EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM TO

THE TRIBUNAL PROCEDURE AND EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) RULES 2026

2026 No. 115 (L. 3)

AND

THE EMPLOYMENT APPEAL TRIBUNAL (AMENDMENT) RULES 2026

2026 No. 114

1. Introduction

1.1 This Explanatory Memorandum has been prepared by the Ministry of Justice and is laid before Parliament by Command of His Majesty.

2. Declaration

2.1 Sarah Sackman MP, Minister of State for Courts and Legal Services at the Ministry of Justice confirms that this Explanatory Memorandum meets the required standard.

2.2 Rawfiah Choudry, Deputy Director for Tribunals, Fees and Irregular Migration Policy at the Ministry of Justice confirms that this Explanatory Memorandum meets the required standard.

3. Contact

3.1 Vijay Parkash at the Ministry of Justice can be contacted by email at the following address with any queries regarding these instruments: Vijay.Parkash@justice.gov.uk.

Part One: Explanation, and context, of the Instrument

4. Overview of the Instruments

What does the legislation do?

The Tribunal Procedure and Employment Tribunal Procedure (Amendment) Rules 2026 ("the Amendment Rules")

4.1 The Amendment Rules make amendments to the rules of procedure that apply to each chamber of the First-tier Tribunal (other than the Social Entitlement Chamber) and the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024 ("ET Rules"), which applies to the employment tribunals ("ET").

4.2 Broadly, the Amendment Rules make the following changes:

(a) in the First-tier Tribunal ("FtT"),

- in all chambers (other than the Social Entitlement Chamber), reduces the time limits for when an application to the tribunal can be made to request written reasons for its decisions. The TPC agreed with the former SPT's view that there would be no change in the Social Entitlement Chamber for reducing the time limit for requesting written reasons. Requests in this chamber are often said to be received outside the current one-month time limit, often resulting in extensions being requested and granted. Reducing the current time limit may

generate further judicial work through the need to consider applications for extensions of time;

- in the Tax Chamber ("TC"), amends the time limits for the tribunal to provide a decision notice and reasons, and changes the circumstances in which a decision notice can be provided without reasons or a summary of them;
- in the General Regulatory Chamber ("GRC"), enables the tribunal to re-allocate cases to a different track at any time, following an initial allocation made by practice direction, and sets out when written reasons must, or a written summary of reasons may, be given by the tribunal according to the track a case is allocated;
- in the Health, Education and Social Care Chamber ("HESC"), enables the tribunal to dispose of proceedings concerning specified decisions without a hearing;

(b) in the ET,

- clarifies the availability of dispute resolution appointments and judicial assessments as a means of alternative dispute resolution;
- enables the tribunal to reject the whole or part of a claim, response or reply, if no grounds are set out for it;
- enables the tribunal, if it considers it in the interests of justice, to disapply rule 22 (effect of non-presentation) if it does not receive a reply to an employer's contract claim in the specified period;
- enables the tribunal to provide summary reasons for a judgment orally at a hearing and subsequently in writing where requested;
- enables the tribunal to direct a party to provide a draft of a case management order to the tribunal or the other party;
- provides that any written summary of reasons and certain judgments do not have to be entered on to the Register of Judgments and Written Reasons ("the Register");
- consolidates and aligns the requirements to provide copies of decisions to a referring court;
- homogenise references in the rules to written records.

The Employment Appeal Tribunal (Amendment) Rules 2025 ("the EAT Amendment Rules")

4.3 The EAT Amendment Rules make amendments to the rules governing the procedure in the Employment Appeal Tribunal ("EAT") as a consequence of amendments made to the ET Rules by the Amendment Rules, enabling an employment tribunal to provide summary reasons for a judgment orally at a hearing and subsequently in writing where requested.

4.4 The EAT Amendment Rules require that an appeal from a judgment of an ET must be accompanied by written full reasons and clarifies when the time limit for instituting an appeal begins.

Where does the legislation extend to, and apply?

The Amendment Rules

4.5 The territorial extent of the Amendment Rules (that is, the jurisdiction(s) in which the instrument forms part of the law) is England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

4.6 The territorial application of the Amendment Rules (that is, where the instrument produces a practical effect) is the same as the application of the instruments to which the amendments relate. Practically, the amendments that effect the War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber ("WPAFC"), HESC and Property Chamber apply to proceedings in England and Wales. The amendments that effect the TC, GRC and Immigration and Asylum Chamber ("IAC") apply to proceedings in England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The amendments that effect the ET apply to proceedings in England and Wales and Scotland.

The EAT Amendment Rules

4.7 The territorial extent and application of the EAT Amendment Rules is England and Wales and Scotland.

5. Policy Context

What is being done and why?

Amendments to the provision of written reasons for decisions disposing of proceedings and other related changes

5.1 Following a request from the former Senior President of Tribunal's ("SPT"), the written reasons consultation exercise ran between July and October 2024. This consultation concerned the extent to which specific chambers of the FtT and the ET are required to provide written reasons for decisions disposing of proceedings and other related changes. Following consideration of respondents views, the TPC considered that it was appropriate that some of the rule changes proposed should be taken forward.

Reducing the time limits to request discretionary written reasons

5.2 The Amendment Rules reduce the time limits for parties to request discretionary written reasons in certain chambers and proceedings in the FtT as set out in the table below. These amendments reflect that requesting written reasons is straightforward and requires little effort. Longer time periods to make such requests can unnecessarily prolong the disposal of proceedings and increase the judicial time involved.

First-tier Tribunal Chamber	Current time limit for requesting written reasons	New time limit for requesting written reasons
Immigration and Asylum Chamber ('in country' cases other than asylum or humanitarian protection cases)	28 days.	14 days.
Property Chamber (in cases relating to rent)	1 month.	14 days.

Tax Chamber	28 days.	14 days.
War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber	42 days.	28 days.

5.3 The Amendment Rules do not amend the 28-day time limit for a party to request discretionary written reasons where the appellant is outside the United Kingdom. This maintains consistency and avoids confusion, as appellants who are abroad currently have 28 days to lodge their appeal or permission to appeal application against the tribunal's decision. In contrast, appellants in-country are given 14 days. This longer period reflects that appellants abroad will not have attended the hearing either in person or remotely, they will not have had the benefit of seeing how the appeal progressed at the hearing, how well witnesses withstood cross-examination, or the questions from the judge and final submissions. The 28-day period therefore reflects that such appellants require more time, frequently with the aid of an interpreter, to provide instructions and decide whether to pursue an appeal.

5.4 In addition, the Amendment Rules do not make changes to asylum or humanitarian protection cases in the IAC, or to proceedings in the Property Chamber (other than cases relating to rent), for which the tribunal must always provide written reasons (see rule 29(3)(a) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Immigration and Asylum Chamber) Rules 2014, and rule 36(2)(b) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013).

Removing the requirement for a decision notice in the TC to be provided within 28 days

5.5 Rule 35(2) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Tax Chamber) Rules 2009 requires the tribunal to provide a decision notice which disposes of proceedings within 28 days of making a decision, or as soon as practicable thereafter. Although the 28-day period is not a fixed deadline, it nevertheless sets an expectation that this period will normally be met. The TPC considered that it was not necessary for an indicative deadline to be provided, as there will be cases where it is reasonable for a decision notice to be provided much earlier, however in more complex cases a 28-day period is unrealistic. The Amendment Rules therefore amend rule 35(2) to remove reference to the 28-day period but retain a requirement for a decision notice to be provided "as soon as reasonably practicable". For consistency, rule 35(6) is also amended so that written full reasons must be provided "as soon as reasonably practicable" after an application is received.

Removing the requirement for the parties' consent to issue a decision notice in the TC without written reasons, where oral reasons have been given at a hearing

5.6 The Amendment Rules remove the requirement for the tribunal to obtain the consent of each party before issuing a decision notice without reasons where an oral decision, with reasons, has been provided at a hearing. As parties will already have been provided with oral reasons, obtaining consent for the tribunal to give a decision notice without reasons is an unnecessary procedural step. This change promotes more efficient use of judicial time and brings the TC Rules in line with other chambers, which permit decision notices to be issued without written reasons and without the need for the parties' consent.

Allocation of cases in the GRC to 'tracks' by practice direction and the provision of summary reasons

5.7 The Amendment Rules specify that cases in the GRC are to be automatically allocated by practice direction to either the 'standard track' or the 'open track', with discretion for the tribunal to re-allocate a case to a different track at any time, where it is in the interests of justice to do so. This avoids the need for any judicial decision to be made when proceedings are begun. The current SPT has issued the *Practice Direction: Allocation of Cases to Track in the First-tier Tribunal (General Regulatory Chamber)*[1], which allocates proceedings falling within the category of cases listed in the Schedule to the standard track and all other proceedings to the open track. The Practice Direction comes into effect at the same time as the Amendment Rules.

5.8 In standard track cases, the tribunal may give either written reasons or a written summary of its reasons; in open track cases, written reasons must always be given. The Amendment Rules also introduce an indicative 21-day period for issuing decision notices in standard track cases, reflecting that such cases are intended to be less complex and capable of being determined more quickly. By contrast, in open track cases the tribunal must provide its decision notice "as soon as reasonably practicable" recognising that these cases will generally be more complex and not suited to an indicative timeframe. These amendments are intended to ensure that cases are dealt with promptly and in a manner proportionate to, and commensurate with, their complexity.

Enabling provision of summary reasons in the ET

5.9 The Amendment Rules enable the ET to provide 'summary' reasons for its decisions orally at a hearing. Summary reasons are intended to be shorter than 'full' reasons, crafted specifically with the parties in mind, as parties will already be familiar with the case and capturing the essential reasoning of the ET. Where summary reasons are given orally, parties may first apply for written summary reasons, and once provided, may apply for written full reasons. Where a request for written summary reasons is received, the ET may instead where appropriate, provide written full reasons. These changes aim to encourage the ET to provide summary reasons orally at a hearing in suitable cases, reduce the need for written full reasons in every case, thereby saving judicial time and speeding up case resolution.

Special Educational Needs and Disability Refusal to Assess Appeals ("Refusal Appeals")

5.10 In April 2024, the TPC received a request from the Ministry of Justice ("MoJ"), proposing amendments to rule 23 of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Health, Education and Social Care Chamber) Rules 2008 ("HESC Rules"), concerning Special Educational Needs and Disability ("SEND") appeals, specifically appeals where a local authority has refused to carry out an Education, Health and Care ("EHC") needs assessment ("Refusal Appeals"). Rule 23 of the HESC Rules specifies the circumstances where the Tribunal can determine a case without a hearing. Specifically, rule 23(1)(a) of the HESC Rules requires both the appellant and the respondent to consent to the case being decided without a hearing.

5.11 The MoJ's request for amendment was prompted by the significant increase in SEND appeal volumes, long waiting times for hearings and the low proportion of cases decided on the papers (14.5%). Decisions made on paper are significantly quicker than hearings and could improve access to justice for children and young people requiring

[1] https://www.judiciary.uk/courts-and-tribunals/tribunals/first-tier-tribunal/general-regulatory-chamber/general-regulatory-chamber-guidance-and-information/

timely EHC assessments. Evidence indicates that appellants succeed in the majority of Refusal Appeals, and the current consent requirement may allow local authorities to delay proceedings.

5.12 Having considered the outcome to the "Refusal Appeals Consultation, the TPC concluded that it was appropriate to take forward the rule changes. Further details of the consultation and its outcome are set out at paragraphs 7.5 to 7.7.

5.13 The Amendment Rules remove the requirement for the parties to consent for a Refusal Appeal to be determined on the papers, leaving to the tribunal's discretion on whether to decide the matter without a hearing.

Amendments to the ET Rules (other than the provision of summary reasons)

5.14 The TPC conducted a consultation on changes to the ET Rules that ran from 24 March to 19 May 2025 ("the ET Consultation"). The ET Consultation was largely based on changes requested by the ET Presidents, either to update the rules to reflect more accurately current ET practice, improve tribunal efficiency and reduce administrative and judicial burdens. Having considered the outcome to the consultation, the TPC concluded that it was appropriate to take forward the rule changes set out in paragraphs 5.15 to 5.20. Further details in respect to the consultation and its outcome are set out in paragraphs 7.8 to 7.11.

Dispute resolution appointments ("DRAs")

5.15 The ET rules require the tribunal, where appropriate, to encourage parties to engage in alternative dispute resolution ("ADR"). Dispute resolution appointments ("DRAs") are a type of ADR held as a form of preliminary hearing without the need for parties' consent, at which a judge provides an impartial evaluation of the parties' prospects. However, DRAs are not explicitly recognised by the rules. The Amendment Rules amend rules 4 and 52 of the ET Rules to refer to DRAs, formalising existing practice and increasing awareness of the tribunal's power to conduct them.

Requiring grounds for bringing or defending a claim to be set out

5.16 The ET Rules do not expressly require that a claim or a response to a claim must set out the grounds on which a claim is respectively brought or defended. Although rule 13(1)(b) allows the tribunal to reject a claim where it 'cannot be sensibly responded to', there is no equivalent provision enabling the tribunal to reject a response that contains no grounds of defence. The Amendment Rules therefore introduce a requirement for parties to state the grounds for bringing or defending a claim. This change is intended to support effective case management, reduce delays caused by inadequate pleadings and reduce the need for the tribunal to make orders requesting further information.

Waiving the consequences of not providing a reply to an employer's contract claim

5.17 Where an employee brings a contract claim, the respondent may bring a contractual counter claim ("an employer's contract claim"). Where a claimant does not reply to an employer's contract claim, the ET Rules impose strict consequences similar to default judgment. Sometimes employer's contract claims are overlooked and only become apparent at the final hearing. This creates a number of issues, including that the claimant will be out of time to provide a reply against the claim. This risks creating unfairness, particularly for unrepresented parties who often have not realised the potential consequences of not replying in time and have not had this highlighted to them. The Amendment Rules address these issues by enabling the tribunal to waive

the consequences of a failure to provide a response where it is in the interests of justice to do so.

Directing a party to draft a case management order

5.18 Tribunals currently draft most case management orders, but in some cases, parties are better placed to prepare draft orders. The Amendment Rules give the tribunal greater flexibility to direct a party to supply a draft case management order, where appropriate, to the tribunal or to another party. This change reflects that drafting a case management order can help clarify the nature of the order sought and encourage agreement between the parties, thereby potentially saving judicial time and improving the quality of the resulting order.

Excluding written summary reasons and certain judgments of the ET from being entered onto the Register

5.19 The ET Rules allow ET judgments to be reconsidered. A refusal of a reconsideration application is itself a judgment, and that judgment is susceptible to further reconsideration, with each refusal treated as a separate judgment that must be placed on the Register. In a small number of cases, this results in multiple refusal decisions being published on the same matter, creating a significant administrative burden. The Amendment Rules therefore remove the requirement to publish judgments made under rule 70(2) that refuse a reconsideration application, on the grounds that substantially the same application has already been made and refused. This aims to reduce the administrative burden without affecting the rights of the parties to apply for reconsideration. For similar reasons, written summary reasons are also excluded from the requirement to publish, although the tribunal retains discretion to publish them where appropriate.

Minor drafting improvements

5.20 During the drafting exercise it became clear that there was an opportunity to consolidate and align the requirements of rules 59 and 66, which make provision in cases that have been referred by the courts, for a copy of the ET's decision to be sent to that court. The Amendment Rules remove the requirement from rule 59 and make minor changes to rule 66 so that the requirement to provide a copy of an ET decision sits entirely within that rule. The amendment to rule 66 also makes it clear that the requirement applies to both case management orders and judgments. In addition, the Amendment Rules homogenise references in the rules to written records to improve clarity and consistency.

Amendments to the EAT Rules (consequential amendments)

5.21 Rule 3 of the EAT Rules currently requires an appeal against a judgment of the ET to be instituted by serving a notice of appeal with a copy of the ET's judgment and written reasons. The time limit for instituting an appeal begins, from the date that written reasons were sent to the parties, or if these were not requested in time, from the date judgment was sent to the parties. Due to the introduction of summary reasons in the ET (see paragraph 5.9), reference in the EAT Rules to "written reasons" could be read as including "written summary reasons". This is undesirable as it may give rise to appeals being brought prematurely, without parties having the benefit of written full reasons, which the EAT requires written full reasons to determine appeals. To avoid any change to appeal requirements, the EAT Amendment Rules amend rule 3 and Form 1 in the Schedule, to substitute various references to "written reasons" with "written full reasons". In addition, reference to "other decisions" in paragraph 6

of Form 1 has been removed. This phrase reflected terminology used in the 2013 Rules and is a legacy from those rules. Under the current ET Rules, ET decisions are now clearly defined as being either case management orders or judgments and only judgments of the ET can be reconsidered under Part 12 of the ET Rules. Accordingly, the earlier reference to "other decisions" is no longer necessary.

6. Legislative and Legal Context

How has the law changed?

6.1 The Amendment Rules amend the following instruments:

- the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (War Pensions and Armed Forces Compensation Chamber) Rules 2008 ("the WPAFCC Rules");
- the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Health, Education and Social Care Chamber) Rules 2008 ("the HESC Rules");
- the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Tax Chamber) Rules 2009 ("the TC Rules");
- the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (General Regulatory Chamber) Rules 2009 ("the GRC Rules");
- the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013 ("the PC Rules");
- the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Immigration and Asylum Chamber) Rules 2014 ("the IAC Rules");
- the Employment Tribunal Procedure Rules 2024 ("the ET Rules").

6.2 The Amendment Rules make the amendments set out in paragraphs 5.1 to 5.20, for the reasons given in those paragraphs.

6.3 The EAT Amendment Rules make amendments to the EAT Rules as set out in paragraph 5.21, for the reasons given in that paragraph.

Why was this approach taken to change the law?

6.4 This is the only possible approach to make the necessary changes.

7. Consultation

Summary of consultation outcomes

The Written Reasons Consultation

7.1 The TPC publicly consulted on proposals to amend the provision of written reasons for decisions disposing of proceedings and related changes ("the Written Reasons Consultation"), which ran from 30 July to 22 October 2024[2].

7.2 As the Written Reasons Consultation was published before the ET Rules came into force, references to the 'ET rules' in the consultation were to the rules contained in Schedules 1 to 3 to the Employment Tribunals (Constitution and Rules of Procedure) Regulations 2013 ("the 2013 Rules"). The 2013 Rules have since been revoked and replaced by the ET Rules . Accordingly, the proposals and consultation outcome are considered by reference to the equivalent provisions in the ET Rules.

[2] https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-procedure-rules-on-the-provision-of-written-reasons-for-decisions

7.3 A total of 28 responses were received from a mix of professional bodies, judiciary, representative organisations and individuals. Broadly, the majority neither supported nor opposed the proposals, with some respondents providing no comments or generalised comments without addressing the question. With the exception of the proposal to restrict the right to apply for written reasons to an unsuccessful party, where the majority of respondents opposed the proposal. Respondents regarded the proposal as inconsistent with the principles of natural justice and open justice, noting that written reasons are essential to ensure transparency, equality of arms and public confidence in the tribunal process.

7.4 The TPC having considered all representations concluded that the proposals in the consultation should be taken forward, with the exception of the proposals to limit the right to apply for written reasons of the tribunal's decision. The TPC agreed that, as a matter of principle, both successful and unsuccessful parties should be entitled to request written reasons, and it acknowledged the significant practical reasons identified by respondents as to why successful parties may require such reasons. Further details as to the TPC's Reply to the Consultation can be found here[3]

Refusal Appeals Consultation

7.5 The TPC's Refusal to Appeal Consultation[4] took place between October to November 2024, seeking views on two alternative proposals for amendments to rule 23 of the HESC Rules, with the aim of improving judicial and administrative efficiency and providing speedier decisions on Refusal Appeals.

7.6 A total of 40 responses were received. 25 supported change, 8 opposed both proposals, 5 expressed generalised support in favour of both proposals, and 2 explained their reasons for non-participation. Opponents of both proposals argued that changes should occur only as part of wider SEND reforms, that mutual consent protects fairness and trust, and that removing it risks undermining confidence, increasing adversarial tensions, and disadvantaging local authorities. They stressed the importance of oral hearings for full evidence examination.

7.7 The TPC noted that the proposals had support from the Chamber President of HESC and the Deputy Chamber President responsible for SEND appeals. The TPC determined that both proposals would promote efficiency but concluded that rule 23 should be amended to leave to judicial discretion whether a Refusal Appeal is heard on the papers. The TPC considered this was fairer, preserved equality of arms and avoided perceptions of bias. Further details on the TPC's position is set out in its Response to the Consultation[5].

The ET Rules Consultation

7.8 The TPC consulted on changes to the ET Rules that ran from 24 March 2025 to 19 May 2025 ("the ET Consultation") [6], to update the rules to reflect more accurately current ET practice, improve tribunal efficiency, and reduce administrative and judicial burdens.

[3] https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-procedure-rules-on-the-provision-of-written-reasons-for-decisions
[4] https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/possible-amendments-to-the-health-education-and-social-care-chamber-rules-2008
[5] https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/67f64c82b7e44efc70acc3ca/send-consultation-response.pdf
[6] https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/potential-further-changes-to-the-employment-tribunal-rules

7.9 A total of 12 responses were received from a mix of professional bodies, judiciary, representative organisations and individuals.

7.10 Some respondents raised specific concerns to the proposals on changes. An opponent to the proposed changes to rule 4 and the proposed rule 52(1)(f) cited concerns that DRAs do not occur in Scotland and the amendment may empower Scottish judges to conduct DRAs without presidential guidance. An opponent to the proposed changes to rule 13(1)(b) and rule 18(1) raised concerns that it is likely to create a barrier for unrepresented litigants, who generally lacked understanding of the issues in their claim and were likely to produce unordered statements perceived to be relevant. An opponent with the proposed amendment to rule 26 argued that employer's contract claims can be of significant value and should therefore require a properly pleaded defence. Opponents of the proposal rule 30(4) argued that providing a draft should be on a purely voluntary basis, with potential risks of one party unduly influencing case management. An opponent to the proposed change to rule 65 argued that repeated refusals may highlight vexatious conduct that ought to remain publicly recorded and suggested that concerns about resourcing impact would be better addressed through more robust powers to manage such behaviour.

7.11 Broadly, the majority of respondents supported the proposals. In light of this support, the TPC concluded that the proposals should be taken forward, with some proposals implemented with changes to give clearer effect to the underlying policy intention. Further details on the TPC's position are set out in its Response to the Consultation[7].

8. Applicable Guidance

8.1 His Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service produces guidance for each Tribunal jurisdiction which is issued to parties at key stages of the appeals process and is available here [8].

Part Two: Impact and the Better Regulation Framework

9. Impact Assessment

9.1 An Impact Assessment has not been prepared for these instruments as its impact is expected to be minimal and well below the threshold of £5 million per annum at which an assessment must be prepared.

Impact on businesses, charities and voluntary bodies

9.2 There is no, or no significant, impact on business, charities or voluntary bodies.

9.3 There is no, or no significant, impact on the public sector.

10. Monitoring and review

What is the approach to monitoring and reviewing this legislation?

10.1 The MoJ and the TPC approach the monitoring of the impact of changes to the Tribunal Procedure Rules, ET Rules and the EAT Rules by way of feedback received from the Tribunal, His Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service and tribunal users.

10.2 The Amendment Rules and the EAT Amendment Rules do not include a statutory review clause. The legislation applies to activities that are undertaken by small

[7] https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/potential-further-changes-to-the-employment-tribunal-rules
[8] https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/hm-courts-and-tribunals-service/about

businesses in so far as they may be appellants in proceedings before the FtT, ET and the EAT.

Part Three: Statements and Matters of Particular Interest to Parliament

11. Matters of special interest to Parliament

11.1 There are no matters of special interest to Parliament.

12. European Convention on Human Rights

12.1 As both the Amendment Rules and the EAT Amendment Rules are subject to the negative resolution procedure and do not amend primary legislation no statement is required.

13. The Relevant European Union Acts

13.1 The Amendment Rules and the EAT Amendment Rules are not made under the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018, the European Union (Future Relationship) Act 2020 or the Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023 ("relevant European Union Acts").