

EAMA position on the **Retained EU Law** (Revocation and Reform) **Bill**

Comments are restricted to the many technical regulations affecting the machinery sector that the UK has carried over from our membership of the EU, while recognising there are also concerns over employment and environmental regulations. Our main points:

- 1 There is a lack of clarity as to the government's intentions and how revocations and reforms will work in practice, including what could be changed by SI and what would need primary legislation. I suspect this is taxing civil servants as well as stakeholders.
- 2 There is no clamour from the machinery sector for widespread reform of these technical regulations, many of which the UK helped to shape. There is strong desire that proposals for substantive change be properly considered with industry, to establish the benefits and drawbacks for the UK. There is no urgent need for change.
- 3 Publicity around REUL not only fails to resolve uncertainties, it is a distraction. Industry's main focus in this area is on whether and how our technical regulations should evolve in future, and the extent to which we take account of what developments take place in other jurisdictions, especially the EU. This is where government attention should be focused.
- 4 Meanwhile, industry is also looking for government to come forward with SIs that are urgently needed, to give effect to specific technical commitments that have already been made. An example is the SI for easements related to UKCA marking requirements. An SI was laid by the Johnson government and subsequently withdrawn by the Truss government. At time of writing, we are waiting for BEIS to make clear the position of the Sunak government. Having had three sets of ministers in quick succession, industry is looking for stability and consolidation.