

2025-0264

Part C – Decision Under Appeal

The decision under appeal is the Reconsideration Decision of the Ministry of Education and Child Care (the “**Ministry**”) dated July 11, 2025, in which the Ministry determined that the Appellant was not eligible for and is liable to repay \$18,326.39 received through the Affordable Child Care Benefit Program (“**ACCB**”) from December 1, 2022, to May 31, 2025.

The Ministry found that the amounts claimed by the Appellant were not reduced by the Child Care Fee Reduction Initiative (“**CCFRI**”) amounts and the Appellant had claimed amounts for a withdrawn child, resulting in an overpayment of \$18,326.39 (the “**Overpayment**”). In accordance with Section 10 of the *Early Learning and Child Care Act* and Section 7(1) of the *Child Care Subsidy Act*, the Ministry determined that the Appellant is liable to repay the government for the Overpayment.

2025-0264

Part D – Relevant Legislation

- *Child Care Subsidy Act ("CCSA")*, sections 5 and 7
- Child Care Subsidy Regulation ("CCSR"), sections 8, 14, 15
- *Early Learning and Child Care Act ("ELCCA")*, sections 7 and 10
- Early Learning and Child Care Regulation ("ELCCR"), section 24

Note: The full text of the legislation is available after the Decision.

Part E – Summary of Facts

The Appellant's written hearing was held on September 28, 2025.

The Reconsideration Decision

The evidence before the Ministry at the Reconsideration Decision consisted of:

- The Appellant operates a licensed childcare facility, and participates in the Affordable Child Care Benefit Program ("ACCB"), which provides subsidies to eligible parents based on their net child care costs after subtracting any Child Care Fee Reduction Initiative ("CCFRI") amounts received by the provider through the Child Care Operating Funding Program ("CCOF"). The ACCB relies on fee data reported to and confirmed by the CCOF.
- During the period between December 1, 2022, to May 31, 2025, the Appellant submitted monthly claims for ACCB subsidies for various children in her care, categorized by age groups (e.g., J2 for children aged 30 months to school age).
- The Appellant reported fees to the CCOF via annual Program Confirmation Forms. For instance, in the 2022/2023 form, she entered \$900 monthly for J2 children in the main fields but noted in the "*Is there any other information about this facility you would like us to know?*" section that the \$900 was before CCFRI application, with actual pre-CCFRI fees ranging from \$1,000 to \$1,100 for different age groups. Similar notations and corrections appear in forms for subsequent years (e.g., 2023/2024 form, showing proposed fees of \$1,100 for infants and toddlers, \$1,000 for 3-5 years; 2025/2026, showing \$1,130 for infants/toddlers, \$1,030 for kindergarten-age).
- At some point, one child was withdrawn from the Appellant's care without the contractually required one-month notice or payment in lieu, leading to the Appellant claiming subsidy for the notice period despite the child not receiving care. The Appellant was unable to enroll a replacement child due to the sudden withdrawal, resulting in lost revenue.
- On May 28, 2025, the Ministry's Verification and Audit Unit completed a review of the Appellant's file. A letter was sent to the Appellant advising that she received an overpayment totaling \$18,326.39 in ACCB benefits for the period between December 1, 2022 and May 31, 2025 due to service discrepancy (the "**Overpayment**"). The Ministry determined the Appellant received funding for 7 children during the noted period for which she was not eligible to receive, under sections 5 and 7 of the CCSA and sections 8 and 14 of the Regulation because she did not reduce the parent fees by the amount of the CCFRI she received for the 9 children each month as agreed upon with the Child Care Funding Program. The

Verification and Audit Unit included an Overpayment calculation chart showing how it calculated the Overpayment.

- On June 14, 2025, the Appellant submitted a Request for Reconsideration outlining her disagreement with the Verification and Audit Unit's Overpayment calculation.
- On July 11, 2025, the Ministry issued the Reconsideration Decision. The Ministry calculated the Overpayment at \$18,326.39 based on CCOF-reported fees (e.g., \$900 monthly pre-CCFRI for J2 children, reduced by \$600 CCFRI to a maximum eligible ACCB of \$300 per month). The Ministry determined that the Appellant's claim exceeded her eligibility amount due to un-subtracted CCFRI reductions. The Reconsideration Decision also addressed the situation of the withdrawn child, stating that ACCB is payable only for actual care provided and that contractual disputes (e.g., unpaid notice periods) are between the provider and parent, not affecting subsidy eligibility. The Ministry acknowledged the Appellant's negotiations with CCOF for fee corrections but noted no changes had been confirmed, emphasizing it was the Appellant's responsibility to ensure accurate CCOF reporting.
- The Ministry notes that two sets of acts and regulations apply to its decision. For eligibility decisions made from March 31, 1997, to August 31, 2024, the CCSA and CCSR apply. Beginning September 1, 2024, the *ELCCA* and ELCCR apply.

The Appeal

On July 29, 2025, the Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal. In her reasons, the Appellant disagreed with the Overpayment determination, stating that her fees were reported incorrectly to CCOF due to a misunderstanding of the forms. She submitted that once corrected, recalculations would show no Overpayment. For the withdrawn child, the Appellant noted the lack of notice prevented enrolling a new child and that the parents did not pay the balance.

Evidence

On August 21, 2025, the Appellant submitted a 32-page submission, including evidence of incorrect fee reporting by her (e.g., CCOF forms with notations of actual higher fees), parent contracts, Parent Handbooks outlining fees (\$1,000-\$1,200 monthly), and communications with CCOF (e.g., emails, portal submissions requesting historical corrections). She explained her misunderstanding of the CCOF forms, where she subtracted CCFRI prematurely but noted actual fees in comments. The Appellant further submitted that updated fees would align her claims with eligible amounts (e.g., \$1,100 pre-CCFRI minus \$600 CCFRI = \$500 eligible, exceeding her claims in some cases). For the withdrawn child, she reiterated the contractual notice requirement and resulting revenue loss.

2025-0264

On August 29, 2025, the Ministry submitted a response, reiterating that the Overpayment was based on verified CCOF data showing un-subtracted CCFRI, leading to claims exceeding eligible parent fees. The Ministry maintained reliance on CCOF data until corrections are confirmed and that contractual issues with parents do not impact ACCB eligibility, as subsidies are for actual care only.

On September 8, 2025, the Appellant submitted a 5-page update, including an email detailing a phone call with CCOF the previous week where in the CCOF requested additional proof of post-subsidy payments by families in 2023-2024, which she provided via Interac e-transfer screenshots to verify higher fees. The Appellant noted corrections were ongoing without a timeline.

On September 17, 2025, the Ministry submitted a 2-page response to the Appellant's late submission, acknowledging the ongoing CCOF process but maintaining the original Overpayment determination until system updates occur and a reassessment is completed.

Admissibility of New Evidence

The Panel determined that the Appellant's and Ministry's evidence were admissible as additional evidence pursuant to section 22(4) of the *Employment and Assistance Act* as it was reasonably required for a full and fair disclosure of all matters related to the decision under Appeal. More specifically, the additional evidence contributed to the Panel's understanding of the circumstances surrounding the Appeal.

Part F – Reasons for Panel Decision

The issue under appeal is whether the Reconsideration Decision, which determined that the Appellant is liable for the Overpayment of \$18,326.39 in ACCB benefits, was reasonably supported by the evidence and a proper application of the relevant legislation.

Appellant's Position

The Appellant submits that the Overpayment resulted from errors in how she reported her fees to the CCOF, caused by a misunderstanding of the Program Confirmation Forms. The Appellant believed she was required to report fees after subtracting CCFRI amounts. However, she included notations in her submissions explaining that the figures shown were before CCFRI application, and that her actual parent fees ranged from \$1,000 to \$1,200 depending on age group. The Appellant contends that when corrected, her fee structure would show that her ACCB claims were consistent with, or lower than, her actual eligible amounts.

With respect to the withdrawn child, the Appellant maintains that the parent breached the contract by failing to give notice. She submits that she was justified in claiming subsidy for the notice period because she was unable to fill the vacancy and lost income.

Ministry's Position

The Ministry maintains that the Overpayment was correctly determined based on the data reported through the CCOF, which is the official record of fees for ACCB purposes. It submits that the Appellant, as a licensed provider, bears responsibility for ensuring that her CCOF submissions are accurate. Until those records are formally corrected, the Ministry must rely on them when calculating subsidy eligibility. The Ministry further maintains that subsidies are only payable for periods when a child is actually receiving care, and that contractual disputes between a parent and a provider cannot alter ACCB entitlement.

Panel Decision

The Panel has considered the relevant legislation, including sections 5 and 7 of the *Child Care Subsidy Act*, sections 8, 14, 15, and Schedule A of the Child Care Subsidy Regulation, sections 7 and 10 of the *Early Learning and Child Care Act*, and section 24 and the Schedule of the Early Learning and Child Care Regulation.

Section 5 of the CCSA outlines the Minister's authority to request and verify information for the purpose of determining or auditing eligibility for child care subsidies. It allows the Minister to require applicants or recipients to provide information and verification, and to collect relevant information from third parties even if unsolicited. Recipients must notify the Minister of any changes in circumstances that affect their eligibility, as specified by regulation. If a person fails to comply with these requirements, the Minister may declare

them ineligible or reduce their subsidy. Additionally, child care providers may be directed to supply information about subsidized care they provide for audit purposes.

Section 8 of the CCSR sets out how the amount of subsidy a family is eligible for is calculated.

Section 14 of the CCSR provides that recipients of child care subsidies are required to notify the Ministry as soon as possible after any change in circumstances that could affect their eligibility. This notification must be provided either in writing or by telephone and must be directed to an employee at the Child Care Service Centre.

Section 15 of the CCSR provides that child care providers must submit billing for subsidies in the format specified by the Ministry. Payments are made directly to parents or providers depending on the type of care.

Section 7 of the *ELCCA* outlines the Minister's authority to request and verify information for determining or auditing eligibility for child care benefits and grants. The Minister may require applicants or recipients to provide information and verification within specified timelines and formats, and may also collect unsolicited information if it relates to benefit or grant payments. Additionally, child care providers may be directed to supply information about subsidized care they provide.

Section 10 of the *ELCCA* establishes the rules for repayment of overpaid child care benefits and grants. If the Minister determines that a child care grant or benefit was paid to a person who was not eligible under the applicable agreement or regulations, that person is legally required to repay the amount to the government. However, if the overpayment of a child care benefit occurred due to an error, omission, or misrepresentation by the child care provider, the liability to repay shifts from the recipient to the provider.

Section 24 of the *ELCCR* outlines the duty of both recipients and child care providers to promptly inform the Ministry of any changes that may affect eligibility for child care benefits. Specifically, recipients must notify the Ministry as soon as possible after any change in their personal circumstances that could impact their benefit eligibility. Similarly, child care providers are required to report any operational changes in their facility that could influence the payment of benefits. Notifications must be made either in writing or by telephone and directed to an employee at the Child Care Service Centre.

Overpayment Relating to the Withdrawn Child

The Panel finds that the Ministry reasonably determined that ACCB funding is payable only for periods during which a child is actually receiving care. This principle is grounded in section 8 of the CCSR, which ties subsidy eligibility to the provision of care, and section 7 of the CCSA, which establishes liability for repayment where subsidies are paid to individuals not entitled to them.

In this case, the Appellant claimed ACCB for a child who was withdrawn from care without the contractually required notice. The Appellant explained that the sudden withdrawal caused a financial loss, as she was unable to enroll a replacement child and did not receive payment from the parent for the notice period. While the Panel acknowledges the financial impact on the Appellant, this issue arises from a private contractual dispute between the provider and the parent and falls outside the scope of the ACCB framework.

Subject to some exceptions which do not apply in the circumstance, the legislation does not authorize subsidy payments for periods when a child is not physically in care, regardless of whether the provider incurred a loss due to a breach of contract. The ACCB is designed to subsidize actual child care services rendered, not to compensate for lost income or enforce contractual obligations.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Ministry reasonably applied the legislation in determining that the Appellant was not entitled to ACCB for the period following the child's withdrawal. The Ministry's decision aligns with the statutory requirement that subsidies be tied to actual care provision, and not to anticipated or contractually expected care.

Overpayment Relating to Fee Reporting

The more complex issue concerns the accuracy of the Appellant's reported fees. The Panel notes that the Ministry relied exclusively on CCOF data showing monthly fees of \$900 for J2 children, reduced by a \$600 CCFRI to yield an eligible ACCB amount of \$300. However, the Appellant provided extensive corroborating evidence demonstrating that her actual pre-CCFRI fees ranged from \$1,000 to \$1,200. This evidence included signed contracts, Parent Handbooks, and multiple annotations on the CCOF Program Confirmation Forms explicitly indicating that the reported figures were before CCFRI application. The Panel finds this evidence credible, consistent, and contemporaneous. The Panel finds that, by disregarding this evidence despite acknowledging that the CCOF correction process was ongoing, the Ministry prematurely calculated the Overpayment.

The Panel notes that in the case of one child, when the Appellant's documented pre-CCFRI fees are substituted into the Ministry's calculation model (\$1,100–\$1,200 minus \$600 CCFRI) the resulting eligible parent fees (\$500–\$600) equal or exceed the Appellant's actual ACCB claims in multiple months. As a result, the Panel finds that this example demonstrates that, on corrected figures, no Overpayment would arise for the noted child in the specified periods. As a result, the Ministry's failure to await or incorporate these corrections therefore renders the Reconsideration Decision not reasonably supported by the evidence.

The Panel emphasizes that this finding does not absolve the Appellant of her obligation to ensure accurate reporting, but it recognizes that she acted promptly to rectify the error once discovered. The Ministry retains the authority to reassess the file once CCOF corrections are finalized, at which point a new determination of any Overpayment may be made.

On the Panel's calculation, the benefit amount under section 8 of the CCSR is determined by subtracting any amount received through the CCFRI from the cost of child care to arrive at the parent fee, which is then subject to income thresholds and caps. For December 1, 2022, to March 31, 2025, the Ministry stated the Appellant's "declared rates before CCFRI" for children classified as a J2 were \$900 monthly. The Ministry then applied the full CCFRI of \$600 to that J2 rate. The reduced cost to the parent was \$300 a month, which was the maximum amount the Appellant could claim from the ACCB. The Ministry calculated the Overpayment for the children in the Appellant's care during that time period. The eligible ACCB amount used for the calculation for all J2's is listed as \$300.

The Panel finds that this would be accurate if the Appellant's rates were \$900 for J2's. However, the Appellant provides evidence that her fees were higher. Again, for one J2 child, the Appellant submitted a 2023 contract shows a monthly rate of \$1200. If the maximum CCFRI amount of \$600 were applied to that \$1200, then the Appellant's ACCB eligibility amount is \$600. Other documentation indicates lower monthly fees of \$1100 for a J2 in 2023, which would reduce the eligibility amount to \$500. For October 2023, the Appellant claimed \$483.67 for that child. In either circumstance, there would be no Overpayment for that child.

The Appellant also provided communications that were sent to the CCOF. These included Child Care Operating Funding Program Confirmation Forms for some of the years in question. For the years 2022/2023, the Appellant had fees that were consistent with the Ministry's chart, showing a fee of \$900 monthly. However, there is a question on the form that asks, "Is there anything else about this facility you would like us to know?" In this area of the form, the Appellant indicates that the amounts are correct in the previous year's submission, and that the \$900 amount is before the CCFRI is applied. The Appellant then indicated monthly child care costs of \$1000 to \$1100 for different age groups. The Appellant also supplied information showing corrected higher fees.

With respect to the Child Care Operating Funding Program Confirmation Forms, the Panel finds that the Appellant misunderstood how to indicate child care amounts. Even though she reported incorrect amounts because she thought she had to subtract an amount, she supplied information in an area of the form that indicated her actual fees. These fees are consistent with the other information she has supplied, and close to the amounts in the contracts she submitted.

The Panel finds that the Ministry erred by relying solely on evidence it received from the CCOF and failing to adequately address or weigh the Appellant's evidence about her actual fees (e.g., parent contracts, handbooks, and form notations), except to acknowledge that she is negotiating corrections to her reported fees with the CCOF. This reliance on potentially outdated or incomplete CCOF data, despite evidence from the Appellant demonstrating higher pre-CCFRI fees and ongoing correction efforts (including submissions of receipts and communications as late as September 8, 2025), renders the Reconsideration Decision

premature. The Ministry should have considered the Appellant's documentary evidence, which substantiates that updated information would likely impact the Overpayment for the fee calculation issue. By ignoring this evidence and proceeding without awaiting confirmation of corrections that the Ministry itself acknowledged were in progress, the Panel finds that the Reconsideration Decision on the fee reporting point is not reasonably supported by the totality of the evidence. Based on the evidence provided by the Appellant, the Panel finds that the CCOF data is incorrect and will be updated. With updated information, the Panel finds that, in the case of at least one child, the Panel's calculation above shows that there likely would be no Overpayment. As the calculation of the Overpayment with respect to one child does not hold based on the available evidence, the Panel finds that the total Overpayment was not reasonably calculated by the Ministry.

The Panel finds that it was not reasonable for the Ministry to ignore the Appellant's evidence and to rely on evidence that is incorrect because the process to update that evidence is not yet complete. As a result, the Panel finds the Ministry's Overpayment calculation to be premature. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Reconsideration Decision on this point is not reasonably supported by the evidence.

Conclusion

The Panel finds that the Ministry's decision to determine an Overpayment related to the withdrawn child was a reasonable application of the governing legislation and is supported by the evidence. This portion of the decision is confirmed.

The Panel finds that the Ministry's decision to determine an Overpayment related to fee reporting was not reasonably supported by the totality of the evidence. Accordingly, the Panel rescinds that portion of the decision and, as a result, the appeal is allowed on this basis only.

Legislation

Child Care Subsidy Act, SBC 1996, c 26

Information and verification

5 (1) For the purpose of determining or auditing eligibility for child care subsidies, the minister may do one or more of the following:

- (a) direct a person who has applied for a child care subsidy, or to or for whom a child care subsidy is paid, to supply the minister with information within the time and in the manner specified by the minister;
- (b) seek verification of any information supplied by a person referred to in paragraph (a);
- (c) direct a person referred to in paragraph (a) to supply verification of any information supplied by that person or another person;
- (d) collect from a person information about another person if
 - (i) the information relates to the application for or payment of a child care subsidy, and
 - (ii) the minister has not solicited the information from the person who provides it.

(2) A person to or for whom a child care subsidy is paid must notify the minister, within the time and in the manner specified by regulation, of any change in circumstances affecting their eligibility under this Act.

(3) If a person fails to comply with a direction under subsection (1) (a) or (c) or with subsection (2), the minister may

- (a) declare the person ineligible for a child care subsidy until the person complies, or
- (b) reduce the person's child care subsidy.

(4) For the purpose of auditing child care subsidies, the minister may direct child care providers to supply the minister with information about any child care they provide that is subsidized under this Act.

Overpayments, repayments and assignments

7 (1) If a child care subsidy is paid to or for a person who is not entitled to it, that person is liable to repay to the government the amount to which the person was not entitled.

(2) Subject to the regulations, the minister may enter into an agreement, or may accept any right assigned, for the repayment of a child care subsidy.

(3) A repayment agreement may be entered into before or after a child care subsidy is paid.

(4) An amount that a person is liable to repay under subsection (1) or under an agreement entered into under subsection (2) is a debt due to the government and may

- (a) be recovered by it in a court of competent jurisdiction, or
- (b) be deducted by it from any subsequent child care subsidy or from an amount payable to that person by the government under a prescribed enactment.

(5)The minister's decision about the amount a person is liable to repay under subsection (1) or under an agreement entered into under subsection (2) is not open to appeal under section 6 (3).

Child Care Subsidy Regulation, BC Reg 74/97

Amount of subsidy

8 (1)In this section:

"full time child care" means child care for which the minister may pay a child care subsidy that is provided for the equivalent of at least 20 full days per month;

"full time subsidy amount", in relation to a child receiving part time child care, means the monthly child care subsidy determined in accordance with subsection (3), (4) or (5), as applicable, that would apply if the child were receiving full time child care;

"number of full days" means the number of full days per month for which the minister may pay a child care subsidy;

"number of half days" means the number of half days per month for which the minister may pay a child care subsidy;

"parent fee" in relation to a parent, means the fee the parent is charged by the applicable child care provider for child care for which the minister may pay a child care subsidy;

"part time child care" means child care for which the minister may pay a child care subsidy that is provided for less than the equivalent of 20 full days per month.

(2)For the purposes of applying the definitions of "full time child care" and "part time child care" in subsection (1), 2 half days are the equivalent of one full day.

(3)If a family's adjusted annual income is less than or equal to the following, the monthly child care subsidy for a child receiving full time child care is the parent fee or the amount set out in Column 3 of the applicable table in Schedule A, whichever is less, for the type of child care the child is receiving:

(a)\$45 000 for a child receiving child care in a licensed child care setting;

(b)\$39 000 for a child receiving child care in a registered licence-not-required child care setting;

(c)\$24 000 for a child receiving child care

(i)in a licence-not-required child care setting, or

(ii)in the child's own home as described in section 2 (c).

(4)If a family's adjusted annual income exceeds the applicable amount under subsection (3) (a), (b) or (c), the monthly child care subsidy for a child receiving full time child care is the parent fee or the amount determined in accordance with the applicable formula in Schedule A, whichever is less, for the type of child care the child is receiving.

(5)Despite subsections (3) and (4), the monthly child care subsidy for a child described in section 7 (2) who is receiving full time child care is the parent fee or the amount set out in Column 3 of the applicable table in Schedule A, whichever is less, for the type of child care the child is receiving.

(6)If child care is provided through a Young Parent Program and the child care provider operating the Young Parent Program confirms, in the form specified by the minister, that the parent is participating in the Young Parent Program,

(a)despite subsections (3) and (4), the monthly child care subsidy for a child who is receiving full time child care provided through the Young Parent Program is \$1 500, and

(b)despite subsection (7), the monthly child care subsidy for a child receiving part time child care provided through the Young Parent Program is the amount determined in accordance with the following formula:

$$\left[\frac{(\text{number of half days} \times 0.5) + \text{number of full days}}{20} \right] \times 1 500$$

(7)The monthly child care subsidy for a child receiving part time child care is the parent fee or the amount determined in accordance with the following formula, whichever is less, for the type of child care the child is receiving:

$$\left[\frac{(\text{number of half days} \times 0.5) + \text{number of full days}}{20} \right] \times \text{full time subsidy amount}$$

(8)Despite subsection (7), the monthly child care subsidy for a child receiving part time child care provided in a licensed preschool is the parent fee or the amount determined in accordance with the following formula, whichever is less, for that type of child care:

$$\left[\frac{\text{number of half days}}{20} \right] \times \text{full time subsidy amount}$$

(9)Despite subsection (7), the monthly child care subsidy for a child receiving part time child care that is care surrounding school day is the parent fee or the amount determined in accordance with the following formula, whichever is less, for that type of child care:

$$\left[\frac{(\text{number of half days} \times 0.83333) + \text{number of full days}}{20} \right] \times \text{full time subsidy amount}$$

(10)If the child care is arranged or recommended by staff delegated under the Child, Family and Community Service Act, after staff have

(a)offered support services or agreements to the child and family under section 16 (2) (a) of that Act,

(b)begun an assessment under section 16 (2) (b.1) of that Act, or

(c)begun an investigation under section 16 (2) (c) of that Act,

the minister may pay any increase in the amount of the child care subsidy that the minister considers necessary to ensure that the child care is provided.

[en. B.C. Reg. 148/2018, App. 1, [s. 6.](#)]

Notifying the minister of change in circumstances

14 The notification required by [section 5 \(2\)](#) of the [Act](#) must be given in writing or by telephone, (a)as soon as possible after any change in circumstances affecting the eligibility of the parent, and (b)to an employee in the Child Care Service Centre.

[am. B.C. Regs. 337/2008, s. 5; 148/2018, App. 1, [s. 10.](#)]

Accounts and payment

15 (1)Child care providers must submit billing for child care subsidies to the minister in the manner and form specified by the minister.

(2)The minister must pay

(a)child care subsidies for child care described in [section 2](#) (c) directly to the parent, and (b)child care subsidies for child care described in [section 2](#) (a), (b) or (b.1) directly to the child care provider.

(3)Despite subsections (1) and (2), a non-profit agency providing child care support services may pay the caregiver and submit accounts to the ministry for reimbursement.

(4)If a licence issued for a child care setting under the [Community Care and Assisted Living Act](#) is cancelled, the minister may accept, for up to 30 days after the date the licence is cancelled, billing for subsidized child care provided in that setting.

(5)No child care subsidy will be paid to a child care provider under subsection (2) (b) for a day on which the child care setting is closed, unless the day is a statutory holiday.

(6)In subsection (5), "statutory holiday" means any day, except Sunday, that is listed as a holiday in the [Interpretation Act](#).

[am. B.C. Regs. 387/2004, s. 3; 281/2005, s. 10.]

Early Learning and Child Care Act, SBC 2021, c 22

Information and verification

7 (1)For the purpose of determining or auditing eligibility for a child care benefit, the minister may do one or more of the following:

(a)direct an applicant for or recipient of a child care benefit to supply information to the minister within the time and in the manner specified by the minister;

(b)seek verification of any information supplied by a person referred to in paragraph (a);

(c)direct a person referred to in paragraph (a) to supply to the minister verification of any information supplied by that person or another person;

APPEAL NUMBER 2025-0264

Part G – Order

The panel decision is: (Check one) **Unanimous** **By Majority**

The Panel **Confirms the Ministry Decision** **Rescinds the Ministry Decision**

If the ministry decision is rescinded, is the panel decision referred back to the Minister for a decision as to amount? Yes No

Legislative Authority for the Decision:

Employment and Assistance Act

Section 24(1)(a) or Section 24(1)(b)

Section 24(2)(a) or Section 24(2)(b)

Part H – Signatures

Print Name

Anil Agarwal

Signature of Chair

Date (Year/Month/Day)

2025/09/28

Print Name

Margarita Papenbrock

Signature of Member

Date (Year/Month/Day)

2025/10/17

Print Name

Adam Shee

Signature of Member

Date (Year/Month/Day)

2025/10/19