

T: 0300 244 4000
E: scottish.ministers@gov.scot

Bruce Crawford MSP
Convener
Finance & Constitution Committee
Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP

04 July 2019

Dear Bruce

I am writing to draw the attention of your committee to the enclosed common framework outline. The outline has also been published simultaneously by the UK and Welsh Governments. This reflects the fact that the content of this framework outline is the outcome of joint working between the three governments, together with the NICS in the absence of the Executive, to take forward the Hazardous Substances Planning Framework. This is one of the 24 policy areas where it was originally considered future legislation might be required though it is now considered that this will not be the case. This framework has completed Phase 2 of the frameworks development process, further details of which are attached at Annex A, and the four administrations felt that it was timely to put this outline in the public domain to increase transparency about the frameworks process and to aid understanding of what frameworks might look like.

The SG's position remains that we support continued EU membership and remaining in the EU continues to be our strong preference. We also remain of the view that any deal agreed by the Westminster Parliament must be put to the people for another UK referendum.

However if the UK was to leave the EU, powers previously exercised at EU level that intersect with devolved competence would flow back directly to Edinburgh, Cardiff and Belfast and in some of those areas the UK, Scottish and Welsh Governments have agreed it would be necessary to maintain UK-wide approaches, or common frameworks.

As I have stated previously frameworks are not a policy choice of the Scottish Government but an unfortunate necessity given that Scotland still faces the prospect of being taken out of the EU against our will and for which, as a responsible government, we have to prepare. My officials have therefore engaged in a detailed programme of collaboration to agree where common frameworks would be needed and how they would be implemented. The precise nature and extent of the necessary arrangements will of course be dependent on the nature of the UK's future relationship with the EU.

Scottish Ministers, special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot

This technical work has been taken forward on the basis of agreement and, on the basis of the continuing joint progress, the UKG has to date concluded that it does not need to bring forward any section 12 regulations. In response the Scottish and Welsh Governments have reaffirmed their commitment not to create divergent policy in ways that would cut across future frameworks, where it has been agreed they are necessary or where discussion continues.

Timings for the phased approach set out in Annex A were always indicative and were intended to provide flexibility for policy teams to move through the phases at different speeds depending on the dependencies and circumstances of individual policy areas. The speed at which frameworks have progressed has been determined by a range of influences, not least the impact of no-deal planning and the continuing uncertainty about the legislative timetable.

Further work has now been undertaken to take stock of the progress made to date and to review the timeline for delivery. This review has taken into account the potential impact of the different routes for implementation, decisions that have been taken recently with regard to reviewing frameworks as they develop and the plans for stakeholder engagement discussed below. Although being managed through clear and agreed project management disciplines, in reality the development of frameworks is emerging as a complex ongoing integrated process with significant impacts and dependencies.

Work continues on the cross-cutting issues which require to be worked through for frameworks to be finalised in the areas of domestic governance, the internal market across the UK, trade, international obligations and, where appropriate, future funding.

Your committee will also wish to be aware that a programme of stakeholder engagement is to begin shortly. The plan will inform stakeholders about frameworks, allow their input into the development process and increase transparency.

Engagement is proposed on 3 levels:

- to raise general awareness with umbrella organisations whose members will have an interest in the process and progress of frameworks;
- proactive parliamentary engagement at Westminster and the devolved legislatures to inform both clerks and elected representatives about frameworks, including key milestones and the progress being made; and
- technical engagement by policy teams with sector specific stakeholders, including parliamentary committees, on the detail of individual frameworks. The Hazardous Substances Planning framework was the pilot for testing this approach with stakeholders across the UK.

Scottish Ministers, special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot

The Scottish Parliament, Edinburgh EH99 1SP
www.gov.scot




Accredited
Until 2020



I hope your committee finds this information useful. As ever, I and my officials are willing to discuss and answer any queries.

I am copying this letter to the Convener of the Culture, Tourism, Europe & External Affairs as well as the Convener of the Local Government and Communities Committee whose members will have a policy interest in this framework.



MICHAEL RUSSELL

Scottish Ministers, special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot

The Scottish Parliament, Edinburgh EH99 1SP
www.gov.scot



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

Accredited
Until 2020



Frameworks Development Process

The development of common frameworks is overseen by the UK Frameworks Project Board¹ which reports to JMC(EN). Development work has demonstrated frameworks form only one part of a much broader change in the way that the governments of the UK work together and the need therefore to build new working relationships between the national governments of the UK.

The 5 phase approach to the development of Frameworks that policy teams have been asked to follow to date is set out below:

PHASE 1 of multilateral engagement on common frameworks took place between October 2017 and March 2018 and focused on establishing the principles, and proof of concept for this programme of joint work between the UK Government and Devolved Administrations.

PHASE 2 running from April 2018 onwards, focused on detailed policy development, including iterative multilateral engagement through deep dive discussions. The outcome of these discussions is recorded by the policy team in the framework's outline agreement. The final stage of this phase of work is to sight UKG and DA portfolio Ministers on framework outlines and seek their clearance to undertake informal multilateral stakeholder engagement. It will be made clear that a framework at this point is the product of official level technical discussions and is without prejudice to the views of Ministers and also the outcome of negotiations on the UK's future relationship with the EU.

PHASE 3 is intended to provide a period of review, consultation and more detailed policy development up to and beyond March 2019. It has been broken down into the following work streams.

Further Policy Development

- Explore in detail the interaction with the Future Economic Partnership and identify related timescales for implementation; and
- Continue to explore further dependencies including the role of the DAs in the negotiation of trade agreements and other international obligations.

Stakeholder Engagement

Engagement is proposed on 3 levels:

- engaging with umbrella organisations, whose members will have an interest in the process and progress of frameworks, to raise general awareness;
- parliamentary engagement at Westminster and the devolved legislatures to ensure clerks and elected representatives are informed about frameworks, including key milestones and the progress being made; and,
- technical engagement with sector specific stakeholders, which we would expect to include consultation with parliamentary committees, on the detail of individual frameworks.

All engagement will be without prejudice to the views of Ministers.

¹ The Project Board comprises Deputy Directors from the relevant divisions in each of the 4 administrations, UKG Cabinet Office, SG Constitution & UK Relations Division, NI Executive Office, WG Brexit Policy. Scottish Ministers, special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot

Seeking Agreement

- Completed framework outlines will then be subject to review before being submitted to UKG and DA portfolio Ministers and endorsed through the relevant collective agreement processes and the Joint Ministerial Committee (EU Negotiations).

PHASE 4 will cover preparation, scrutiny and implementation of final framework proposals, from March 2019 onwards. Work will include preparing and then implementing legislative and non-legislative elements of individual frameworks and then taking those final proposals through the necessary legislative processes, which could include primary and/or secondary legislation, and any non-legislative mechanisms.

PHASE 5 will comprise any post-implementation arrangements from December 2020 onwards.

	2017	2018	2019	2020
PHASE 1 multilateral engagement on common frameworks	Oct. 17 - Mar. 18			
PHASE 2 - detailed policy development		running from April 2018 onwards		
PHASE 3 period of review, consultation and further detailed policy development			up to and beyond March 2019	
PHASE 4 preparation and implementation of final framework proposals			from March 2019 onward	
PHASE 5 post-implementation arrangements				from Dec 2020 onwards

Scottish Ministers, special advisers and the Permanent Secretary are covered by the terms of the Lobbying (Scotland) Act 2016. See www.lobbying.scot

COMMON FRAMEWORKS: OUTLINE FRAMEWORK **HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES PLANNING**

This outline framework for Hazardous Substances Planning should be read as an example of how common frameworks are being developed. The outline framework template has been designed to allow for a variety of approaches to suit the needs of particular policy areas. This example is therefore without prejudice to how other frameworks may be developed in the future.

Purpose

This document provides a suggested outline for an initial UK-wide, or GB, framework agreement in a particular policy area. It is intended to facilitate multilateral policy development and set out proposed high level commitments for the four UK Administrations; it should be viewed as a tool that helps policy development, rather than a rigid template to be followed. The document may be developed iteratively and amended and added to by policy teams as discussions progress. It should be read alongside the accompanying guidance (UK Government and Devolved Administrations Guidance Note for Phase 2 Engagement).

Population of the agreement skeleton should be based on the existing work undertaken and should remain consistent with the underlying Framework Principles agreed by the UK, Scottish and Welsh Governments. The content should inform the drafting of any legislative and non-legislative mechanisms required to implement UK-wide frameworks.

Until it is formally agreed this document should not be considered as Government policy for any of the participating administrations and should be treated as confidential. The process for developing and finalising this document will be mutually agreed by all administrations.

The document is made up of four sections:

Outline

- 1. Section 1:** What We Are Talking About. This section will set out the area of European Union (EU) law under consideration, current arrangements, and any elements from the policy that will not be considered. It will also include any relevant legal or technical definitions.
- 2. Section 2:** Proposed Breakdown of Policy Area and Framework. This section will break the policy area down into its component parts, explaining where common rules will and will not be required and the rationale for this approach. It will also set out any areas of disagreement.

Operational Detail

- 3. Section 3:** Proposed Operational Elements of Framework. This section will explain how the framework will operate in practice by setting out: how decisions will be made; the planned roles and responsibilities for each administration, or a third party; how implementation of the framework will be monitored and, if appropriate enforced; arrangements for reviewing and amending the framework; and proposed arrangements for resolution of a dispute.
- 4. Section 4:** Practical Next Steps and Related Issues. This section will set out the next steps that would be required to implement the framework (subject to Ministerial agreement) and key timings.

Draft Framework Agreement

OUTLINE

SECTION 1: WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT

1. Policy area

Hazardous Substances Planning. Encompasses the elements of the Seveso III Directive (2012/18/EU) which relate to land-use planning, including: planning controls on the presence of hazardous substances and handling development proposals both for hazardous establishments and in the vicinity of such establishments.

The Seveso III Directive ('the Directive') has the objective of preventing on-shore major accidents involving hazardous substances, as well as limiting the consequences to people and/or the environment of any accidents that do take place. 'Hazardous substances' in the legislation include individual substances (such as ammonium nitrate), or whole categories of substances (such as flammable gases). The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) and devolved administrations (DAs) are responsible for the land-use planning (LUP) requirements of the Directive. In accordance with the retained Seveso III Directive, the UK is obliged to ensure that the objectives of preventing major accidents and limiting the consequences of such accidents are taken into account in land-use policies. This requires controls on the siting of new establishments and modifications to establishments which fall within scope of the Directive, and on new developments and public areas in the vicinity of such establishments. It also requires these considerations to form the development of relevant policy and has requirements on public involvement in decision making, including relevant plans and programmes.

When implementing the original EU Directive in this regard, a distinction was made between those elements relating to on-site controls for establishments to minimise the risk of a major accident (those now covered by the Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations 2015 (GB) and their Northern Ireland equivalent) and the residual off-site risk. The latter is primarily the risk of a major accident arising due to the proximity of hazardous substances to other development or sensitive environments (i.e. if there were an accident due to on-site failures, what the risks would be where certain developments or habitats are or would be close by). This latter issue was considered to be a spatial planning matter to be addressed through planning controls. Subsequently, LUP matters generally in the UK were devolved to the new administrations.

To summarise, very broadly the hazardous substances regime;

- a) sets limits on the amount of dangerous substances that can be stored/used in an establishment before that establishment must apply for consent to do so from their local planning authority (usually the local authority);
- b) requires the preparation of planning policies to take into account the aims and objectives of the Directive; and
- c) requires local planning authorities to comply with various consultation requirements and consider any major accident hazard issues before they can grant planning permission in relation to establishments, to certain types of development near such establishments, and hazardous substances consent.

To note the hazardous substances regime does NOT ban any substance, or any development around establishments containing hazardous substances. All decisions rest with local planning authorities, or in some cases, called-in applications or appeals, the Minister(s) in England, Wales, Northern Ireland or Scotland.

It should also be noted that LUP controls on hazardous substances existed in Great Britain for around a decade before becoming an EU requirement. This is an issue on which the UK has led the way.

2. Scope

- The scope of this Common Framework is any legislation which applies the LUP elements of the retained Seveso III Directive in the United Kingdom. At the time of writing The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 and Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 in England, and devolved administrations' equivalent primary and secondary provisions, constitute the main body of legislation that applies these elements of the Seveso III Directive. The Directive's minimum requirements are common across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Whilst the different administrations are currently free to use their devolved planning powers to increase controls beyond the minimum requirements of the Directive, this has not happened.
- Once the UK leaves the EU this set of common minimum requirements may* cease to be in effect and the different administrations will have wider scope to use their

planning powers to make changes.

*This is subject to the terms on which the UK leaves. The Withdrawal Agreement includes a commitment, if the backstop comes into effect, to a principle of non-regression from the standards applicable within the UK at the end of transition period. This will include in areas relating to 'the prevention, reduction and elimination of risks to human health or the environment arising from the production, use, release and disposal of chemical substances'.

- The primary focus of this agreement is to maintain the principles and objectives of retained EU legislation across the hazardous substances regime, that is, primarily, to prevent on-shore major accidents involving hazardous substances and limit the consequences to people and/or the environment of any accidents that do take place. It also seeks to, wherever possible, facilitate the sharing of information on a multilateral basis.
- Post Exit, the UK will still be party to the following relevant international agreements;
 - The Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents is a UNECE convention designed to protect people and the environment from the consequences of industrial accidents. Parties are required to, amongst other things, take appropriate measures and cooperate within the framework of this Convention, to protect human beings and the environment against industrial accidents...shall ensure that the operator is obliged to take all measures necessary for the safe performance of the hazardous activity and for the prevention of industrial accidents...take measures, as appropriate, to identify hazardous activities within its jurisdiction and to ensure that affected Parties are notified of any such proposed or existing activity. The Convention also sets out detailed requirements when it comes to siting of/around hazardous establishments as well as setting out the types and quantities of substances that should be considered hazardous.
 - The UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters ('the Aarhus Convention') establishes a number of rights of the public (individuals and their associations) with regard to the environment. The Parties to the Convention are required to make the provisions necessary so that public authorities (at national, regional or local level) will contribute to these rights to become effective.

3. Definitions

All technical definitions used in this agreement will reflect those set out in legislation implementing the retained Seveso III Directive.

In this framework the following definitions are also used:

- *JMC*. The Joint Ministerial Committee is a set of committees that comprises ministers from the UK and devolved governments, providing central co-ordination of the overall relationship between the UK and the devolved nations.
- *HSE & HSE NI*. The Health and Safety Executive and Health and Safety Executive Northern Ireland are government agencies responsible for the encouragement, regulation and enforcement of health and safety.
- *MoU* – Memorandum of Understanding. This is a multilateral agreement which indicates a common line of action. It is often used where a legal commitment would not be required or appropriate.

SECTION 2: PROPOSED BREAKDOWN OF POLICY AREA AND FRAMEWORK

4. Summary of proposed approach

It is important to first note the context in which the proposed approach has been developed. Divergence is already entirely possible across the devolved administrations, however there are currently a number of restrictions on what the United Kingdom Government (UKG) and DAs can amend based on what has been set at EU level. The key restrictions are that the UKG and DAs;

- i) are unable to change the definition of what an establishment is (in short, a location where dangerous substances are present in significant quantities);
- ii) must not lower standards on what constitutes a dangerous substance (i.e. by removing categories of substances or individual substances from the list, or raising the threshold at which the quantity becomes significant and the establishment falls into scope of the regime);
- iii) must ensure that the objectives of preventing major accidents and limiting the consequences of such accidents for human health and the environment are taken into account in their land-use policies, through controls on the siting of new establishments and new developments close to establishments;
- iv) must set up appropriate consultation procedures to ensure that operators provide sufficient information on the risks arising from the establishment and that technical advice on those risks is available when decisions are taken; and
- v) facilitate public involvement at various stages of decision-making on relevant applications for consent or plans and programmes.

In simplified terms, what may become possible post-Exit that is not possible now is that the UKG and devolved administrations will have the powers within a domestic context to relax

requirements on the level of substances that can be held before triggering the regime and relax the process around what is required once the regime is triggered.

It is considered that whilst a framework is appropriate for the hazardous substances regime, it should be non-legislative. It is envisaged that this would be in the form of an MOU, setting out the principles of engagement between the UK government, DAs and HSE where changes to devolved legislation are concerned (see Section 6 for more details). This view is guided by the overarching principle established by JMC; that any framework should secure the proper functioning of the regime whilst at the same time respecting the devolution rights of the devolved administrations. It is also guided with reference to the priorities that JMC list as key, that any framework should be established where they are necessary to:

- *enable the functioning of the UK internal market, while acknowledging policy divergence*

Hazardous substances planning is not significantly different from devolved planning controls generally – it is about consenting the locations of substances with major accident hazard potential and development around those locations. As stated in section 1, establishments which store certain amounts of certain substances or developers looking to build near such establishments will be required to seek consent from a local authority. The regime is not focused on banning activities or making a substance illegal in a general sense. As a result, (and in a scenario in which the non-regression principle did not apply) the biggest potential discrepancy would be where, for example in one administration, controls were removed for a certain substance completely, where across the border, operators would need to go through the hazardous substances consenting process with their local authority to hold the substances at a site in the same quantities. Whilst any such scenario *could* result in a potentially damaging ‘race to the bottom’, due to the nature of the regime this would bring very limited economic benefits – relaxed hazardous substances standards would not bring a significant enough benefit to operators to influence which administration they set up business in to the point where this would distort the internal market. And as such reducing standards in this way is unlikely to be an attractive proposition (and industry has not been pushing for this up to now). It is therefore considered unlikely and, particularly in consideration with other factors, is not a strong enough argument to justify a *legislative* approach for this framework; but arrangements will need to be in place to manage any potential impacts on the internal market within this – or related – policy areas.

- *ensure compliance with international obligations*

The UK is a signatory to two international agreements relevant to the hazardous substances regime (as mentioned in section 2), the Aarhus Convention and the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents. The latter in particular cements many of the requirements of the current regime in international law, therefore any significant stripping back of the hazardous substances regime could result in a breach of international obligations. This presents limits on what the UKG can do as the party to the treaties, but also constrains the administrations. In very extreme cases the Secretary of State has step-in powers already built into Devolution settlements where there is a potential breach of international law, although we do not envisage these forming any part of the framework. A non-legislative framework would provide the appropriate forum for any

policy changes to be addressed, where anything of concern can be flagged and any necessary dispute resolution measures (see section 13) can be put into place.

- *ensure the UK can negotiate, enter into and implement new trade agreements and international treaties*

Not applicable. Through discussions we have not identified any differences between administrations on hazardous substances that would have an impact on the UK's ability to negotiate (etc.) trade agreements and treaties. Negotiation of any new trade agreements or treaties would in any event need to take account of where devolved competence means there are or could be divergence across the UK in matters pertinent to that particular treaty or agreement.

- *enable the management of common resources*

HSE/HSE NI – as indicated, they operate across the different planning jurisdictions (HSE NI covering Northern Ireland), and so any divergence could affect them, and so any framework encouraging and providing a forum for discussion would be beneficial. However, potential changes to the regime with significant impacts on HSE are already a potential feature of the existing regime *within the EU framework* and are not triggered by EU exit. There is not a new significant issue being created on this point that would need to be addressed by legislative means.

- *administer and provide access to justice in cases with a cross-border element*

Not applicable. Any differences between administrations on hazardous substances will not have an impact on the UK's ability to administer or provide access to justice.

- *safeguard the security of the UK*

Differing hazardous substances planning controls in parts of the UK are already a possibility, i.e. not affected by EU Exit, and these differences do not pose a threat to UK security.

Reducing protections below current levels could become possible after Exit, which could increase the risk to safety *within an area (acknowledging the limited risk of cross-border impacts)* e.g. by allowing hazardous substances near a sensitive development (to note, safety measures within establishments would still be regulated through non-planning requirements under the Control of Major Accidents Hazards Regulations 2015 or their equivalent). As stated previously, hazardous substances powers are broadly analogous to other devolved planning powers in this regard and as such should be seen as a matter for individual administrations – divergence in and of itself does not pose a risk to the security of the UK as a whole.

According to the JMC principles a legislative framework should be considered only where absolutely necessary. As set out above a potential legislative framework for hazardous substances would not meet this criteria. According to the principles set out by the JMC and the objective of securing the proper functioning of the hazardous substances regime whilst at the same time respecting the devolution rights of the devolved administrations, this Common Framework will not be a legislative vehicle but rather a reflection of the discussions that have taken place and agreements reached on ways of working going forward, post the UK's departure from the European Union.

Other factors supporting a non-legislative agreement

- the devolved regimes predate the current version of the Directive, and in certain cases go further than its minimum requirements; this demonstrates the lack of appetite to legislate below its minimum standards.
- the HSE, and in Northern Ireland HSE NI, have a cross-cutting role which provides a common evidence base which all DAs look to; with policy development across all administrations driven by HSE and HSE(NI) advice, differing approaches would be unlikely.

Current potential for divergence – decision making is devolved, so as long as the aims of the Directive are taken into account, it should be emphasised that despite the scope for such divergence, very little of it has occurred. It should also be noted that planning authorities and Ministers in the various home nations are free to make decisions on applications as they see fit, provided the major accident hazard potential forms part of the consideration.

5. Detailed overview of proposed framework: legislation (primary or secondary)

N/A – no legislation is considered to be necessary

6. Detailed overview of proposed framework: non-legislative arrangements

The UKG and the DAs have agreed a set of eight principles for future ways of working that would make up the agreement:

- i. In the absence of EU requirements applying to the UK, the nations of the UK will consider the evidence and advice of the Control of Major Accidents Hazards (COMAH) competent authority, as appropriate, as regards the substances and quantities to which hazardous substances consent should apply.
- ii. Administrations will respect the ability of other administrations to make decisions (i.e. allowing for policy divergence).
- iii. Administrations will consider the impact of decisions on other administrations, including any impacts on cross-cutting issues such as the UK Internal Market.
- iv. Wherever it is considered reasonably possible, administrations agree to seek to inform other administrations of prospective changes in policy one month, or as close to one month as is practical, before making them public.
- v. Parties will create the right conditions for collaboration, by for example ensuring policy leads attend future meetings.
- vi. Future collaborative meetings will be conducted at official level and on a without prejudice basis.
- vii. In order to broaden the debate at future collaborative meetings, parties will ensure that different perspectives are present.
- viii. Those attending future collaborative meetings recognise the importance of how collaboration is approached.

7. Detailed overview of areas where no further action is thought to be needed

N/A

OPERATIONAL DETAIL

SECTION 3: PROPOSED OPERATIONAL ELEMENTS OF FRAMEWORK

8. Decision making

The MoU or equivalent will be drafted in cooperation with the devolved administrations – the UKG will pull together an initial draft which will be sent out for comment, with each party then feeding in. The common framework will only be put in place once there is unanimous agreement. We will also involve HSE, HSE NI, and other stakeholders with an interest. The overarching principles were agreed at official level at the ‘deep dive’ meeting with all administrations.

Ministerial clearance will be sought on the principle of proceeding with a non-legislative framework, as well as the final framework agreement itself.

Once this has been taken forward all decision making under the relevant devolved competences (within the scope of the framework) will fall to the UKG and the DAs within their respective territories, taking into account the principles set out in Section 6. The framework will also link into any future arrangements for the maintenance of the UK Internal Market. Currently the arrangements for coordinating work on the implementation of the Seveso III Directive are ad hoc. Usually, HSE acts as the coordinator for implementing new requirements from revision of, or amendments to the Directive and engage with planning representatives from the various administrations to coordinate implementation. As other issues arise, again contact is made on an ad hoc basis to seek to resolve these. Ministers responsible for planning individually sign off implementing legislation or changes to procedures.

To facilitate the sharing of information where appropriate, and as a forum to discuss wider policy issues, it is envisaged that a working group of the policy leads in each administration will hold a six-monthly telephone conference to discuss any issues and share learning. This would not rule out issues being raised for consideration by the working group between meetings if necessary.

9. Roles and responsibilities of each party to the framework

See key principles (section 6).

10. Roles and responsibilities of existing or new bodies

HSE and HSE NI are government agencies and the key existing bodies relevant to this framework. Under the Hazardous Substances regulations they act (in conjunction with the Environment Agency in England, the Scottish Environmental Protection Authority in Scotland, Natural Resources Wales in Wales and the Northern Ireland Environment Agency in Northern Ireland) as the COMAH competent authority. They advise hazardous substances authorities (local planning authorities) across the four territories on the nature and severity of the risk to persons in the vicinity and the local environment arising from the presence of a hazardous substance at an establishment.

They have the lead for the UK on the Seveso III Directive, and post-Exit will be taking up several of the functions that currently sit with the European Commission in relation to COMAH, this will include the responsibility for advising on any changes to the lists of controlled substances or other policy updates that may impact the hazardous substances regime. Changes in their policy, e.g. on risk or the way they engage in the planning system ultimately rest with the UK Secretary of State for Work and Pensions.

In relation to hazardous substances they will continue in their current role and with their current responsibilities after Exit and have been kept informed throughout the process of developing this framework.

11. Monitoring and enforcement

As no legislative arrangements are considered necessary then enforcement measures are not appropriate. In place of formal monitoring measures there will be regular meetings to review the framework (see sections 8 and 12.)

12. Review and amendment

We propose having a review meeting two years after the day the framework comes into effect, to consider the ongoing application of transposing domestic legislation across the different administrations. The meeting would focus in particular on any issues encountered, and allow parties to provide a forward look of any changes that they are considering. This would not rule out an earlier review if required. After this initial review a more permanent arrangement for recurring meetings on this framework will be decided based around a timeframe that is considered appropriate.

13. Dispute resolution

The intention under this framework is that there will be a regular group at working level to discuss and work through any issues at an early stage.

This approach to dispute resolution largely reflects the current decision-making approach mentioned in section 8. i.e. matters proceed via policy leads, with senior managers and Ministers within each administration brought in to agree a course of action as appropriate. We have not previously had disagreements in this area that have warranted engagement between senior officials or Ministers of the different administrations. There is no particular reason to suppose that EU Exit will make the need for that level of engagement any more likely. Therefore whilst we think disagreement is unlikely it is appropriate to have a procedure in place in the event it is needed. This process would be as follows:

Policy leads. Where officials become aware of potential issues or areas of disagreement via any means the first step will be to seek to resolve this amongst policy leads without escalation. This will usually be resolved via discussion with equivalents in other administrations to determine the source of the disagreement, to establish whether it is a material concern and to work through possible solutions to the satisfaction of all parties. It is expected that most disagreements would be resolved at this point.

Director level/Chiefs of planning. Where disagreements cannot be resolved amongst policy leads the next stage will usually be to escalate the issue to director level. At this stage directors can decide whether it would be appropriate to arrange a meeting with counterparts across administrations. Alternatively, or after such a meeting, directors may determine that the issue cannot be resolved at this stage at which point the involvement of ministers will be required.

Ministers. This is expected to be a last resort for only the most serious issues and where all alternatives have been exhausted. In very extreme cases the Secretary of State has step-in powers, already built into Devolution settlements, although we do not envisage these forming any part of the framework.

HSE/HSE NI. They may be included at multiple stages of the process, either flagging potential issues, or providing advice on potential solutions.

Agree to disagree. It does not always follow that where disagreements emerge these will need to be escalated or a 'solution' need to be established. This framework will not prejudice the right of administrations to 'agree to disagree' in certain circumstances.

SECTION 4: PRACTICAL NEXT STEPS AND RELATED ISSUES

14. Implementation

This framework will take effect once agreed by all parties and approved by Ministers. It is intended that the concordat/MoU be in effect when the UK leaves the European Union.

