



# **REPORT OF THE POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW OF THE CIVIL CONTINGENCIES ACT (2004) (CONTINGENCY PLANNING) REGULATIONS 2005**

Presented to Parliament pursuant to Regulation 59 of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Contingency Planning) Regulations 2005, as amended by the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 (Contingency Planning) (Amendment) Regulations 2012

March 2017



© Crown copyright 2017

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](http://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3) or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at [www.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications)

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at [ccs@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:ccs@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk)

Print ISBN 9781474141758

Web ISBN 9781474141765

ID 06031703 03/17 59132

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum

Printed in the UK by the Williams Lea Group on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office

the work of practitioners and aid the assessment of capabilities and performance. The project is expected to be underway in mid-2017.

18. These standards will be created by the responders themselves (the organisations to which the standards will apply), which will increase their accuracy, relevance, acceptance and eventual uptake. In order to do so, CCS will facilitate detailed discussions with responders and other interested parties to agree what “good” looks like and the nature of barriers to achieving it. It is during these discussions that any governance or legislative issues will be uncovered, and non-legislative means to addressing those issues can be fully explored.

## **D: Our current knowledge**

### **Broad situation**

19. We have regular contact with those with responsibilities under the CCA through a variety of forums. There is no specific evidence, anecdotal or from the RCS, to suggest that major legislative change is required. In practice – based on our regular conversations with interested parties, exercises and lessons learned from real incidents – the legislative framework appears fit for purpose.

### **Knowledge of local resilience and the practice of local responders**

20. CCS and the Department for Communities and Local Government’s Resilience and Emergencies Division (DCLG RED) have a well-developed knowledge of the practice of local resilience through working with both local resilience forums, and with local responders planning for and responding to emergencies. This knowledge, which includes learning from emergencies and exercises, indicates that although there may be a need to consider the way in which the CCA, Regulations and guidance are being interpreted by central government and responders, there is no clear case for reviewing the regulatory framework itself.

### **Data from the National Capabilities Survey 2014**

21. A total of 79 transport companies and 57 utilities companies were invited to participate in the survey. Responses were received from 10 transport companies and 34 utilities companies.
22. The responses highlighted the following issues to be carried forward for further exploration in workstreams 2 and 3 of this review:
- Are there any opportunities for aligning, coordinating or sharing assurance activities or their outcomes to improve efficiency and effectiveness?
  - Are category 2 responders aware of the minimum requirements made by the legislation?
  - What are the motivators for taking part in activities beyond these minimum requirements?
    - To what extent does this align with commercial, corporate social responsibility or other “business as usual” imperatives?