, supported by DIUS and the BRE, recently consulted an advisory group to the LSC Council, which represents third sector interests. At that meeting, there was a welcome for the progress made to date, and agreement on the action that was now required. Fuller details of the progress to-date, and further action now in hand, is set out in Table 1 and Table 2 of the Simplification Grid.

# Quality assurance through stakeholder engagement

We very much value the input of our frontline stakeholders. The gatekeeping groups listed below will ensure that our simplification initiatives are quality assured through advice, challenge and insight.

## The Further Education and Training Bureaucracy Reduction Group (BRG)

The BRG is the independent gatekeeper for the FE sector, and has been operating for about two years. The BRG is applying a formal scrutiny process, which involves the Department and the key delivery partners (LSC, Ofsted, QIA, QCA and Sector Skills Development Agency) reporting on their plans for reducing bureaucracy in the FE system. The BRG published an annual report earlier this year on progress made during 2006. The BRG was consulted on the FE sections of this Simplification Plan.

## The Further Education Information Authority (IA)

The Government's White Paper, Raising Skills, Improving Life Chances, identified that there is a need to bring together the information needs of all the organisations who request information from the FE system, and to agree what will be required from all providers, based on common standards. Data is to be collected once and used for a variety of purposes. The intent is to ensure that only priority information is collected, and that reports are made back in a standard format.

This has led to the establishment of a single mechanism or gatekeeper for setting information standards, and data and reporting requirements, the IA. The IA Board will make far-reaching decisions that will reform data andçinformation across the FE system. Data will be collected by and be reported on by a Data Service, which will use a 'collect once, use many times, used by all' philosophy.

Key points in relation to the IA are that:

- DIUS Ministers have asked stakeholders in the sector to work together to reform FE data;

- the IA Board has an independent Chair and cross-system membership; and,

- a protocol agreement has been signed by stakeholder organisations, supporting the objectives, and working together to deliver them, which gives the authority to deliver reforms to FE data.

## The Further Education Communications Gateway Panel

In the last Simplification Plan, we reported that one of the major irritants for the sector was around communication. To address this, an independent communications gateway panel has been set up. Its role is to define and promote standards for producing good quality publications for the FE system, as part of the new communications gateway. The panel reviews proposals for, and drafts of new DIUS/ Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and LSC publications that are intended for providers in the FE system, and is able to challenge the proposals. Members represent colleges, independent training providers and sixth form colleges.

## Case study: improving relationships and communications

In FE, there have been a number of measures taken aimed at giving the sector itself greater control and ownership. Two key developments are on information management and communications. These changes, in turn, are helping to improve the relationship between the sector and government.

An independent Information Authority (IA), with strong sector representation, is now in place. The IA is directly responsible for setting the standards for information collection and reporting, and is looking at the extent of the current burden in the sector and has committed to reducing the data streams by 20%.

A Communications Gateway Panel, again involving strong sector representation, is scrutinising drafts of publications being sent out by DIUS, DCSF and the LSC to the sector, so they better meet the needs of the sector.

These developments mean that the sector now has much greater say in what information is collected, and when, and how it will be reported. All the key organisations which want information from the sector have signed up to a protocol to abide by the IA's decisions.

In terms of communications, the sector has routinely complained about the quality of communication and seen this as one of the major irritants. Enabling the sector to comment on the key communications before they are published has made a real difference to the quality of publications.

'We know the FE Communications Gateway Panel has already made a difference to specific publications, including the LSC's Statement of Priorities Better skills, Better jobs, Better Lives, World Class Skills: implementing the Leitch Review of Skills in England and the update in July on the FE White Paper Raising Skills, Improving Life Chances. After the Panel's scrutiny, publications offer better targeted key messages and include summaries, for example for Governors. The Panel routinely challenge authors to focus on the primary audience, to reduce the amount of background, by removing what readers would already know, and to use plain English. They also encourage a more inclusive tone to reflect shared objectives across the FE system. Through considering a range of drafts of different types of publications, the Panel have developed a set a guidelines to help authors in DIUS and the LSC prepare better drafts, and a feedback form which will be included in future publications.'

Sally Dicketts, Principal of Oxford and Cherwell Valley College and Chair of the FE Communications Panel

## Higher Education Regulation Review Group (HERRG)

HERRG, which is the independent gatekeeper for the HE sector, was re-appointed for a further two years in 2006. It is primarily comprised of senior managers from the sector, with an independent chair. Its task is to review administrative burdens placed upon HE institutions through interventions by government and its agencies, and to identify how the burden might be eliminated or reduced. The Chair – Steve Bundred, who is also Chief Executive of the Audit Commission – has brought in valuable skills and expertise of the better regulation agenda.

## Case study: HE Concordat on quality assurance and data collection

HERRG's HE Concordat was launched in May 2006. 16 organisations active in the sector committed to its principles, and prepared action plans detailing how they would put these principles into practice. HE Concordat signatories pledged to minimise the regulatory burdens they place on universities, and to eliminate the duplication of effort that existed in the past. The HE Concordat will help to bring about better co-ordination of inspection and data collection which could ultimately save at least £15 million annually. This should also

mean a significant reduction in the burdens that are placed on universities.

Progress to date has been encouraging. The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) has overhauled its Quality Assurance Framework, and is co-ordinating with Ofsted the scheduling of work in institutions subject to review by both. The Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) has moved to a web-based system of data collection, and is implementing the Higher Education Database for Institutions (HEIDI). The Training and Development Agency (TDA) has streamlined its data collection requirement, aligned collection dates with HESA, and brought its financial memorandum into line with other funding bodies.

HERRG has also been seeking to extend the reach of the HE Concordat; there are a large number of organisations involved in the regulation of higher education. There are now 22 organisations signed up to the Concordat, with the National Audit Office (NAO) the most high-profile of those to have recently signed up. HERRG is also in discussions with a number of other organisations about joining the HE Concordat.

## Other groups

The UK-IPO meets regularly with a number of external stakeholder groups to discuss emerging policy issues and internal policies and practices. These groups provide valuable insight into the likely impact of policy and practice changes, including administrative burdens, on a wide range of stakeholders. The UK-IPO has three permanent practice working groups: the Designs Practice Working Group; the Patent Practice Working Group; and, the Trade Marks Registry Practice Working Group. In addition, there is a Policy Interests Group. It convenes subject-specific focus groups to provide reactions to international developments and draft consultation documents. The Chief Executive of the UK-IPO meets quarterly with the 'Four Presidents' of the Chartered Institute

of Patent Attorneys, Institute of Trade Mark Attorneys, Trade Mark Patents and Designs Federation, and, the International Federation of Intellectual Property Attorneys.

NWML meets every six months with the Local Authorities Co-ordinating Office on Regulatory Services (LACORS), Accredited Certification Bodies (ACBs), Forecourt Equipment Federation (FEF), and the Petrol Retailers Association (PRA). NWML meets annually with a Joint Consultative Committee (JCC), which is a meeting between NWML and the United Kingdom Weighing Federation (UKWF). NWML's type approval team hold annual clubs on the following topics: weighing, volume, and software. These meetings and clubs are used to inform stakeholders of any changes that have, or will, occur, which will affect them, to receive feedback from our stakeholders on successes, or, any problems with the way things have, or are going. They are also used to help NWML develop future policy that is feasible, sensible, and needed.

## Implementing the recommendations of the Hampton Report

The Hampton Report Reducing Administrative Burdens: Effective Inspection and Enforcement, was published in March 2005, and set out a vision for a risk-based approach to regulation. The report, whose recommendations the Government accepted, identified that the cumulative administrative burden of inspections and form-filling was significant for the business community, particularly for smaller businesses. It recommended that:

- regulators, and the regulatory system as a whole, should use comprehensive risk assessment to concentrate resources on areas that need them the most;

- all regulations should be written so that they are easily understood, easily implemented and easily enforced;

- regulators should reduce the number and

complexity of forms they use;

- businesses should not have to give unnecessary information, or give the same piece of information, twice;

- regulators should provide authoritative, accessible, advice easily and cheaply;

- no inspection should take place without a reason;

- the few businesses that persistently break regulations should be identified quickly and be subject to meaningful sanctions;

- regulators should recognise that a key element of their activity will be to allow, or even encourage, economic progress, and only to intervene when there is a clear case for protection.

Three DIUS regulatory bodies were within the scope of the Hampton Report: NWML; the Hallmarking Council; and, UK-IPO. This Simplification Plan outlines what the Department is doing to implement the Hampton recommendations. For example:

- reviewing and simplifying UK-IPO forms;

- measures to enable electronic filing of trade mark applications; electronic communications in patent applications; and, electronic access to UK-IPO files and documents;

- measures to enable a single application to file patents in multiple EU Member States, and to remove the need to translate such applications into various national languages;

- A new NWML website designed to improve the advice and guidance and resources available to businesses;

- simplification of the packaged goods regulations, which have reduced burdens on businesses;

- allowing more instances of when businesses can verify their own weights and measures equipment as it is placed on the UK market, without the need for trading standards intervention;

- consolidation and simplification of the

existing weights and measures legislation dealing with quantity labelling and prescribed (or specified) quantities for food; and,

- a current reform project with the aim of identifying scope for reform to make compliance with legislation easier, quicker, and, cheaper. This is being done in conjunction with the Consumer Law Review being carried out by the Centre for Competition Policy (CCP) and the BRE.

The UK-IPO is not itself a regulatory enforcement body – rather rightsholders are able to uphold their intellectual property rights through the civil courts. The UK-IPO does, however, play a key policy role in the national IP crime strategy, working alongside trading standards departments, the Police, and, HM Revenue and Customs, to enforce the law on counterfitting and piracy.

The scope of the Hampton Review considered ways of reducing the administrative costs that regulations impose on business. It did not, therefore, include bodies regulating public or third sector provision of further and higher education. Nonetheless, this plan outlines a number of the measures in this area that are consistent with the Hampton vision, including by:

- streamlining communications, data requirements and relationships between government and further and higher education providers;

- Merging the Adult Learning Inspectorate (ALI) with Ofsted, to create a single inspectorate – reducing the incidence and burden of inspections, especially for good and excellent providers; and

- streamlining the further education qualifications system.

# Simplification Grid

The following Simplification Grid contains the detail of our simplification initiatives. The grid sets out briefly:

- what the work strand is about;
- the desired outcome for stakeholders;
- the cost savings and benefits; and,
- progress to date.

# Table 1: Simplification measures delivered

**Private sector**

| Title/policy/initiative | Nature of burden | Description of simplification measure | Outcomes (including sector to benefit) | Cost saving (administrative or policy) | Delivery |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Weights and Measures: costs of repeating type approval | Costs of repeating type approval for different EEA countries. | Transposition of Measuring Instruments Directive. Provisions for Designation of Notified Bodies came into force on 30 May 2006. | One type approval will open the EEA market to all manufacturers. | Only obtaining type approval in the UK, rather than every EU state in which the company does business, should save £750,000 per annum in administrative burdens (based on RIA data). | 11 SIs came into force on 30 October 2006. |
| 2. Weights and Measures: labelling information on fuel pumps | Cost of labelling information on fuel pumps. | Amendment to Liquid Fuel and Lubricants Regulations 1995, to remove requirement for indication of product standard, and, date on retail fuel dispensers. | Re-labelling of 250,000 fuel pump nozzles will no longer be required for small changes to fuel specification. | Assuming a 10p saving for each fuel nozzle, this leads to a saving of £25,000 per annum to fuel retailers in administrative burdens (based on RIA data). | Regulation amendment came into force on 30 October 2006. |
| 3. Weights and Measures: Weights and Measures (Packaged Goods) Regulations 1986 | Complex, overlapping rules on packaged goods. | Simplification of UK law on quantity indications through consolidation of 5 Orders into 1. This removes the distinction between 'Class A' and 'Class B' packaging, and helps understanding of the indication requirements. | Simpler law: more consistent, certain, accessible and comprehensible. Greater freedom over the equipment for measuring and checking quantity, primarily in the bread sector, but also for other suppliers. Will facilitate greater innovation. | Removal of information obligations resulting from this measure will save £119 million per annum in administrative burdens. | Came into force 6 April 2006. |
| 4. Weights and Measures: researching weights and measures legislation – NWML website | Costs to business of researching weights and measures legislation. | Improved website. | Simpler navigation, improved search mechanism for legislative documents, and, facilities for web-based booking of NWML services. | Time savings for stakeholders achieved through a more easily navigable website. | Implemented October 2005. |
| 5. Intellectual Property Rights: simplification of forms | Time to complete forms. | Administrative burden reduction. The total number of forms (for applications and renewals etc) has been reduced with some forms removed altogether and others combined. | The reduced information obligations along with improved layout and clearer instructions will make it easier and quicker for customers to supply the information the UK-IPO needs, which ultimately leads to more efficient processing of IP applications. | £100,000 per annum in administrative burdens. | Implemented April 2007. |
| 6. Intellectual Property Rights: modernisation of design registration system | Time to file multiple applications. | Administrative burden reduction. The simplification of design registration processes has removed the need for multiple applications. | The removal of the need to file multiple applications means that less time is spent on an application (including form filling). This has also resulted in savings in official fees (policy cost reduction) and reduced external legal costs. | £200,000 per annum in administrative burdens. | Implemented in March 2007. |
| 7. Intellectual Property Rights: address for service requirements | The requirement to provide a UK address for service resulted in additional legal and other fees for some customers. | Administrative burden reduction. The removal of the requirement to provide an address for service in the UK was replaced with a requirement to provide an address in the EEA. | Customers can use existing address in the EEA and do not need to engage an agent in the UK to fulfil this function. | £670,000 per annum in administrative burdens. | Implemented in January 2005. |
| 8. Intellectual Property Rights: web-based filing of trade mark applications | The time to file a trade mark application manually. | Administrative burden reduction. Introduction of a web-based electronic form for filing trade mark applications. | Reduced costs to businesses submitting trade mark applications to the UK-IPO due to a more efficient and user friendly process. Over 40 per cent of applications are now filed electronically (60 % of these from private applicants). | £16,000 per annum in administrative burdens. | Implemented in June 2005. Uptake continues to rise. |
| 9. Intellectual Property Rights: implementation of revised European Patent Convention | The cost of filing patent applications in multiple member states. | Administrative burden reduction. Allow single application to file patents in multiple member states. | It will be easier and less costly for businesses to protect their inventions across Europe as only one application will be required. It will also be easier to amend European patents. | £100,000 per annum in administrative burdens. | The revised EPC will come into force on 13 December 2007. |
| 10. Intellectual Property Rights: declaration for an invention which is a product | Previously, a declaration was required. | Administrative burden reduction. A declaration is no longer required. | Customers do not have to take the time to prepare a declaration or engage a legal representative to assist. | £5,923 per annum in administrative burdens. | This transitional provision has expired. |

| Title/policy/initiative | Nature of burden | Description of simplification measure | Outcomes (including sector to benefit) | Cost saving (administrative or policy) | Delivery |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. Intellectual Property Rights: examination of trade marks on relative grounds | Previously, the UK-IPO examined trade marks on relative grounds (to see if anyone has already registered a mark that conflicts with it). Correspondence between the UK-IPO and customers on relative grounds was time consuming and often involved legal representatives. | Administrative burden reduction: The Trade Marks Act 1994 has been amended to remove relative grounds examination. Policy cost reduction: a saving in official fees due to less trade mark applications failing on relative grounds. | Applicants will not have to engage with the office on relative grounds issues (unless an application is opposed by a trade mark owner), saving time and money on legal fees. | £120,000 per annum in administrative burdens. £1,180,000 (does not impact on administrative burden baseline, but will deliver policy cost reduction). | Implemented in October 2007. |
| 12. Intellectual Property Rights: changes to the Patents Rules 1995 | Complex and overlapping rules on litigation at the UK-IPO and other administrative matters. | Administrative burden reduction. The entire rules package has been redrafted, including a clearer and simpler set of rules on patent litigation (before the UK-IPO). A number of forms have also been abolished along with requirements for duplicate papers to be filed and copies of certain documents to be supplied. | When the new rules come into force there will be a general scheme of rules for litigation rather than separate sets of rules for different procedures. This consolidation exercise will make it easier for lawyers to understand what is required. The process will also be streamlined so that litigation takes a shorter time, which will result in savings to users of the IP system in legal fees. | £730,000 per annum in administrative burdens. | December 2007. |
| 13. Student Loans: repayment of student loans through payroll | Employers have to account for the repayment of student loans in the same manner as deduction of PAYE tax. | Changes have been made to allow the P46 form to function as a start notice. | Employers who recruit someone with a student loan can now use the P46 as a start notice where the box is ticked. Otherwise, SLC instruct HMRC separately. The borrower thus can enter into repayment more quickly where SLC does not have to submit a separate start notice. | There is potential reduced administrative burden on employers (but the employer still has to start the repayments, irrespective of whether the trigger is a P46 or an SL1 start notice). | April 2005. |
| 14. Further Education: financial arrangements in FE | Complex audit arrangements. | The LSC has made significant changes to its financial and audit arrangements. This has given the sector greater control over how financial returns are managed, and has led to a significant reduction in the level of audit required. Specifically, in terms of financial management, the LSC has contracted with the Association of Colleges and the College Finance Directors Groups to improve financial reporting in colleges. This is delivering: national accounts direction guidance for the 2006/07 and 2007/08 college finance statements; national model financial plan templates for the 2007-2010 and 2008-2011 college financial years; and, operation of a helpdesk. | Reduced audit requirement. | In 2006, we estimated that £12 million per year savings would be secured from the changes made to audit arrangements. This saving has been monitored, and has been confirmed. However, we expect this saving to be slightly reduced in future years because of recent changes to adult funding arrangements. The change is marginal and should reduce the saving by up to £1 million. | The changes to financial management were introduced in Summer 2007. |
| 15. Further Education: streamlining the relationship with FE providers | In last year's plan, we recognised that there was a lack of clarity in the respective roles of organisations operating in the FE System. | A new relationship with FE providers. The LSC will strengthen its strategic capability at regional level and reduce its administrative effort at local level. DIUS will concentrate on strategic leadership and policy formulation. The Quality Improvement Agency (QIA) will lead on quality improvement discussions and action planning with colleges supported by a single Quality Improvement Strategy for the sector. In addition, DIUS (and DCSF) and the LSC have streamlined their structures. | Each college or training provider will have a single named strategic partner in the LSC. Colleges and providers will in future have a single source of support on all quality issues. | A Regulatory Impact Assessment was produced when the FE White Paper *Further Education: Raising Skills, Improving Life Chances* was published. The LSC has achieved and exceeded the administrative efficiency savings set for them, and are on target to achieve their full £40 million efficiency savings by 2008/09 at the latest. | The milestones in last year's plan have been achieved or are on track:<br>• LSC announced a new streamlined non-executive in autumn 2006, and introduced new single strategic partners in December 2006;<br>• LSC has reduced its staff by 1,100 by the end of 2006; and,<br>• full National Improvement Strategy (NIS) published autumn 2006 and operational by April 2007. |
| 16. Further Education: streamlining communications with FE providers | Inconsistent presentation of publications and consultation papers to providers. | A Communications Gateway Panel that reviews all key publications. | All publications and consultations to FE providers from DIUS, DCSF and LSC will be scrutinised by the Communications Gateway Panel against agreed standards. | RIA for the FE Reform White Paper includes a strategic view of the costs and benefits. DIUS and LSC will review the impact on level and standard of publications through provider perception. | Communications Gateway Panel was in place by May 2007 and fully operational by September 2007. |

**Public sector**

| Title/policy/initiative | Nature of burden | Description of simplification measure | Outcomes (including sector to benefit) | Cost saving (administrative or policy) | Delivery |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. Further Education: streamlining and rationalising FE data | A need for better use of data, greater control over demands, improved supply of data, and a more efficient, effective and accountable service. | 1. A new FE Information Authority, supported by a secretariat, act as a gatekeeper and decision maker on data standards, collections and reporting. | Improved quality and use of information in support of effective decision making by all stakeholders (improvements in data relevance, consistency, timeliness and accuracy). | Studies are underway to analyse what the current state burden comprises, to determine how, and a measurable 20% reduction can be effected, and reported against in measurable terms. | The milestones included in the 2006 plan have been met: • Authority now in place, with independent Chair; • Information Standards Protocol agreed and signed off by Board; • Memorandum of Understanding developed between Information Standards Board (responsible for standards in education) and the FE Information Authority. |
| 18. Further Education qualifications | Large numbers of qualifications and awarding bodies with different and complex administration. | Introduction of web-based system for qualifications administration and accrediting new qualifications, including fast-track process for organisations with a good track record. | A national database of accredited qualifications (NDAQ). | All qualifications now accredited on-line. | Openquals succeeded by the National Database of Accredited Qualifications in late 2006. Re-launch site implemented in September 2007. The site now contains details of the new 14-19 diplomas and their constituent parts. |
| 19. Further Education: quality – launch of an excellence gateway | | A single online service for post 16 providers, including an Improvement Services Directory. | To facilitate the dissemination of proven good practice between providers. | In the two months since official launch at end of July 2007, the site has attracted 200,000 unique visitors. 88% of users thought it was good or better (84% is average for public sector websites). A study is being undertaken of the resource savings from bringing together such a wide range of websites and resources into a single resource. | June 2006 – Initial launch of the Gateway. June 2007 – Gateway links to four key websites. Early 2008 – results of study into resource savings. April 2008 – further websites added. |
| 20. Further Education & Higher Education: cross-cutting simplification measures – Managing Information Across Partners (MIAP) | | MIAP is improving how data is shared across the whole post-14 education sector, including higher education and across the UK. It is doing this through 3 new internet based services: 1. a Learner Registration Service, incorporating a ULN; 2. a learner data sharing interface that will enable the creation of learner records; and, 3. a UK Register of Learning Providers. | MIAP will benefit a wide range of stakeholders, including learners and employers: • reduced administrative burdens, better policy and funding decisions; and, • improved personalisation of services. | Over the six year period 2006–2012 the total investment in developing MIAP services is estimated at around £45m. The MIAP business case indicates that by the end of the second year of full operation of the initial services (2012/13), the programme will have realised efficiency and administrative savings equivalent to or greater than the costs of development and operation. | Key developments are: • 2005 – UK Register of Learning Providers established; and, • 2006 – common data definitions developed and being introduced in FE and HE sectors; • 2007 – learner registration service was launched in September 2007 and being adopted by over 60 providers. |
| 21. Research Councils measures on peer review and funding of research projects that straddle their remits | 'Double jeopardy' occurring in the assessment of interdisciplinary research proposals. | The Research Councils have made significant amendments to their collaboration on the peer review and funding of research projects that straddle their remits. This ensures that no gaps develop between the Councils' subject domains and equality of opportunity for proposals at the interface between traditional disciplines, where many of the major research challenges of our time are located. | Little or no 'double jeopardy' in assessment of interdisciplinary proposals. | | Protocol agreed from August 2006. |

## Table 2: New simplification measures identified, and, measures previously identified and yet to be completed

**Private sector**

| Title/policy/initiative | Nature of burden | Description of simplification measure | Outcomes (including sector to benefit) | Estimated cost saving (administrative or policy) | Implementation timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Intellectual Property Rights: the London Agreement on Patents | The cost of translating European patents to meet the requirement that they must be filed in the national language of each country where protection is sought. | Administrative burden reduction: remove the requirement to file in national languages through the negotiation and implementation of the London Agreement. | The cost to UK businesses of obtaining patent protection in EU countries will be significantly reduced by the removal of the requirement to file applications in national languages. Translation costs currently account for 25% of the cost of a European patent application, and will be almost halved. There will also be savings to UK-IPO operational costs. | £10 million to £15million per annum in administrative burdens. | The London Agreement will come into force in early 2008. |
| 2. Intellectual Property Rights: business friendly hours | Customers are currently limited in the hours they may deal with the office. | Liberalisation of the times and dates on which documents can be filed with the UK-IPO. | The UK-IPO will provide a more convenient service to its customers who will be able to deal with the Office at more flexible times. | Not quantified at time of publication, but following consultation, will be reviewed. | October 2008 |
| 3. Intellectual Property Rights: OHIM (Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market) fees | UK businesses seeking a community trade mark must pay fees to OHIM. | Policy cost reduction. The UK is working with other EU member states to reduce OHIM fees. | UK businesses will pay less to register community trade marks and protect their trade marks across the EU. | £1.5 million (does not impact on administrative burden baseline, but will deliver policy cost reduction). | September 2008 |
| 4. Intellectual Property Rights: fast track processing of trade mark applications | Currently, it takes, on average, 6 months to have a trade mark registered. | Administrative burden reduction. Introduce a fast track process for the registration of trade marks. | UK businesses take less time to obtain trade mark registration and benefit from trade mark protection faster. | Saving to be determined following consultation process, and will be a reduction in administrative burdens. | April 2008 |
| 5. Intellectual Property Rights: electronic communication in patent applications | Correspondence between applicants and the UK-IPO on matters concerning patent search and examination can be time consuming. | Administrative burden reduction: increased use of electronic communication associated with patent applications such as web-based forms will offset the administrative burdens for search and examination. These efficiencies will also constitute a saving to government. | UK businesses taking advantage of electronic communication will spend less time communicating with the UK-IPO through a paperless 24 hour filing system with rapid acknowledgement of receipt. They will be able to identify and understand our requirements more easily through online guidance. Business and the UK-IPO will also save on photocopying and postage costs. | £14,000 per annum in administrative burdens. | Ongoing. Electronic communication is already available and more web forms will be introduced. Uptake of existing services continues to increase. |
| 6. Intellectual Property Rights: fast track processing of patent applications | Currently, it can take, on average, three years to have a patent granted. | Administrative burden reduction: greater availability of fast track patent processing. | More UK businesses could be granted patents in under a year. | Saving to be determined following consultation process, and will deliver an administrative burden reduction. | April 2008 |
| 7. Intellectual Property Rights: electronic access to UK-IPO patent files | Currently, applicants or their legal representatives must complete a form 23 to request a hard copy of a file or travel to Newport to view it. | Administrative burden reduction: allow electronic access (mode yet to be determined) to files. | UK business will spend less time and money on accessing information contained in UK-IPO files. | As the mode of access is yet to be determined the level of saving is yet to be quantified, and will deliver an administrative burden reduction. | 2009 |
| 8. Intellectual Property Rights: patent prosecution highway – trial with Japan and USA | UK businesses that have already applied for a patent in the UK must wait for their applications to be processed in other countries, even where examination has already taken place in the UK. | The Patent Prosecution Highway agreement with Japan and the USA will benefit UK businesses seeking patent protection in Japan and the USA, by speeding up processing time. It will also enhance patent quality as each intellectual property office will have access to work already undertaken by other offices (a policy benefit). | UK business will spend less time pursing patent protection in Japan and the USA. | The Patent Prosecution Highway is currently being trialled and it is too early to quantify the impact it will have. | 2010 |
| 9. Intellectual Property Rights: mediation and opinion services | Intellectual property disputes are time consuming and expensive due to the need to engage a legal representative. | The UK-IPO has instituted mediation and opinion services. | These services are likely to reduce administrative burdens either by reducing the likelihood of litigation taking place, or, by focusing the litigation and reducing its duration. | The mediation service was launched in 2006, and has not been operating long enough to be able to quantify the impact | Launched in April 2009. |
| 10. Intellectual Property Rights: asserting moral rights | Section 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 requires an author to make a statement asserting their right to be identified as an author or director. If the statement is not made, in certain circumstances no infringement of moral rights will be considered to have taken place and a remedy will not be available. | Administrative burden reduction. The UK-IPO will consult with stakeholders to identify the costs and benefits of removing the requirement to make a statement. | Depending on the outcome of the policy process, authors and directors will not have to make a statement in their works in order to benefit from moral rights provided in copyright law. | £39 million per annum in administrative burdens. | 2010 |

| Title/policy/initiative | Nature of burden | Description of simplification measure | Outcomes (including sector to benefit) | Estimated cost saving (administrative or policy) | Implementation timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. Intellectual Property Rights: name and address details on registers | Customers have to complete separate forms to amend their name and address details across the three registers maintained by the UK-IPO (patents, trade marks and designs). | Administrative burden reduction. Institute a single form for name and address changes. Web-based self management of customer information is also being considered. | UK businesses will spend less time updating their name and address details with the UK-IPO. | Further work is required to determine the number of customers affected, and will deliver an administrative burden reduction. | 2010 |
| 12. Intellectual Property Rights: fees and receipts | A range of administrative burdens result from current processes for paying application and renewal fees and acknowledging these payments. | Administrative burden reduction and savings to government. Make the payment and acknowledgement of fees easier for customers through credit card or mobile phone payments, direct debits etc. Automated payment methods take less time and can reduce the need for professional assistance. | UK businesses spend less time meeting requirements. | Further work is required to scope the available options and determine the number of customers affected, and will deliver an administrative burden reduction. | The introduction of credit card payments for trade mark applications took place in 2006. Any further measures to be implemented by 2010. |
| 13. Intellectual Property Rights: electronically circulated copies of certified documents | Certified documents are exchanged on paper. The process of making a request for a certified document is timely and involves the completion of a form and payment of a fee. | Administrative burden reduction. Introduce an electronic form for the request of certified copies and issue certified copies electronically. | UK businesses spend less time and money obtaining certified documents. | Further work is required to scope the likely administrative burden reduction. | 2009 |
| 14. Intellectual Property Rights: electronic case files | Traditional case processing is administratively cumbersome. | Internal efficiency (saving to government) and speedier service for customers. | Introduction of electronic case files results in more rapid provision of uncertified copies with delivery by email leading to faster service to customers. Internal efficiencies result for the IPO. | Quantifiable following complete transition period. | Transition to electronic case files has started. |
| 15. Intellectual Property Rights: regulation of patent and trade mark attorneys | The Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 currently deals with the qualifications and registration necessary to be able to practise as an attorney. | Repeal these provisions and associated rules. Allow attorneys to self regulate under the Legal Services Board. | Attorneys do not have to comply with prescribed registration process and instead will self regulate. | £16,243 per annum, and will deliver an administrative burden reduction. | 2008 |
| 16. Weights and Measures: Weights and Measures Act 1985 – consolidation under Part IV | Over-complex, overlapping, regulation. | Simplification of UK law on quantity indications through consolidation of 8 Orders into 1, and, closer modelling on relevant EU Directives. | Primarily affecting businesses manufacturing and packaging foodstuffs, which will benefit from a more consistent, certain, accessible, and, comprehensive framework. | There are some 88,000 retailers in the affected sectors. On PwC figures, they will realise savings of £500,000 per annum in administrative burdens. | Next steps depend on progress in Brussels of proposals to simplify EC law on specified quantities. |
| 17. Weights and Measures: weights and measures self-verification – Legislative Reform Order | Restriction on who can re-verify equipment after adjustment. | Deregulation. Extension of scope planned to remove the requirement for verification by Trading Standards, following adjustments of equipment. | Approved manufacturers, repairers and installers of weighing and measuring equipment can self-verify their products. | Savings of £300,000 to £1 million per annum achieved in reduced fees. | NWML is liaising with Better Regulation Executive and others to resolve outstanding issues. |
| 18. Weights and Measures: prescription review | The manner by which it is decided which measuring instruments should be covered by regulations, both in relation to their approval and/or use for trade. | The consultation should identify projects where existing legislation relating to measuring instruments can be removed, or, where the legislation needs to be amended/simplified. | To be identified. | Each legislative change identified will be subject to a full consultation at a later date, at which point, potential savings will be identified. | Initial consultation document to issue by end of 2007. |
| 19. Weights and Measures: reform of weights and measures legislation | Over-complicated regulation, scope for flexibility in enforcement and traceability of standards. | A broad review of what reduction in burdens might be achieved through reforming weights and measures legislation. | Potentially simplified regulations for retailers and enforcers. | Cost savings will be assigned once potential areas for reform have been identified. | Evidence to be collated and next steps identified by March 2008. |
| **Public sector** | | | | | |
| 20. Weights and Measures: amending the Non-automatic Weighing Instruments (NAWI) Regulations 2000 | | Administrative burden reduction. Proposal to allow installers and repairers as well as manufacturers to re-verify instruments. | Saving to business. | Administrative burden reduction to be identified. | Consultation closed June 2007. Preliminary government response to the consultation issued September 2007. |

| Title/policy/initiative | Nature of burden | Description of simplification measure | Outcomes (including sector to benefit) | Estimated cost saving (administrative or policy) | Implementation timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21. Further Education: planning and funding framework for FE | In 2004/05, we recognised that the existing planning and funding arrangements were complex, and did not encourage providers to respond to learners and employers. The funding consultation proposals published in 2007, recognised that arrangements for 16-18 year olds and adults would need to be different, but would have the same overall ambition of giving learners greater choice. | For 16-18 year olds, funding arrangements need to support collaboration and widen learner choice, including, Diploma entitlement. Following the Machinery of Government changes, 16-18 funding for colleges will transfer from the LSC to local authorities, once the appropriate legislation is in place, likely to be 2010. For 16-18 year olds, a plan led system is being introduced for 2008/09 and 2009/10 for colleges and sixth form schools and colleges, as supported in the recent consultation. For adults, the objective is a demand led system that will give individuals and employers much greater control over the training they can access. For adults, a demand led system will be extended that will expand and improve Train to Gain, and introduce Adult Learner Accounts. | Colleges and providers will be more responsive to the needs of adult learners. Different models for 16-19, adults and employers will reflect the different characteristics and needs of these learners. Those colleges that perform best and contribute towards our targets will attract more funding and benefit from a light touch approach. For 16-18, the same methodology will be used for school sixth forms and colleges. This should: reduce costs of collaboration to FE; narrow the gap further between schools and college funding; ensure that the transfer of funding to local authorities takes place on the basis of an existing common funding approach; which should simplify transition. For adults and employers, the funding will more closely follow their choices of learning. | An impact assessment of the financial impact on providers of moving to the new plan-led and demand-led funding models for 2008/09 has been undertaken and informed decisions on transitional arrangements set in the statement of priorities for 2008/09. An assessment of the impact on the FE system of demand-led funding will need to take into account updated impact assessments on Train to Gain and Adult Learner Accounts as well as the impact on changes to 14-19 policy when they are completed. An Impact Assessment will be published alongside the consultation. | The consultation on funding was undertaken between January and March 2007. Decisions on the new funding are described in the LSC's statement of priorities for 2008/09. The recommendations of a review of bureaucracy in Train to Gain will be adopted during 2007/08. |
| 22. Further Education: reducing the impact and burden of inspection on FE providers | Providers have overly bureaucratic and time-consuming inspections – in terms of number of visits, number of inspection days, and time spent preparing for them. | Reducing the average number of inspection days per provider, more so for good and excellent providers; relying on annual monitoring assessments between inspections to flag potential problems and good practice; development of self assessment to identify performance; ALI/Ofsted merger ends joint inspections – single inspectorate. | All providers (colleges, private and voluntary sector providers) are inspected by Ofsted. The single inspectorate is able to bring together different inspections into one visit more efficiently. Average number of inspection days per provider reduces by 30% (50% for good and excellent providers). | Inspectorate budgets reduced by 30% by 2008-09, a total reduction of £13m on 2003-04. All colleges prepare for inspection in different ways but there will be commensurate savings in colleges as fewer staff days are spent on inspections. | The plans for 2006 have been met or are on track: • new Ofsted was in place from April 2007; • budget reductions are on track; and, • details of new inspection arrangements designed to reduce the burden of inspection have been published and took effect from September 2007. |
| 23. Further Education: key performance indicators for the FE sector | Many different indicators used to measure the success of learners and the performance of FE providers. | Framework for Excellence – a set of standard performance indicators for all colleges and providers covering responsiveness, effectiveness and finance. Seven key performance indicators will produce a single overall performance rating on a balanced scorecard basis. | Simpler identification of quality for all stakeholders including learners and employers. | Framework for Excellence is at an early stage of development. It is not yet possible to estimate savings. The principle behind the framework is that its elements focus on the core work of providers and includes data which they should currently be collecting. It should therefore not create a burden for providers. The Bureaucracy Reduction Group has reviewed the Framework this year and will continue to scrutinise its future development. | In last year's plan it was indicated that the aim would be to bring in the new indicators in 2007/08. In the event, and following consultation, it has been agreed that the Framework will be piloted in 100 colleges and work based learning providers during 2007/08. By Summer 2009, the Framework will be operational across the whole FE system. |
| 24. Further Education: streamlined procurement and shared services | Colleges and other providers do not collaborate as effectively as they might on back office functions, including procurement. | Support and tools provided encourage shared services and collaborative procurement. | Increased use of collaboratively negotiated contracts by colleges. Increased use of e-procurement. Development of shared services. | A range of efficiencies are likely. First returns from colleges are due in 2008, showing savings arising from improved procurement. | August 2008 – college returns reporting on savings arising from procurement initiative. |

| Title/policy/initiative | Nature of burden | Description of simplification measure | Outcomes (including sector to benefit) | Estimated cost saving (administrative or policy) | Implementation timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25. Further Education: qualifications | Large numbers of qualifications and awarding bodies with different and complex administration. | 1. Rationalisation of qualifications with the introduction of Diplomas and Qualifications and Credit Framework. 2. Reduced monitoring and inspection related directly to risk. 3. Introduction of a standard process and requirements for 'centres' (ie. colleges and providers) to be recognised to deliver qualifications. 4. Employers put in the driving seat through Sector Skills Councils and their Sector Qualifications Strategies which will simplify and streamline qualifications. 5. Greater transparency in examination fee levels. | 1. A streamlined qualifications system, with associated administrative burden reduced to a minimum. A coherent, rational and integrated framework for units and qualifications. 2. Providers with a good record of qualifications delivery will be subject to fewer monitoring checks. 3. Ensure information is collected once and used by a number of organisations. 4. Ensuring that the development of qualifications is based on employer and learner needs by enhancing the role of the Sector Skills Councils. 5. Awarding bodies to submit to QCA fee proposals for revised A Levels. GSCEs and A Level fees to be published one year in advance. | 1. 14-19 Diplomas initial impact assessment developed, and, the consultation is on-going through phases 1, 2 and 3 of the programme. Qualifications and Credit Framework will be evaluated over the life of tests and trials. 2. Potential for long term savings and benefits for both centres and awarding bodies. 3. Initial modification of systems costs offset by reductions in cost of visits. 4. A Research & Evaluation Sub-Programme will inform impact assessments. 5. Effect on costs not known, but there will be significant improvement in transparency. | There is a wide range of activity underway as detailed below. Good progress has been made in 2006. 1. 14-19 Diplomas: progress on first 3 phases; Qualifications and Credit Framework: tests and trials underway. Decision in Summer 2008. 2. Development in 2008; testing in 2008/09, and, final review and report in 2010. 3. Milestones currently under development. 4. 2007/08 – SSCs approval of VQs being piloted and report in July 2008. 5. Details of fees published in September 2008, apply at September 2009. |
| 26. Further Education: streamlining communications with providers | Uncoordinated distribution of publications. | Creation of a Communications Gateway. | All publications and guidance and information for FE providers will be routed through a single FE workforce channel. | RIA for the FE Reform White Paper includes a strategic view of costs and benefits. DIUS and the LSC will review the impact on level and standard of publications through provider perception. | FE Workforce Channel in place by April 2008. |
| 27. Further Education: streamlining and rationalising FE data | A need for better use of data, greater control over demands, improved supply of data, and a more efficient, effective and accountable service. | 1. A new Data Service to implement and deliver the agreed standards, collections and outputs. 2. Further reductions in information and data required by the LSC for 2007/08 following MIAP principles (see cross-cutting measure below). | Improved quality and use of information in support of effective decision making by all stakeholders. Greater stability and reduced bureaucracy for providers. Improved accountability to customers. Easier data sharing between agencies on a 'collect once, use many times, used by all' basis. | Studies are underway to analyse what the current state burden comprises, to determine how, and a measurable 20% reduction can be affected, and reported against in measurable terms. | The milestones included in the 2006 plan have been met: • permanent Head of Secretariat in place November 2007. Future milestones are: • agree Data Service arrangements July 2008. |
| 28. Further Education & Higher Education: cross-cutting simplification measures – Managing Information Across Partners (MIAP) | | MIAP is improving how data is shared across the whole post-14 education sector, including higher education and across the UK. It is doing this through 3 new internet based services: 1. a Learner Registration Service, incorporating a ULN; 2. a learner data sharing interface that will enable the creation of learner records; and, 3. a UK Register of Learning Providers. | MIAP will benefit a wide range of stakeholders, including learners and employers: • reduced administrative burdens, better policy and funding decisions; and, • improved personalisation of services. | Over the six year period 2006-2012 the total investment in developing MIAP services is estimated at around £45m. The MIAP business case indicates that by the end of the second year of full operation of the initial services (2012/13), the programme will have realised efficiency and administrative savings equivalent to or greater than the costs of development and operation. | Key milestones: • February 2008 – learner registration service becomes universally available; and, • Spring 2008 – tests and trials of learner data sharing interface, including learner record. |

| Title/policy/initiative | Nature of burden | Description of simplification measure | Outcomes (including sector to benefit) | Estimated cost saving (administrative or policy) | Implementation timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 29. Higher Education: monitoring requirements, funding arrangements, and quality assurance in HE (via the Quality Assurance Agency) | Monitoring and accountability burdens, bureaucracy around funding arrangements and the role of quality assurance in HE. | Develop the risk assessment process, to make monitoring proportionate to risk.<br><br>Streamline funding arrangements.<br><br>The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) is consulting the sector about making improvements to the quality assurance framework.<br><br>Continually review the quality assurance framework to identify further improvements. | Monitoring: lower risk higher education Institutions to benefit from fewer monitoring requirements.<br><br>Funding: HEFCE's aim is to review constantly its processes, programmes and funding arrangements, in order to eliminate any requirements that are no longer necessary, and to try to simplify and consolidate the demands they make on the sector. In developing the Single Conversation, HEFCE has consulted HERRG at regular intervals, and has conducted a detailed consultation of stakeholders.<br><br>Quality assurance: the objective is for arrangements that will enable QAA to continue to provide the necessary assurance of quality, but with a lighter touch and fewer visits for the best institutions. QAA and HEFCE continually review and assess the quality assurance framework, and introduce appropriate changes. Institutions will benefit from reduced burdens. | These measures and other minor changes will together bring about a cumulative reduction of 20% of annual administrative costs by 2008 ie. around £42m at 2004 prices. A 2004 study for HEFCE by PA Consulting estimated that the total cost impact on HEIs from accountability demands was around £211 million. The previous four years had seen an estimated reduction in accountability costs of some 25%; with that in mind, and considering the steps taken by the sector since 2004, a further 20% reduction appears realistic. | Monitoring:<br>• consultation with the HE sector carried out in 2006;<br>• new arrangements were piloted in late 2006, and evaluated in early 2007;<br>• draft revised Financial Memorandum (FM) for consultation by winter 2007/08;<br>• new FM implemented for all HEIs in 2008.<br><br>Funding: this will be delivered over the years 2005–2008.<br><br>Quality Assurance:<br>• published revised audit method in 2006;<br>• first QAA audit visits using revised, less burdensome methodology, January 2007;<br>• revised audit cycle (with less frequent visits to each HEI) 2005/06 – 2010/11;<br>• report from QA Framework Review Group on Teaching Quality Information October 2006;<br>• consultation about TQI for FE Colleges delivering HE by end 2006;<br>• report from QA Framework Review Group on reviews of collaborative provision in Spring 2008; and,<br>• new Integrated Quality and Enhancement Review (IQER) method for HE in FECs to roll out from January 2008. |

| Title/policy/initiative | Nature of burden | Description of simplification measure | Outcomes (including sector to benefit) | Estimated cost saving (administrative or policy) | Implementation timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 30. Higher Education: concordat on data collection and quality assurance in HE | Burdens around monitoring of quality, inspection visits and demands for data and other information. | Concordat on data collection and quality assurance. Agreement has been reached on a concordat between HE funding bodies, Higher Education Statistics Authority (HESA), Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and other major bodies, whereby the HESA would become the single source of base data, the QAA would supply basic inspection and quality assurance, and, all signatories agree to work together to eliminate any other overlapping requirements. | The aim will be that agencies and regulatory bodies would rely upon inspection and other quality data produced by each other. Higher education institutions will benefit from fewer monitoring or inspection visits or demands for quality assurance information.<br><br>For data provision, the aim would be to develop the role of HESA to meet all external demands for data and information. Higher education institutions will benefit from the elimination of duplicated and overlapping demands for data. | HERRG estimated that better co-ordination of inspection and data collection in higher education could ultimately save at least £15 million annually, although some of these changes were already in the pipeline and had been taken into account in the overall savings above. This estimate is derived in part from the PA Consulting study made for HEFCE in 2004, and also from a study of the impact of external review of quality assurance carried out by JM Consulting in 2005 for DfES. | The Concordat launched May 2006. Informal review of progress with signatories at end of 2006.<br><br>Formal review with all signatories in May 2007 and revision of their individual business plans for delivering the Concordat's principles.<br><br>HERRG planned for additional organisations to steadily sign up to the Concordat, and has targeted those that have the greatest impact on HE institutions.<br><br>HERRG was able to report in Autumn 2007 that a further six had committed to joining, and that talks were continuing with several others; further bodies have now been targeted.<br><br>A further review of progress is planned for Summer 2008, with further new signatories joining during 2008. |
| 31. Higher Education: HE student finance systems | Inconsistency and lack of accountability in student finance systems for those applying for, receiving and repaying student support. | Centralised student finance service with online applications and centralised assessment and delivery. Co-ordination of student funding applications with UCAS to reduce repetition and duplication of information. | Responsibility for assessment and payment of student support will rest with a single delivery organisation instead of different approaches by local authorities. Student finance applications will be simpler and faster. Assessment and delivery of student loans will be more consistent. Variation in student finance applications and delivery will be reduced. New technology and centralised assessment will provide more efficient use of resources and realise real cost savings. | As the work is centralised and assessment function is removed from local authorities function is removed from local authorities – by financial year 2010/011, £20m per annum should be released from bureaucracy to spend on other priorities.<br><br>The Student Finance Customer First Programme will realise financial savings in student finance in three main areas:<br><br>• responsibility for delivery of the application and assessment service will move from around 140 local authorities to the Student Loans Company, who expect to provide an equivalent service for around £25 million per annum, compared to the £39 million per annum provided to local authorities, a saving of around £14 million;<br><br>• we also expect the Student Loans Company to be able to bear down on the costs of the services that it already provides by driving process improvement and greater use of the on-line application service to save around a further £3.5 million; and,<br><br>• we also anticipate the departmental administrative cost of student finance delivery to reduce by around £3 million as a result of work moving from DIUS to the Student Loans Company. | The Students Loans Company (SLC), the national delivery organisation, is leading the development and implementation of the new service, supported by DIUS. The new service is due to go-live in September 2008 for new students applying for 2009/10 entry to higher education. |
| 32. Research Councils improving efficiency of peer review | Time and cost to all involved in the peer review process. | Addressing the final reporting process, greater use of outlines, controlling re-submissions, and consolidation. | Peer review remains efficient and effective and excellent value for money. | £30 million of efficiency gains over the CSR period. | |

| Title/policy/initiative | Nature of burden | Description of simplification measure | Outcomes (including sector to benefit) | Estimated cost saving (administrative or policy) | Implementation timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 33. Further Education: contracting with the third sector | The level of unnecessary bureaucracy imposed by government and its agencies on voluntary and community organisations. | LSC (amongst other funding organisations) should systematically measure the administrative burdens of its contracts with the third sector, develop plans to reduce these burdens, and set appropriate targets and incentives for reductions. | Reduce the burden on third sector providers. | OTS funding research by New Philanthropy Capital and is due to report in Spring 2008. Advisory Group to the LSC Council has asked that this work should investigate:<br><br>• case for more payment by grant to the VCS sector; and,<br><br>• why contracts for non mainstream innovative projects are perceived as less bureaucratic.<br><br>Opportunities for:<br><br>• streamlining inspection;<br><br>• adoption of common accreditation systems; and,<br><br>• more risk-based inspection, based on the size of the contract.<br><br>At the same time, the LSC should also review its procurement strategy for the third sector, and, look at the case for grant payments and opportunities for streamlining audit etc. | In 2006, the LSC, with Ofsted and QIA, put in place improvements:<br><br>• a single e-tendering process; and,<br><br>• additional quality improvement support, new approach to inspection of ESF contractors.<br><br>In 2007/08, the LSC will:<br><br>• actively support the OTS/NPC research and set targets for further reductions accordingly;<br><br>• improve timeliness and clarity of guidance on audit and information requirements;<br><br>• issue guidance on Intellectual Property Rights;<br><br>• investigate the case for providing software to VCS sector when introducing changes; and,<br><br>• review procurement strategies, particularly, in relation to maximising use of third sector capabilities in the area of innovation, and, in engaging excluded and hard-to-reach learners. |

## Table 3: Regulatory flow

**Private sector**

| Title/policy/initiative | Nature of burden | Description of the measure | Outcomes (including sector to be impacted) | Estimated cost (administrative or policy) | Implementation timeline |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Further Education: Machinery of Government changes: Post-19 landscape review | | Following the Machinery of Government changes, the Government is considering the future shape of the post-19 skills landscape, and, will consult on proposals for the future. | Dependent on the results of the consultation. | An impact assessment, setting out the costs and benefits, will be published alongside the consultation. | Consultation will be published in January 2008. |
| 2. Further Education: Leitch implementation – qualifications | | We are putting in place measures to ensure that qualifications on offer meet employers' needs, as set out in *World Class Skills*. | In future, only those qualifications that are approved by Sector Skills Councils, on the basis of Sector Qualifications Strategies and National Occupational Standards, will receive public funding, and, be placed on the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF). We are making it easier to accredit employers' own in-house training, making sure that the value of existing good training is acknowledged and utilised. | An impact assessment will be produced setting out the costs and benefits. | The first reformed qualifications will be submitted for accreditation in January 2008, and the new framework will be fully operational by September 2010, subject to testing and trialling. |
| 3. Further Education: Leitch implementation – business simplification | | Streamline the skills portfolio, so that businesses experience a more joined-up service. | The integration of skills brokerage with Business Link into a single brokerage service, which simplifies both business support and the skills system. | BERR is working on an impact assessment covering this and other areas of business simplification, which will be published in December. | From April 2009. |
| 4. Further Education: Leitch implementation – levies | | A consultation will be carried out on the scope for increased collective action by business through the introduction of levies, and, if appropriate, to making new provision for the simpler introduction of such levies in sectors where the majority of employers agree that this is the right approach, and where there was evidence that they would increase productivity and skills. Research will be carried out into whether there are any circumstances where an extended use of occupational licensing could drive up skills and productivity, without introducing any barriers to the competitiveness of businesses and industry. | New measures must bring benefit to business; with increased skill levels and greater productivity, without introducing barriers to the competitiveness of businesses and industry. | An impact assessment, setting out the costs and benefits, will be published alongside the consultation. | The consultation is likely to be carried out in 2008, and any implementation would be around 2010, dependent on legislation. |

# Annex 1: public sector datastreams

| Item No. | Data return description | Driver for information | Collection format | How is information used (inc. frequency) | Type of frontline body completing return | No. of frontline bodies affected | Frequency collected by frontline | Frequency collected by department |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | FE Individualised Learner Record (ILR) received from the LSC and the University for Industry ILR. (An additional ILR collection is made to meet ESF requirements. (The Information Authority is reviewing the potential for streamlining all the ILR collections into a single collection) | To monitor learner numbers and success rates in FE | Database | To produce 3 FE learner number and achievement Statistical First Releases – October, December, and April each year. For the LSC to monitor learner numbers for funding purposes. | FE colleges (general FE tertiary, sixth form colleges and specialist colleges) and external institutions | Around 385 FE colleges and 135 EIs | Ongoing. They provide a minimum of 5 returns a year to LSC (FO1 – FO5) | We receive FO1 – FO5 from LSC at various points throughout the year |
| 2 | Work-based learning Individualised Learner Record (ILR) received from the LSC | To monitor learner numbers and success rates in WBL | Database | Also for the 3 SFRs above. For the LSC to monitor learner numbers for funding purposes | Work-based learning providers | About 1,100 | Ongoing. Provide at least monthly returns (periods 1-12) to LSC | We receive periods 1-12 from LSC |
| 3 | Adult and Community Learning Individualised Learner Record (ILR) received from the LSC | To monitor learner numbers in ACL | Database | For the October and December SFRs above. For the LSC to monitor learner numbers for funding purposes | Adult and Community Learning providers | About 250 | Ongoing. Provided to LSC 3 times per year | Receive data 3 times per year from LSC |
| 4 | Staff Individualised Record | To monitor staff numbers in FE colleges | Database | It is not published in an SFR, but is made available on the LSC website | FE colleges only (general FE, tertiary, sixth form colleges and specialist colleges) | Around 385 FE colleges | Annually. Currently collected by LSC but from 07/08 the scope will be widened and it will be collected by LLUK | Received annually |
| 5 | National Learner Satisfaction Survey | To monitor the views of learners about the FE system | Database | For LSC to produce an annual learner satisfaction report | FE colleges, WBL and ACL | 385 colleges, 1,100 WBL, 250 ACL | Bi-annually. Last one was 2004/05, next one 2006/07 | Received annually |
| 6 | Student Income and Expenditure Survey. | Detailed information is collected on the financial circumstances of around 3,700 students in higher education. The outputs are used to inform student support policy. | Each student participates in a face-to-face interview, and fills in a spending diary for a week. These tasks are overseen by an external contractor. | Published statistics. | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc.). | Over 80 institutions. | Infrequent – at most biennial (once every two years). | Infrequent – at most biennial (once every two years). |
| 7 | HESA Student Record: individualised student record collected by the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). | To allow detailed analysis of HE student entrants, enrolments and qualifiers to inform policy (statistics, models) and briefing. (UK legislative requirement) | Electronic form. | Annually published statistics and inform policy (on-going). Used by multiple stakeholders for funding purposes, public accountability, national statistics, research. | Higher Education Institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc.). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 8 | HESA Destinations of Leavers from HE. | To allow detailed analysis of the destinations of HE students 6 months after qualifying to inform policy (statistics, models) and briefing. (UK legislative requirement) | Electronic form; Database (a survey of students). | Published statistics (annually) and inform policy (on-going). Multiple stakeholders, used for funding purposes, public accountability, national statistics, research. | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc.). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 9 | HESA Longitudinal Destinations of Leavers from HE. | To allow detailed analysis of the destinations of HE students 3.5 years after qualifying to inform policy (statistics, models) and briefing. | Database | Inform policy. | Contractors based upon information provided by higher education institutions. | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Biennial (once every two years). | Biennial (once every two years). |
| 10 | HESA Staff Record. Individualised staff record. | To allow detailed analysis of HE staff to inform policy (statistics, models) and briefing. (UK legislative requirement) | Electronic form; Database. | Published statistics (annually) and inform policy (on-going). Multiple stakeholders, used for public accountability, national statistics, research. | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc.). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |

| Item No. | Data return description | Driver for information | Collection format | How is information used (inc. frequency) | Type of frontline body completing return | No. of frontline bodies affected | Frequency collected by frontline | Frequency collected by department |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | HESA Finance Record | To allow detailed analysis of HE finance to inform policy (statistics, models) and briefing. (UK legislative requirement). | Electronic form; Database. | Published statistics (annually) and inform policy (on-going). Multiple stakeholders, used for funding purposes, public accountability, national statistics. | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 12 | Medical and Dental Survey | UK legislative requirement admissions to medical schools | Spreadsheet | Used for planning purposes – annual | Medical schools | 27 | Annual | Annual |
| 13 | HESES | UK legislative requirement – aggregate student numbers used by HEFCE to monitor and allocate mainstream funds for teaching | Spreadsheet | Used for funding purposes | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 14 | Research Activity Survey | UK legislative requirement – aggregate return of research minor volume measures | Spreadsheet | Funding purposes | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 15 | Access to Learning Fund Monitoring Return | UK legislative requirement – carried out on behalf of DIUS | Spreadsheet | Funding purposes | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 16 | PGCE Pilot Bursary Scheme | UK legislative requirement – carried out on behalf of DIUS | Spreadsheet | Funding purposes | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 20 | Annual | Annual |
| 17 | 2008 Research Assessment Exercise | UK legislative requirement – carried out by RAE Team | Electronic Form | Research outputs of academic staff | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Periodic – last one was in 2001 | Periodic – last one was in 2001 |
| 18 | Assignment of academic departments to cost centres | UK legislative requirement – information for HESA return | Spreadsheet | Maintenance return requesting changes to established assignments | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 19 | Financial statements | UK legislative requirement – FSR and HESA | Spreadsheet | Extract of audited accounts in the finance record | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 20 | Transparency Review | HM Treasury | Spreadsheet | Still being developed | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 21 | Staff recruitment and retention survey | | | Used to identify recruitment and retention difficulties across the centre | Universities, colleges, employers' association. | No additional work for institutions – populated from HESA database. | Annual | Annual |
| 22 | Mid Year Finance Return | UK legislative requirement | Spreadsheet | Finance return | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 23 | Higher Education business and community interaction survey | UK legislative requirement | Spreadsheet | Allocation of HE fund | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 24 | Financial forecasts annual monitoring statements and corporate planning | UK legislative requirement | Spreadsheet | Monitoring and planning | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 25 | Public supply, works and services contracts awarded | EU requirement | Spreadsheet | Public procurement | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 26 | Estates Management Statistics | HEFCE and institutions | Spreadsheet | Management information and dissemination of good practice | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |

| Item No. | Data return description | Driver for information | Collection format | How is information used (inc. frequency) | Type of frontline body completing return | No. of frontline bodies affected | Frequency collected by frontline | Frequency collected by department |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 27 | National Student Survey | UK legislative requirement | Electronic form | To obtain feedback on students HE experience | Higher education institutions (universities, HE colleges, etc). | 131 English higher education institutions (October 2007). | Annual | Annual |
| 28 | Financial returns and monitoring reports on milestones | UK legislative requirement information is required as part of the monitoring process for access agreements and is a legal requirement in the HE Act | On-line survey for finance return, free format reports submitted by e-mail for other monitoring reports | Allows OFFA to perform regulatory duty, ensuring financial and other commitments have been met. This is an annual process that informs our Annual Report | HE Institutions, FE College's and School-Centred Initial Teaching Training providers (SCITT) with an access agreement. | 224 | Annual | Annual |
| 29 | Access agreements | UK legislative requirement. All publicly funded providers of HE who want to charge a fee above the standard rate must have an approved agreement. | Free format document | Access agreement is approved to allow institutions to charge fees and is made a public document. The agreement must be current at all times and many institutions make annual changes. | HE Institutions, FE College's and School-Centred Initial Teaching Training providers (SCITT) with an access agreement. | Currently 224. There are a further 95 FE College's and 16 SCITTs who could come forward with an agreement in the future | Once every 5 years, but amendments to agreements are made ad hoc, often annually. As legal documents, we have to request changes when government student support policy impacts on the agreements. Since the establishment of OFFA this has happened twice | See previous response. Once every 5 years, but respond to ad hoc requests to amend |
| 30 | Confirmation of fee and bursary levels. Each year the amount an institution can charge in fees and offers in bursaries | UK legislative requirement. Each year the amount an institution can charge in fees and offers in bursaries changes with government announcements for inflation. We have to keep up to date records to ensure we can meet our regulatory duty | Spreadsheet | Published statistics | HE Institutions, FE College's and School-Centred Initial Teaching Training providers (SCITT) with an access agreement. | 224 | Annual | Annual |
| 31 | GEMS Return | Financial accountability | Spreadsheet | Published report. Not sure of frequency | NDPB | 3 | Monthly | Monthly |
| 32 | Annual Report and Accounts | Financial accountability | Report | Published report | NDPB | 3 | Annual | Annual |
| 33 | National and Territorial Breakdown | HMT requirement | Spreadsheet | Published statistics | NDPB | 3 | Annual | Annual |
| 34 | Operating Plan | Financial accountability | Report | Inform policy | NDPB | 3 | Annual | Annual |
| 35 | Budget Profile | Financial accountability | Spreadsheet | Inform policy | NDPB | 2 (TBs) | Quarterly | Quarterly |
| 36 | Budget Profile | Financial accountability | Spreadsheet | Inform policy | NDPB | 1 SSDA | Quarterly | Quarterly |
| 37 | GiA Claim | Financial accountability | Form | Annual Report | NDPB | 1 SSDA | Monthly | Monthly |
| 38 | Performance Review | Financial accountability | Report | Inform policy | NDPB | 2 SSDA | Quarterly | Quarterly |
| 39 | Annual Report from authorities appointed as Notified Bodies (a body who NWML inform the European Commission is appointed for particular tasks under European Directives) for verification under the NAWI and MID European Directives. | This is a condition and requirement of their appointment as a Notified Body. | Paper or electronic | A list of verifications of each instrument type carried out during the previous year. | Local authorities | 93 | Annually | Annually |
| 40 | Audit report of the Notified Body by a peer auditor. For example, audit report of the body verifying petrol pumps or weighing machines by a peer. | This is a condition and requirement of their appointment as a Notified Body, NWML peer audit report. | Paper or electronic | This is used to maintain local authorities notified body status. | Local authorities | 93 | Every 1-3 years | Every 1-3 years |

| Item No. | Data return description | Driver for information | Collection format | How is information used (inc. frequency) | Type of frontline body completing return | No. of frontline bodies affected | Frequency collected by frontline | Frequency collected by department |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 41 | Annual reports by local weights and measures authorities. National Performance Framework, Performance Measures and Contextual Information Return | Required by Section 70 of the Weights and Measures Act 1985. Only method of measuring weights and measurement enforcement activity at national level. | Paper or electronic | To monitor weights and measures enforcement activity and to provide evidence base to help NWML make enforcement more efficient as part of simplification activity. | Local authorities | 203 | Annually | Annually |