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Historical Note

In January 2000, the Royal Commission on the Reform of the House of Lords said that there was a good case for enhanced Parliamentary scrutiny of secondary legislation and recommended establishing a “sifting” mechanism to identify those statutory instruments which merited further debate or consideration. The Merits of Statutory Instruments Committee was set up on 17 December 2003. At the start of the 2012–3 Session the Committee was renamed to reflect the widening of its responsibilities to include the scrutiny of Orders laid under the Public Bodies Act 2011.

The Committee has the following terms of reference:

1. The Committee shall, with the exception of those instruments in paragraphs (3) and (4), scrutinise—
   a. every instrument (whether or not a statutory instrument), or draft of an instrument, which is laid before each House of Parliament and upon which proceedings may be, or might have been, taken in either House of Parliament under an Act of Parliament;
   b. every proposal which is in the form of a draft of such an instrument and is laid before each House of Parliament under an Act of Parliament,
   with a view to determining whether or not the special attention of the House should be drawn to it on any of the grounds specified in paragraph (2).

2. The grounds on which an instrument, draft or proposal may be drawn to the special attention of the House are—
   a. that it is politically or legally important or gives rise to issues of public policy likely to be of interest to the House;
   b. that it may be inappropriate in view of changed circumstances since the enactment of the parent Act;
   c. that it may inappropriately implement European Union legislation;
   d. that it may imperfectly achieve its policy objectives;
   e. that the explanatory material laid in support provides insufficient information to gain a clear understanding about the instrument’s policy objective and intended implementation;
   f. that there appear to be inadequacies in the consultation process which relates to the instrument.

3. The exceptions are—
   a. remedial orders, and draft remedial orders, under section 10 of the Human Rights Act 1998;
   b. draft orders under sections 14 and 18 of the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006, and subordinate provisions orders made or proposed to be made under the Regulatory Reform Act 2001;
   c. Measures under the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act 1919 and instruments made, and drafts of instruments to be made, under them.

4. The Committee shall report on draft orders and documents laid before Parliament under section 11(1) of the Public Bodies Act 2011 in accordance with the procedures set out in sections 11(5) and (6). The Committee may also consider and report on any material changes in a draft order laid under section 11(8) of the Act.

5. The Committee shall also consider such other general matters relating to the effective scrutiny of secondary legislation and arising from the performance of its functions under paragraphs (1) to (4) as the Committee considers appropriate, except matters within the orders of reference of the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments.
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Statutory instruments
Third Report

INSTRUMENTS DRAWN TO THE SPECIAL ATTENTION OF THE HOUSE

The Committee has considered the following instruments and has determined that the special attention of the House should be drawn to them on the ground specified.

A. Draft Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice: 0 to 25 years

Date laid: 11 June

Parliamentary Procedure: affirmative

Summary: The draft Code of Practice provides statutory guidance on duties, policies and procedures relating to children and young people with special educational needs or disabilities. The Department for Education has stated that some bodies are legally obliged to have regard to the Code when carrying out functions under the Children and Families Act 2014, but that the Code also provides useful information to others such as parents, young people and practitioners. This is a desirable objective, but we are concerned that the Code as laid before Parliament may be far too lengthy and complex to be of use to families concerned with the issue of special educational needs. We see a real risk that it may fall short of serving this purpose.

We draw this instrument to the special attention of the House on the ground that it may imperfectly achieve its policy objectives.

1. The Department for Education (DfE) has laid this draft Code of Practice, with an Explanatory Memorandum (EM). In the EM, DfE says that the Code of Practice provides statutory guidance on duties, policies and procedures relating to children and young people with special educational needs (SEN) or disabilities. It explains that some bodies are legally obliged to have regard to the Code when carrying out functions under Part 3 of the Children and Families Act 2014 (“the 2014 Act”), but that the Code also provides useful information to others such as parents, young people and practitioners.

2. DfE sets the draft Code in the context of the package of reforms for the support of children and young people with SENs or disabilities contained in Part 3 of the 2014 Act. The Department explains that the reforms, including the new draft Code, are intended to remedy difficulties with the current system, including the issues that too many children with SEN have their needs picked up late; and that too many families have to battle to find out what support is available and to get the help they need from education, health and social care services.
Consultation

3. DfE states that it conducted two formal consultations in relation to the Code (as well as associated regulations). The first ran from 4 October to 9 December 2013, and attracted over 700 responses. The Department says (at paragraph 8.11 of the EM) that respondents said that there was not enough detail on post-16 arrangements, and that parents were concerned about the transfer of rights to young people at age 16, and about the role that they would play in supporting their child. In addition, a significant number of respondents raised questions about how the local offer and joint commissioning would work in practice.

4. The second consultation was held from 16 April to 6 May 2014, in order to give interested parties the opportunity to comment on a draft of the Code which had been revised to reflect amendments to the Children and Families Bill and comments from the first consultation. This second consultation attracted 218 responses. DfE says in the EM (at paragraph 8.15) that respondents were positive about the changes made to the Code and felt that it was a lot clearer and more accessible.

5. On 11 June 2014, the Department published a response to the consultation exercises. This shows that, even in response to the second consultation, views continued to be mixed. For example, while 41% of respondents agreed that the changes made to the Code addressed concerns about clarity, layout and accessibility, a third of respondents did not agree, and 26% were not sure that the concerns had been met.

Grand Committee consideration of related Regulations

6. On 16 June 2014, there was consideration in Grand Committee of the Special Educational Needs (Personal Budgets) Regulations 2014, which provide a framework for the use of personal budgets for children and young people with SEN who have an Education Health and Care plan (EHC plan) or for whom a draft EHC plan is prepared. In Grand Committee, Lord Nash, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Schools, referred to the draft Code, and said that, along with regulations covering the local offer and EHC plans, it would set out a flexible framework for implementation while providing a clear expectation of what local authorities must have in place by September of this year. Conversely, Baroness Hughes of Stretford, referring to decisions by local authorities not to make a direct payment, said that the sections of the draft Code dealing with reasons for such decisions were “about as clear as mud”. Lord Nash undertook to consider this further.

---

1 DfE says that this included a consultation with children and young people from 18 October to 20 December 2013.
2 Local authorities are required to publish a clear, transparent “local offer” of services for children and young people with SEN or disabilities, so that parents and young people can understand what is available.
3 The Bill received Royal Assent on 13 March 2014.
5 HL Deb, 16 June 2014, col GC1.
External submission

7. The section of the draft Code dealing with the use of direct payments covers little more than one page of a document of more than 250 pages. However, it is noticeable that the issue of clarity and accessibility has been raised in relation to the draft Code as a whole by a large proportion of respondents to both the consultation exercises. The Committee has received a submission from IPSEA (Independent Parental Special Educational Advice) on the draft Code, and we have in turn obtained further comments from DfE on this submission. In view of the length of these documents, we are publishing both on our website.\(^8\) We are struck, in particular, by IPSEA’s comment that, despite a DfE commitment that the new Code would be significantly shorter, clearer and more concise than its predecessor, the new Code is in fact considerably longer; and that “insufficient improvements have been made in the final draft to accurately reflect the underlying law on which this statutory guidance advises”.

Conclusion

8. The Department has said that, while the Code is intended to guide some bodies (notably, local authorities and their partner commissioning bodies) when carrying out functions under Part 3 of the 2014 Act, it will also serve to provide useful information to parents and young people. We recognise that this is a desirable objective, but we are concerned that the Code as now laid before Parliament may be far too lengthy and complex to be of use to families concerned with the issue of special educational needs. In this very important respect, we see a real risk that it may imperfectly achieve its policy objectives.

---


Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (Revocation) Regulations 2014 (SI 2014/1258)

Date laid: 16 May

Parliamentary Procedure: negative

Summary: The EU Regulation on the protection of animals at the time of killing was adopted in September 2009. Defra carried out earlier consultation with interested parties before it issued a consultation paper in September 2012, with a six-week deadline for comments. At that point, the Department planned to implement the EU Regulation in January 2013. It published a summary of consultation responses in May 2013, indicating that implementation would take place by the end of 2013. In fact, the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing Regulations 2014 (SI 2014/1240) were laid on 16 May 2014, to provide for the administration and enforcement in England of the EU Regulation. The Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (Revocation) Regulations 2014 (SI 2014/1258) were also laid on 16 May 2014, with the purpose of revoking SI 2014/1240 before it took effect. After SI 2014/1240 had been made, the Department decided that the potential impact on some limited aspects of religious slaughter needed further consideration, and that SI 2014/1240 should be revoked in order to give full consideration to the relevant issues.

We consider that inadequacies in Defra’s handling of consultation in this case appear to have contributed to a process of policy-formulation which has been protracted, uncertain and still unresolved, more than eighteen months after the key consultation was carried out. We trust that the Department will draw lessons from its experience in this case in order to ensure that its general approach to consultation is better organised and serves the needs of policy-making more effectively.

We draw these instruments to the special attention of the House on the grounds that they are politically or legally important or give rise to issues of public policy likely to be of interest to the House; and that there appear to be inadequacies in the consultation process which relates to the instruments. (First use)

9. The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) has laid these instruments with a shared Explanatory Memorandum (EM). The Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing Regulations 2014 (SI 2014/1240) were laid on 16 May 2014, with a date of 20 May 2014 to come into force. The Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (Revocation) Regulations 2014 (SI 2014/1258) were also laid on 16 May 2014, with a date of 19 May 2014 to come into force, and with the purpose of revoking SI 2014/1240 before it took effect.

10. In the EM, Defra says that SI 2014/1240 provided for the administration and enforcement in England of EU legislation (“the EU Regulation”). The EU Regulation applies to all animals killed for the production of meat or other products in a slaughterhouse or on a farm. It aims to ensure that animals

---

(including poultry and fish, but excluding reptiles and amphibians) are spared any avoidable pain, distress or suffering at the time of killing. It introduces a series of new, directly applicable operational requirements including stunning parameters, improvements to chicken shackle lines, and requirements relating to slaughterhouses. In addition, it provides for a derogation to Member States to allow religious slaughter without prior stunning and permits them to maintain existing national rules providing for more extensive protection of animals at slaughter.

11. Defra explains that, after SI 2014/1240 had been made (it received Ministerial signature on 9 April 2014), it was decided that the potential impact on some limited aspects of religious slaughter needed further consideration; and that it was preferable to revoke SI 2014/1240 in order to give full consideration to the relevant issues. This revocation was achieved by bringing SI 2014/1258 into effect. Defra has given no more specific indication of when the further consideration is likely to be completed.

Consultation

12. The Department states that it consulted on proposals to implement the EU Regulation, from 1 January 2013, over six weeks from mid-September to the end of October 2012; and that a shorter period was used because of previous rounds of consultation between 2009 and 2012. In the September document, Defra stated that the consultation was in line with the Government’s Consultation Principles (of July 2012).

13. It published a summary of responses in May 2013. There were 446 responses to the consultation document. Defra says that, in addition, 300 responses were received campaigning in support of compulsory CCTV in slaughterhouses; 140 responses disagreed with the suggestion that slaughterhouses were best placed to decide monitoring tools suitable to their individual circumstances; and almost 80 individuals campaigned for tighter controls on meat from animals slaughtered for religious purposes.

14. In the EM, the Department states that the 2012 consultation demonstrated concern amongst welfare groups, veterinary organisations and the public about any weakening of existing welfare protection for animals at killing, while industry raised concerns about the impact on business and possible loss of flexibility. It identifies five key issues that were raised, where respondents’ views were divided: maintenance of existing national rules providing more extensive protection than the EU Regulation; certificates of competence; compulsory installation of CCTV at abattoirs; religious slaughter; and method of slaughter labelling.

15. Defra also says that the consultation itself was criticised by some for having only a six-week duration, and for its complexity. The summary of responses published in May 2013 gives more detail of this criticism. Questions 21 to 24 in the consultation document related to the “approach to consultation”. There were 55 responses to the question of whether the consultation paper had explained the issues sufficiently well: 45% of these responses said “no”.

---


52 responses were made to a question about the timing of the consultation process: 81% of these thought that the time allowed was insufficient.

16. 45 respondents offered further comments, generally critical, about the way in which the consultation process had been conducted. Among the comments quoted are the following from the RSPCA: “It is of concern that the lack of time between the end of the consultation period and the requirement to implement the new Regulations is so short. If the consultation responses raise any points that require/warrant further investigation by Defra with a view, potentially, to changing the current proposals, there will be little time in which to achieve this. That in turn might result in a view that such changes cannot be made due to insufficient time to investigate properly the issues raised, rather than because the potential changes are unwarranted.”

17. The May 2013 summary of responses also referred to the Department’s proposed way forward. The target date for implementation of 1 January 2013, as stated in the September 2012 consultation paper, was no longer mentioned. Instead, Defra said that the implementing Regulations would be finalised in the light of the consultation responses received and then laid before Parliament, and were expected to come into force in late 2013.

Conclusions

18. The EU Regulation was adopted in September 2009. Defra has said that it carried out earlier consultation with interested parties in the intervening period before it issued a consultation paper in September 2012, with a six-week deadline for comments. At that point, the Department planned to implement the EU Regulation in January 2013. In fact, it published a summary of consultation responses only in May 2013, and then indicated that implementation would take place by the end of 2013. As explained above, the implementing Regulations (SI 2014/1240) were finally laid in May 2014 and revoked before they came into force, “in order to give full consideration to the relevant issues”.

19. In presenting the Consultation Principles of July 2012 (as restated in October 2013), the Government have said that “increasing the level of transparency and increasing engagement with interested parties improves the quality of policy-making by bringing to bear expertise and alternative perspectives, and identifying unintended effects and practical problems.”

20. We agree, but we consider that inadequacies in Defra’s handling of consultation in this case appear to have had the opposite effect, and to have contributed to a process of policy-formulation which has been protracted, uncertain and still unresolved, more than eighteen months after the key consultation was carried out. Those inadequacies have been well flagged up in the comments mentioned above by large numbers of respondents to the 2012 consultation. We trust that the Department will draw lessons from its experience in this case, in order to ensure that its general approach to consultation is better organised and serves the needs of policy-making more effectively.

---

C. Finance-Bilateral Agreement for the Promotion and Protection of Investments between the United Kingdom and Colombia (8887)

*Date laid: 5 June*

*Parliamentary Procedure: negative*

*Summary:* this instrument sets out the terms of a reciprocal trade agreement between the UK and the Republic of Colombia which protects investment against expropriation. A letter has been received from Traidcraft which expresses a number of concerns about the level of protection for the investor and about the effect of the agreement on the human rights of certain groups within Colombia.

The instrument is drawn to the special attention of the House on the grounds of policy interest

21. The instrument is laid as a Command Paper under section 20 of the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 to ratify a Treaty signed in March 2010. The instrument is subject to the draft negative procedure and cannot be ratified unless a period of 21 sitting days, starting from the date on which the Treaty was laid before Parliament has elapsed and, during that period, neither House has resolved that it should not be ratified.

22. The Treaty aims to encourage UK investment in Colombia and *vice versa* by setting high standards of investment protection in the host country (for example, protection against discriminatory terms in contracts and market rate compensation in the event of expropriation). The Government wish to encourage investment in Colombia as an area of sustained economic growth. The Treaty has been authorised by the European Union.

23. The Committee has received a letter from Traidcraft expressing some reservations about the effectiveness of the protection for the investors because of the way the Treaty is worded. The letter also draws attention to the difficulties these arrangements may create in relation to the human rights of certain groups within Colombia, in particular over the land restitution rights of some 5.7 million displaced people. The letter is published in full on the Committee’s website. We have offered the Government the opportunity to respond and, if received, we will publish the response in our next report.

---

13 Letter from Traidcraft.
CORRESPONDENCE

Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012
(Amendment Of Schedule 1) Order 2014

24. We drew this instrument, which introduces a residence test that individuals will need to satisfy in order to access civil legal aid, to the attention of the House in our 40th Report of Session 2013–14 on the grounds that it was legally important and gave rise to matters of policy interest. A response from Shailesh Vara MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Justice, addressing the points raised in that report was published in our 2nd Report of Session 2014–15. Mr Vara has written again to inform us that the Ministry of Justice has now also published on its website an initial draft of further procedural regulations on this matter and intends to place copies in the Library of both Houses.

INSTRUMENTS OF INTEREST

Draft Adoption and Children Act Register (Search and Inspection) (Pilot) Regulations 2014

25. The Department for Education (DfE) has laid these draft Regulations with an Explanatory Memorandum. In the EM, DfE says that the Adoption and Children Act Register ("the Register") is a database that includes details of children waiting to be adopted and of approved prospective adopters. Given the Government’s wish for adopters to have a more active role in identifying children for whom they might be suitable as adoptive parents, DfE intends to run a nine-month pilot scheme allowing adopters access to the Register to identify children for whom they might be appropriate adopters/carers.

26. The objective of the pilot is to test whether allowing adopters such access will improve the performance of the matching service provided by the Register. The adopters involved will be those approved by the adoption agencies listed in the Schedule to the Regulations. DfE says that, since the pilot is designed to test adopter access in agencies that represent different characteristics across England, the pilot agencies are a mix of voluntary adoption agencies and local authorities.

27. The Department undertook a related public consultation over a six-week period between 28 February and 11 April 2014: the Government’s response was published on 29 May 2014. DfE says that respondents were very supportive of the Register proposals and identified the issues that the evaluation of the pilot should examine; and that the Government will include all the suggestions in its evaluation of the pilot.

Draft Copyright and Rights in Performances (Quotation and Parody) Regulations 2014
Draft Copyright and Rights in Performances (Personal Copies for Private Use) Regulations 2014

28. On 27 March 2014, the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) laid five separate affirmative instruments to update the framework of exceptions to copyright and rights in performances, expanding the freedoms in copyright law that allow third parties to use copyright works (such as text, film or music) for a variety of economically and socially valuable purposes, without permission from copyright owners. We took evidence from Viscount Younger of Leckie, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State in the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), in relation to these five instruments on 6 May; and we drew all five to the special attention of the House in our 41st Report of Session 2013–14. Two of the instruments –

---
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those listed above – were subsequently withdrawn by BIS, and were re-laid on 9 June. The other three were approved by the House on 14 May.  

29. In our 41st Report of last Session, we said that we saw the changes proposed in the Regulations as undoubtedly significant, for example in their positive potential for the research sector, and in their negative potential, conversely, for rights-holders in the music sector and elsewhere. We urged the Government to monitor the impact of the changes from the point of implementation, and to respond effectively if it became clear that any negative potential was being realised. The purposes and effects of the instruments now re-laid are on all fours with the earlier versions, and we have no further comment to make on them.

Draft Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (Amendment of Standard Scale of Fines for Summary Offences) Order 2014

Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (Disapplication of Section 85(1), Fines Expressed as Proportions and Consequential Amendments) Regulations 2014

30. These instruments are to be made alongside the commencement of section 85 of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (“the 2012 Act”). The Order increases the maximum amounts of fines at levels 1 to 4 on the standard scale by 400%, preserving the ratios between them as required by the Act. Accordingly, the new levels are: Level 1 £800, Level 2 £2,000, Level 3 £4,000 and Level 4 £10,000. These are maxima. The court would, of course, continue to set the actual level of any fine imposed, having regard to the offender’s financial circumstances as well as the seriousness of the offence, in the usual way. When commenced, section 85(1) of the 2012 Act will have the effect of removing any maximum penalty on summary conviction of £5,000 or more. The change is comprehensive and applies irrespective of whether that penalty is expressed as a numerical amount or with any of the phrases “statutory maximum”, “prescribed sum” or “level 5 on the standard scale”. Instead existing legislation will be ‘glossed’ so that a fine of any amount may be imposed according to the seriousness of the case. The Regulations list a number of specified offences for which this open-ended provision will be disapplied, generally setting the maximum at around £20,000. The House may also wish to note that section 85(2) of the Act will enlarge any power to create an offence punishable on summary conviction by a fine of £5,000 or more (again, however expressed) so that it becomes a power to create an offence punishable on summary conviction by a fine of any amount. These Regulations place no constraints on that power.

---

17 HL Deb, 14 May 2014: col 1882. The three instruments approved were: the draft Copyright and Rights in Performances (Research, Education, Libraries and Archives) Regulations 2014; the draft Copyright and Rights in Performances (Disability) Regulations 2014; and the draft Copyright (Public Administration) Regulations 2014.
Draft Terrorism Act 2000 (Code of Practice for Examining Officers and Review Officers) Order 2014

31. Schedule 7 to the Terrorism Act 2000 allows an examining officer to stop, question, search and detain individuals travelling through UK border controls to determine whether they may be involved in the commission, preparation or instigation of acts of terrorism. This instrument is required to authorise a revised Code of Practice for the officers who conduct such interviews that reflects the amendments made by the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, which include:

- reducing the maximum period of examination from nine to six hours;
- ensuring access to legal advice for all individuals examined for more than one hour and clarifying that it includes consulting a solicitor in person;
- introducing statutory review of the need for continued detention;
- introducing a statutory requirement for training for examining and reviewing officers;
- establishing a statutory basis for undertaking strip searches and repealing the power to seek intimate samples (for example, blood, semen); and
- providing expressly that an examining officer may make and retain a copy of information obtained or found in the course of an examination.

Assisted Areas Order 2014 (SI 2014/1508)

32. The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) has laid this Order, with an Explanatory Memorandum, to specify the Assisted Areas of Great Britain from 1 July 2014. BIS says that, in the context of provisions in EU legislation intended to prevent distortion of competition within the internal market, certain state aid granted to promote the development of certain less economically advantaged areas in the EU, known as Assisted Areas, may be considered by the European Commission to be compatible with the internal market. Member States must designate Assisted Areas in accordance with EU Guidelines, which include a limit on the coverage allowed to each Member State. For the UK this limit is 27.05% of the UK’s population being resident within Assisted Areas, increased from 23.9% in the period 2007–13.

33. BIS says that it carried out a two-stage public consultation. Stage 1, over eight weeks to 30 September 2013, consulted on draft principles for defining the areas that should be included on the draft Assisted Areas Map (“AA Map”). 72 completed response forms were received: 89% broadly supported the principles proposed for developing the 2014–20 AA Map. Stage 2, over seven weeks to 7 February 2014, sought views on a draft AA Map. 229 responses were received. BIS says that there was generally strong support for the areas proposed for inclusion and the spread of population on the draft Map, and that the final Map has sought to take into account respondents’ representations. The Government’s response to the Stage 2 consultation was published on 30 April 2014.¹⁸

INSTRUMENTS NOT DRAWN TO THE SPECIAL ATTENTION OF THE HOUSE

The Committee has considered the instruments set out below and has determined that the special attention of the House need not be drawn to them.

Draft instruments subject to affirmative approval

- Adoption and Children Act Register (Search and Inspection) (Pilot) Regulations 2014
- Copyright and Rights in Performances (Quotation and Parody) Regulations 2014
- Copyright and Rights in Performances (Personal Copies for Private Use) Regulations 2014
- European Union (Definition of Treaties) (Partnership and Cooperation Agreement) (Iraq) Order 2014
- European Union (Definition of Treaties) (Partnership and Cooperation Agreement) (Philippines) Order 2014
- European Union (Definition of Treaties) (Partnership and Cooperation Agreement) (Mongolia) Order 2014
- European Union (Definition of Treaties) (Partnership and Cooperation Agreement) (Vietnam) Order 2014
- Gangmasters (Licensing Authority) Regulations 2014
- The Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (Amendment of Schedule 1: injunctions to prevent gang-related violence) Order 2014
- Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (Amendment of Standard Scale of Fines for Summary Offences) Order 2014
- Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (Disapplication of Section 85(1), Fines Expressed as Proportions and Consequential Amendments) Regulations 2014
- Legal Services Act 2007 (Appeals from Licensing Authority Decisions) (Chartered Institute of Patent Attorneys and Institute of Trade Mark Attorneys) Order 2014
- Legal Services Act 2007 (Appeals from Licensing Authority Decisions) (Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales) Order 2014
- Legal Services Act 2007 (Approved Regulator) Order 2014
- Terrorism Act 2000 (Code of Practice for Examining Officers and Review Officers) Order 2014
**Draft instruments subject to annulment**

Draft Code of Practice No.3: Funding Defined Benefits

**Instruments subject to annulment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HC 198</td>
<td>Statement of Changes in Immigration Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1387</td>
<td>King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (Transfer of Trust Property) Order 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1390</td>
<td>Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust (Transfer of Trust Property) Order 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1459</td>
<td>Quality and Safety of Organs Intended for Transplantation (Amendment) Regulations 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1465</td>
<td>British Nationality (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1505</td>
<td>Tribunal Procedure (Amendment No. 2) Rules 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1507</td>
<td>Plymouth College of Art (Transfer to the Higher Education Sector) Order 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1508</td>
<td>Assisted Areas Order 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1509</td>
<td>Fuel and Electricity (Heating) (Control) (Revocations) Order 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1510</td>
<td>Olympic Lotteries (Payments out of the Olympic Lottery Distribution Fund) Regulations 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1511</td>
<td>Child Benefit (General) and the Tax Credits (Residence) (Amendment) Regulations 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1513</td>
<td>Immigration (Passenger Transit Visa) (Amendment) Order 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI 2014/1530</td>
<td>Special Educational Needs and Disability Regulations 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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