



House of Commons
Environmental Audit
Committee

**Government Response
to the Committee's
Eighth Report of
Session 2005–06 on
Proposals for a draft
Marine Bill**

Fifth Special Report of Session 2005-06

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed Tuesday 24 October 2006*

The Environmental Audit Committee

The Environmental Audit Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to consider to what extent the policies and programmes of government departments and non-departmental public bodies contribute to environmental protection and sustainable development; to audit their performance against such targets as may be set for them by Her Majesty's Ministers; and to report thereon to the House.

Current membership

Mr Tim Yeo, MP (*Conservative, South Suffolk*) (Chairman)
Ms Celia Barlow, MP (*Labour, Hove*)
Mr Martin Caton, MP (*Labour, Gower*)
Mr Colin Challen, MP (*Labour, Morley and Rothwell*)
Mr David Chaytor, MP (*Labour, Bury North*)
Mr Tim Farron, MP (*Liberal Democrat, Westmorland and Lonsdale*)
Mr David Howarth, MP (*Liberal Democrat, Cambridge*)
Mr Nick Hurd, MP (*Conservative, Ruislip Northwood*)
Mr Ian Pearson, MP (*Labour, Dudley South*) [*ex-officio*]
Mr Mark Pritchard, MP (*Conservative, Wrekin, The*)
Mrs Linda Riordan, MP (*Labour, Halifax*)
Mr Graham Stuart, MP (*Conservative, Beverley & Holderness*)
Ms Emily Thornberry, MP (*Labour, Islington South & Finsbury*)
Dr Desmond Turner, MP (*Labour, Brighton, Kempton*)
Mr Ed Vaizey, MP (*Conservative, Wantage*)
Joan Walley, MP (*Labour, Stoke-on-Trent North*)

Powers

The constitution and powers are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally Standing Order No. 152A. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at: www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/environmental_audit_committee.cfm.

A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Parliament is at the back of this volume.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are: Mike Hennessy (Clerk); Sara Howe (Second Clerk); Richard Douglas (Committee Specialist); Oliver Bennett (Committee Specialist); Louise Smith (Committee Assistant); Caroline McElwee (Secretary); and Robert Long (Senior Office Clerk).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to The Clerk, Environmental Audit Committee, Committee Office, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general inquiries is: 020 7219 6150; the Committee's e-mail address is: eacom@parliament.uk

References

In the footnotes of this Report, references to oral evidence are indicated by 'Q' followed by the question number. References to written evidence are indicated by page number as in 'Ev12'. number HC *-II

Fifth Special Report

Proposals for a draft Marine Bill—Government Response

1. The Environmental Audit Committee published its report on *Proposals for a draft Marine Bill* on Tuesday 25 July 2006 as HC 1323.
2. The Government's Response to the Committee's Report was received on Thursday 5 October 2006 in the form of a memorandum to the Committee. It is reproduced as an Appendix to this Special Report.

Government response

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT: "Proposals for a draft Marine Bill" (Eighth Report of Session 2005-06)

Introduction

The Government welcomes the Eighth Report of the Environmental Audit Committee which considers the Government's consultation on proposals for a Marine Bill. It highlights a number of the issues Government faces in developing its proposals and makes helpful recommendations and conclusions.

The conclusions and recommendations emphasise the importance of an open and transparent process for developing proposals and of involving everyone with an interest in the issues in that development process. An extraordinarily broad range of individuals and organisations have an interest in the proposals we are developing. The Government continues to be keen to harness the enthusiasm and commitment of all these groups and individuals. The Government intends to build on the work and engagement accomplished so far and to provide the strong leadership and the commitment required to take the work forward.

This review comes during a period of consultation on early proposals for a Marine Bill. The scope and content of future proposals will need to take account of the views expressed by those with an interest in what was set out in the consultation. We would not wish to pre-empt the outcome of that process or to commit Government to any specific approaches until full consideration has been given to all of the available evidence. With this in mind, the Government's response to each of the Committee's recommendations is set out below.

Response to the Committee's Conclusions and Recommendations:

Recommendation 1: We commend WWF-UK, and those bodies with whom it works, for drawing up its own draft Marine Bill and for pressing Defra to move forward in this area. Likewise we commend Defra for the openness of its dialogue with WWF-UK and other interested bodies prior to its decision to go ahead with plans to introduce a Government Bill for the marine environment. (Paragraph 9)

Agreed. Government recognises the need for full participation of those with an interest in shaping the scope of our policies and our overall strategy as an integral part of policy making. We set out this approach in the 2002 Marine Stewardship Report . We want to involve stakeholders in developing and taking forward our proposals and monitoring progress made in meeting our goals.

Recommendation 2: The Government is to be encouraged to establish a robust structure within the Bill for the resolution of conflicts between those who appear to favour the economic or social pillars of sustainable development over the environmental pillar, and vice-versa. However, it is clear to us that all users of the sea will have to observe environmental limits if the marine environment is not to be degraded still further. In that respect, environmental issues, including marine conservation, must be placed at the very heart of the Bill. (Paragraph 15)

Agreed. The Government's commitment is to a new framework for the seas, based on marine spatial planning, that balances conservation, energy and resource needs. In making that commitment Government recognised that to obtain best value from different uses of our valuable marine resources, we must maintain and protect the ecosystems on which they depend. We want to protect and enhance what we have, whilst at the same time deriving sustainable economic and social benefit.

The framework must be compatible with our national and international commitments and obligations to provide protection of the marine environment and halt the decline in biodiversity by 2010. An holistic ecosystem approach already lies at the heart of our strategy to integrate conservation objectives with sustainable social and economic development goals. Government has also adopted strategic goals for the marine environment including conserving and enhancing the overall quality of our seas, their natural processes and their biodiversity.

Strengthening our ability to protect and restore marine habitats and biodiversity is therefore a key element of the proposals Government is considering, including new mechanisms such as protected areas for important species and habitats and improved enforcement arrangements.

Recommendation 3: It is very disappointing that the timetable for the Marine Bill has slipped. We believe that some of the delay has been caused by uncertainties and doubts at the outset as to what the scope of the Bill ought to be. (Paragraph 19)

Recommendation 4: We call on Defra to establish as soon as possible what the next stage of the process is to be, to issue a draft Bill or another consultation which deals with the detailed substance of the Bill, and—if the latter—to commit itself to place the draft Bill before Parliament before the end of the next Session, 2006-07, with a view to

its enactment as early as possible in Session 2007-08. If a further round of consultation does not materially affect the timing of the draft Bill being brought before Parliament then we think it essential that such a round proceeds. It would be unsatisfactory were the Bill's timetable to slip any further. (Paragraph 19)

Partially agreed. Government is working hard to move forward as quickly as is practicable and to develop and bring forward proposals for a Marine Bill for introduction during this Parliament. This is a hugely ambitious and substantially unique project covering a broad range of issues that have a direct impact on us all. Many of those with an interest see this as a significant opportunity to provide a robust forward looking framework to secure the future health, resilience and productivity of our marine area. Government has a responsibility to ensure that its proposals are soundly evidence based and deliver real benefits. We must therefore take the time to consult widely, to assess the impacts that our proposals may have and ensure that they are appropriate and proportionate.

We are working to develop and agree proposals across UK Government and with the administrations in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland so that we can undertake a further round of consultation as early as possible in 2007. Whether we can progress to consult on a draft Bill or whether a further consultation on more detailed proposals is needed first depends on whether we have the evidence base that we need and if there is sufficient consensus about the direction we should be taking with our proposals.

Over 1200 responses to the Marine Bill consultation were submitted, a proportion of which are extensive and detailed. With so many interested parties it is inevitable that there will be a wide range of views expressed. Views about the rate of development of our proposals range from progress being too slow to concerns that there has been insufficient time and detail to properly consider our proposals. Our analysis of the responses to the recent consultation will determine the timetable and arrangements for the next. Nevertheless we are still committed and striving towards introducing a Bill in this Parliament.

Recommendation 5: It is disappointing that the consultation issued by Defra in March does not suggest that the future Marine Bill will be as holistic a piece of legislation as so many hoped for, or as really appears to be needed. While a new consultation may lead to more areas than just the modernisation of Sea Fisheries Committees being brought from the domain of fisheries into the draft Bill, Defra needs seriously to consider how successful a Marine Act will be which fails to integrate something as central as fisheries into the rest of the marine environment. (Paragraph 27)

Recommendation 6: We press Defra to inform as much of the second consultation as possible with the substance of the responses on matters relating to fisheries received from the first consultation: and to extend the proposals for the Marine Bill to cover as many fisheries issues as possible in order to ensure legislative and administrative integration. (Paragraph 27)

Partially agreed. We want to manage fisheries effectively within a flourishing marine environment and are looking at the relationship between fisheries and proposals across the scope of the Marine Bill to ensure this. Fisheries have a major part to play in the sustainable development of the marine environment at the national, European and international level.

The Government's objective is to bring forward holistic legislative proposals that take account of all activities wherever they occur in the marine area.

The consultation did not make any specific proposals or invite responses on managing marine fisheries since there has already been extensive engagement with stakeholders surrounding the publication of a number of recent reviews of the fisheries sector, including the Bradley Review on Marine Fisheries and Environmental Enforcement and the Prime Ministers Strategy Unit Report, Net Benefits. We set out clearly in the consultation however, a number of areas where we consider that changes to existing primary legislation or new legislation may be required to deliver Government commitments to strengthen the way we manage fisheries and develop fisheries policy. We also identified where these proposals and fisheries management as a whole would interact with or have to be taken into account in other areas such as our proposals for marine planning and nature conservation.

We are engaging with stakeholders on many of our proposals for the Marine Bill, most recently on the reform of Sea Fisheries Committees in England, and this will continue as we further develop our policies. There will be further opportunity at the next round of consultation for stakeholders to comment on the full package of fisheries measures.

Proposals for new legislation are only part of the Government's approach to achieving its vision of clean healthy safe productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas. The Government's preferred approach is to achieve as much as possible without primary legislation. The proposals set out in the Marine Bill consultation document should therefore be considered in the context of the breadth of the Government's other non-legislative activities and initiatives.

Recommendation 7: It is unsatisfactory and counterproductive that the oil and gas industries were given a veto over whether or not they would be part of the new, so-called integrated licensing scheme. As with fisheries, if one of the key purposes of the Marine Bill is legislative and administrative integration, then the oil and gas licensing veto frustrates that purpose. While going back on his assurances to the industry might be difficult for the Minister, he must work with those within the industry who can see the benefits of belonging to the new scheme in order to explain to the rest of the industry why he now must integrate them into the scheme something which so many other users and marine groups wish to see. (Paragraph 28)

Partially agreed. Government has not given any business sector a veto over their inclusion in any part of the proposals in our consultation on a Marine Bill. The Petroleum Act 1998 and matters relating to the exploration and exploitation of oil and gas were not included in the licensing options in the consultation following consideration of the practicalities and benefits of amending or retaining the existing arrangements. Consultees including the oil and gas sector have commented on the inclusion or exclusion of certain regimes from the scope of the proposed licensing reforms. The eventual scope of the proposals for marine licensing reform will ultimately be determined by the potential environmental, social and economic costs and benefits of reform.

Recommendation 8: We believe it is right to praise Defra for the work that it has done in preparation for the consultation paper, for the paper itself, and for the work that has

gone on since it was published in terms of Marine Bill Forums and Newsletters. The Bill Team within Defra has been commendably open, hard-working, conscientious and patient. (Paragraph 29)

Recommendation 9: Almost all those from whom we received memoranda and took oral evidence had occasion to praise Defra and the Bill Team for the manner in which all aspects of the consultation, and the pre-consultations discussions, were handled. (Paragraph 29)

Defra would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who have taken the time to submit their comments on the Marine Bill consultation and who have engaged with us and continue to do so as we develop our proposals. We want to ensure that those with an interest are kept fully informed as our proposals develop and their input will be key to making those proposals integrated, appropriate and relevant.

Recommendation 10: Defra needs to show greater leadership to try and encourage coordination and coherence in decisions made by the Scottish and Welsh administrations and the UK Government. All efforts must be made to make the legislation for the marine environment around all of the UK, from shallow to deep waters, as seamless a robe as possible. We hope that the UK Government and devolved administrations will accept that the unique overlapping nature of the marine environment—foreshore, tidal waters, offshore waters and sea-bed—requires the concerted use of their powers. (Paragraph 34)

Partially agreed. UK Government and devolved administrations are committed to both the devolution process and to working in a joined up way to manage and protect the UK's seas more effectively. We have adopted a number of strategic goals for the marine environment and made a commitment to work to ensure that policy development and management contributes to meeting those strategic goals. Among these is the goal of using marine resources in a sustainable and environmentally sensitive manner in order to conserve ecosystems and achieve optimum environmental, social and economic benefit from the marine environment. We are therefore working together to achieve the best and most appropriate means for managing activities in the marine area around the UK.

Recommendation 11: Defra must punch above its usual weight in these discussions. Not only is it important that Defra convinces its colleague departments of the importance and centrality of sustainable development and environmental limits for the future of the marine environment, but it must attempt to do so quickly. Further delay, taking into account the ongoing degradation of marine biodiversity, is unacceptable. (Paragraph 37)

Partially agreed. Defra and its colleague departments are working together to bring forward proposals that address the Government's commitment to obtaining best value from different uses of our valuable marine resources whilst maintaining and protecting the ecosystems on which they depend. The Government has recognised that working across departmental boundaries and through all levels of Government will be necessary to deliver its challenging sustainable development agenda.

Recommendation 12: A toothless, non-statutory system of marine spatial planning would not act to create integration, will not improve the current complexity,

contradictions and clashes of interest in planning and the marine environment, and would therefore represent a wasted opportunity. We believe that the marine management organisation which results from the Marine Bill needs to have effective powers, beyond the deployment of advice, to develop and administer spatial planning at sea: this planning must be reasonably flexible, but also robust, so that industry, business, and leisure interests can all be accommodated and assisted within the proper environmental limits. (Paragraph 41)

Partially agreed. We agree that a planning system that does not act to create integration or improve the current complexity, contradictions and clashes of interest would represent a wasted opportunity. There are a number of ways in which a planning system could achieve those objectives and we must consider the advantages and disadvantages of these different approaches in order to identify and bring forward proposals for a system that will be most effective and deliver the greatest benefit.

No decision has yet been taken to bring forward proposals to establish a new marine management organisation or on the most appropriate arrangements for implementing a new marine planning system. However, whatever the final shape of our proposals for the structure and arrangements of a robust marine planning system, it is important that it takes account of all industry, business, and leisure interests.

Recommendation 13: We hope that Defra will take RCEP's concern on board and ensure that marine protected areas are not focused too narrowly on fish stocks. (Paragraph 43)

Agreed. In Government's response to the RCEP's 25th Report we agreed that marine protected areas have a role to play as part of the framework for protecting the marine environment and their implementation needs to be seen as part of a balanced package of measures.

We are using the opportunity provided by the Marine Bill to review current legislation used for designating protection of marine areas for various purposes. The Marine Bill consultation includes proposals for a new mechanism for the designation of marine protected areas for the conservation of important species and habitats. As such the focus is not narrowly on fish stocks but potentially extends to all aspects of marine biodiversity and ecosystems.

Such a mechanism would be used to help to deliver our commitment under the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North East Atlantic (OSPAR) to establish a coherent network of protected areas. Whilst some of these areas are likely to require protection from fisheries activities, the network will conserve the areas that best represent the range of species, habitats and ecological processes in our waters as well as protecting vulnerable or sensitive species and habitats.

Recommendation 14: It is vital that marine protected areas are placed on a strong statutory basis and include where necessary some zones—to be reviewed over time—of absolute exclusion. While there will need to be some flexibility in the setting up and supervision of marine protected areas, it must be borne in mind that the application of the precautionary principle and the establishment of environmental limits has to lie at their heart. (Paragraph 45)

Partially agreed. As with all the policies we are considering for inclusion in the Bill there are different ways that marine protected areas could be delivered, including through both statutory and non-statutory mechanisms. Voluntary conservation mechanisms have often proved to be successful and we will consider applying such approaches where we can. Nevertheless, we expect to bring forward proposals to introduce new mechanisms through the Marine Bill to enable the establishment of marine protected areas.

We are proposing to introduce a flexible mechanism that can address the full range of management requirements and provide the level of protection needed for each site. The management measures needed for individual sites will vary widely depending on the objectives of the site and the sensitivity of the protected features to different activities and levels of disturbance. In some cases this may mean that only seasonal or time limited restrictions are required. In others it could lead to the complete restriction of activities on a site.

We do not propose to introduce inappropriate restrictions on development without understanding the impacts of activities on marine ecosystems and biodiversity. However, there may be cases where we would wish to take a more precautionary approach.

Understanding and defining environmental limits will be a difficult task. However, it is important that we understand these and manage our activities in such a way so as not to result in unacceptable or catastrophic environmental consequences.

Recommendation 15: The establishment of a marine management organisation and the rolling out of a programme of marine spatial planning which has to be flexible and capable of proper review must be supported by sufficient funding to ascertain enough reliable and current detailed information about the marine environment to inform good and robust decision-making. While Defra still has to provide further information on the cost implications of the Bill before it is introduced to Parliament, clearly it would be unfair, especially in the case of the renewable energy industry, for users to bear all the financial burden of information provision. We look to Defra to ensure that any new marine management organisation will have enough resources to acquire the sort of level of detailed data needed to support reliable and soundly-based marine spatial planning. (Paragraph 48)

Agreed. Detailed proposals for a system of marine planning and the organisation that should administer it have yet to be determined. It is not therefore possible at this stage to say what proportion of that burden will be borne by business or by Government. It will be essential that any new arrangements are suitably resourced to ensure that they are effective.

The use of data will be a key element of any marine planning arrangements. A number of existing data collection activities undertaken for various purposes by Government and its agencies, industry and other sectors have the potential to provide much of the data needed to implement new arrangements that might be introduced through a Marine Bill. Coordination of these activities and facilitating access to the data collected will be one of the elements for consideration in the development of a marine planning system.

Steps are already being taken to facilitate this. Government departments and agencies concerned are committed to working closely within a UK Marine Monitoring and Assessment Strategy process to ensure that the various marine monitoring activities undertaken by the UK are coordinated and fit for purpose. They are working to rationalise and simplify existing structures to achieve a greater integration of marine monitoring across the UK and to meet new and emerging requirements including those likely to come forward through a Marine Bill. A Marine Data and Information Partnership has also been established to work on ways to enable the dissemination / long term stewardship of marine data and information collected and held by different organisations, and to facilitate its use by marine decision makers and users.

Recommendation 16: Defra deserves credit for how it has conducted the consultation, and for its work in the stages which led up to it, and for how it has listened fairly to all the different interests involved. It is to be hoped that there will indeed be another round of consultation before the draft Bill emerges, and that the content of that consultation, or of the draft Bill following, reflects at least some of the concerns raised in this Report, so that the eventual Marine Act will be as integrated and successful a measure as all those currently involved in discussions over it wish to see. (Paragraph 49)

Partially agreed. See our responses to previous recommendations and in particular those to recommendations 4, 5 and 6.

Past reports from the Environmental Audit Committee since 1997

2005-06 Session

First	Greening Government: the 2004 Sustainable Development in Government Report, HC 698
Second	Sustainable Timber, HC 607
Third	Sustainable Procurement: the Way Forward, HC 740
Fourth	Pre-Budget 2005: Tax, economic analysis, and climate change, HC 882
Fifth	Sustainable Housing: A follow-up report, HC 779
Sixth	Keeping the lights on: Nuclear, Renewables, and Climate Change, HC 584
Seventh	Sustainable Development Reporting by Government Departments, HC 1322
Eighth	Proposals for a draft Marine Bill, HC 1323
Ninth	Reducing Carbon Emissions from Transport, H C981
Tenth	Trade, Development and Environment: The Role of DFID, HC 1014

2004-05 Session

First	Housing: Building a Sustainable Future, HC 135
Second	Corporate Environmental Crime, HC 136
Third	World Summit on Sustainable Development 2002: A UK Progress Report, HC 381
Fourth	The International Challenge of Climate Change: UK Leadership in the G8 and EU, HC 105 (<i>Reply Cm6617</i>)
Fifth	Environmental Education: Follow-up to Learning the Sustainability Lesson, HC84 (<i>Reply Cm6594</i>)
Sixth	Sustainable Public Procurement , HC 266
Seventh	Pre-Budget 04 and Budget 05, HC 261 (<i>Reply HC 528</i>)

2003-04 Session

First	Annual Report 2003, HC 214
Second	GM Foods – Evaluating the Farm Scale Trials, HC 90
Third	Pre-Budget Report 2003: Aviation follow-up, HC 233
Fourth	Water: The Periodic Review 2004 and the Environmental Programme, HC 416 (<i>Reply, HC 950</i>)
Fifth	GM Foods – Evaluating the Farm Scale Trials, HC 564
Sixth	Environmental Crime and the Courts, HC 126 (<i>Reply, HC 1232</i>)
Seventh	Aviation: Sustainability and the Government Response, HC 623 (<i>reply, HC1063</i>)
Eighth	Greening Government 2004, HC 881 (<i>Reply, HC 1259</i>)
Ninth	Fly-tipping, Fly-posting, Litter, Graffiti and Noise, HC 445 (<i>Reply, HC 1232</i>)
Tenth	Budget 2004 and Energy, HC 490 (<i>Reply, HC 1183</i>)
Eleventh	Aviation: Sustainability and the Government's second response, HC1063
Twelfth	Environmental Crime: Wildlife Crime, HC 605 (<i>Reply, HC 438</i>)
Thirteenth	Sustainable Development : the UK Strategy, HC 624

2002-03 Session

First	Pesticides: The Voluntary Initiative, HC100 (<i>Reply, HC 443</i>)
Second	Johannesburg and Back: The World Summit on Sustainable Development–Committee delegation report on proceedings, HC 169

Third	Annual Report, HC 262
Fourth	Pre-Budget 2002, HC 167 (<i>Reply, HC 688</i>)
Fifth	Waste – An Audit, HC 99 (<i>Reply, HC 1081</i>)
Sixth	Buying Time for Forests: Timber Trade and Public Procurement - The Government Response, HC 909
Seventh	Export Credits Guarantee Department and Sustainable Development, HC 689 (<i>Reply, HC 1238</i>)
Eighth	Energy White Paper – Empowering Change?, HC 618
Ninth	Budget 2003 and Aviation, HC 672 (<i>Reply, Cm 6063</i>)
Tenth	Learning the Sustainability Lesson, HC 472 (<i>Reply, HC 1221</i>)
Eleventh	Sustainable Development Headline Indicators, HC 1080 (<i>Reply, HC 320</i>)
Twelfth	World Summit for Sustainable Development – From rhetoric to reality, HC 98 (<i>Reply, HC 232</i>)
Thirteenth	Greening Government 2003, HC 961 (<i>Reply, HC 489,2003-04</i>)

2001-02 Session

First	Departmental Responsibilities for Sustainable Development, HC 326 (<i>Reply, Cm 5519</i>)
Second	Pre-Budget Report 2001: <i>A New Agenda?</i> , HC 363 (<i>HC 1000</i>)
Third	UK Preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development, HC 616 (<i>Reply, Cm 5558</i>)
Fourth	Measuring the Quality of Life: The Sustainable Development Headline Indicators, HC 824 (<i>Reply, Cm 5650</i>)
Fifth	A Sustainable Energy Strategy? Renewables and the PIU Review, HC 582 (<i>Reply, HC 471</i>)
Sixth	Buying Time for Forests: <i>Timber Trade and Public Procurement</i> , HC 792-I, (<i>Reply, HC 909, Session 2002-03</i>)

2000-01 Session

First	Environmental Audit: <i>the first Parliament</i> , HC 67 (<i>Reply, Cm 5098</i>)
Second	The Pre-Budget Report 2000: <i>fuelling the debate</i> , HC 71 (<i>Reply HC 216, Session 2001-02</i>)

1999-2000 Session

First	EU Policy and the Environment: An Agenda for the Helsinki Summit, HC 44 (<i>Reply, HC 68</i>)
Second	World Trade and Sustainable Development: An Agenda for the Seattle Summit, HC 45 (Including the Government response to the First Report 1998-99: Multilateral Agreement on Investment, HC 58) (<i>Reply, HC 69</i>)
Third	Comprehensive Spending Review: Government response and follow-up, HC 233 (<i>Reply, HC 70, Session 2000-01</i>)
Fourth	The Pre-Budget Report 1999: pesticides, aggregates and the Climate Change Levy, HC 76
Fifth	The Greening Government Initiative: first annual report from the Green Ministers Committee 1998/99, HC 341
Sixth	Budget 2000 and the Environment etc., HC 404
Seventh	Water Prices and the Environment, HC 597 (<i>Reply, HC 290, Session 2000-01</i>)

1998-99 Session

First	The Multilateral Agreement on Investment, HC 58 (<i>Reply, HC 45, Session 1999- 2000</i>)
-------	---

Second	Climate Change: Government response and follow-up, HC 88
Third	The Comprehensive Spending Review and Public Service Agreements, HC 92 (<i>Reply, HC 233, Session 1999-2000</i>)
Fourth	The Pre-Budget Report 1998, HC 93
Fifth	GMOs and the Environment: Coordination of Government Policy, HC 384 (<i>Reply Cm 4528</i>)
Sixth	The Greening Government Initiative 1999, HC 426
Seventh	Energy Efficiency, HC 159 (<i>Reply, HC 571, Session 2000-01</i>)
Eighth	The Budget 1999: Environmental Implications, HC 326

1997-98 Session

First	The Pre-Budget Report, HC 547 (<i>Reply, HC 985</i>)
Second	The Greening Government Initiative, HC 517 (<i>Reply, HC 426, Session 1998-99</i>)
Third	The Pre-Budget Report: Government response and follow-up, HC 985
Fourth	Climate Change: UK Emission Reduction Targets and Audit Arrangements, HC 899 (<i>Reply, HC 88, Session 1998-99</i>)