



Guidance on Article 53 emergency authorisation applications

January 2026

Contents

1. Introduction	4
This guidance	4
Emergency authorisations	4
Before applying for an emergency authorisation	5
2. Applying for an emergency authorisation	6
Supporting data	6
Repeat applications	6
Timelines for applications	6
Fees	7
3. Description of special circumstances	8
4. Description of the danger	10
5. Description of alternative options considered	11
Resistance.....	12
Economic considerations.....	12
6. Potential adverse effects and mitigations.....	13
7. Limited and controlled use of the requested product.....	15
8. Development of longer-term solutions.....	17
9. Repeat emergency authorisation applications	18
Pre-application advice	18
10. If an emergency authorisation is granted	20
Data requirements	20
Annex.....	21
How decisions on emergency authorisation applications are taken.....	21
Emergency authorisations: summary of roles and responsibilities	21

1. Introduction

This guidance

This guidance is for anyone who is applying for an 'emergency authorisation' to use a plant protection product that normally cannot be used under Regulation 1107/2009¹. Please refer to it as you complete your application form. Contact details are provided in the relevant sections should you need support.

The guidance applies to all applications for use in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. Applications may be made and granted on a country-by-country basis. If you are making an application that covers use in more than one country, please explain any key differences in any of the elements described below (for example, available alternative reasonable means).

Emergency authorisations

Emergency authorisations allow a plant protection product (PPP) to be placed on the market for limited and controlled use. They may be granted in special circumstances where the PPP is necessary because of a danger that cannot be contained by any other reasonable means. Under an emergency authorisation, the PPP can only be available for sale for a period not exceeding 120 days. Emergency authorisation is sometimes referred to as Article 53 authorisation, because Article 53 of Regulation 1107/2009 sets the requirements for emergency authorisation.

Article 1(4) of Regulation 1107/2009 states that the regulation is "underpinned by the precautionary principle in order to ensure that active substances or products placed on the market do not adversely affect human or animal health or the environment. In particular, a competent authority shall not be prevented from applying the precautionary principle where there is scientific uncertainty as to the risks with regard to human or animal health or the environment posed by the plant protection products to be authorised".

¹ Regulation 1107/2009 means:

In relation to Great Britain, Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 as it has effect in Great Britain

In relation to Northern Ireland, Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 as it has effect by virtue of the Protocol on Ireland/Northern Ireland in the EU withdrawal agreement.

Before applying for an emergency authorisation

Before applying for an emergency authorisation, you should first consider all alternative options, including integrated management approaches, other relevant authorised PPPs (both chemical and biopesticides) and extensions of authorisation for minor use (EAMU).

Ministers are responsible for deciding whether an emergency authorisation should be granted in their respective countries. In practice, Ministers generally delegate this responsibility to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), which is the national regulator, and which takes decisions on behalf of the UK government and the devolved governments. Ministers may, however, choose to take a decision themselves on a case-by-case basis for use in their country. The same legal requirements apply whoever makes the decision.

The decision-maker may also request independent advice from the UK Expert Committee on Pesticides (ECP) or from other sources on specific scientific issues.

The information required in your application is further explained in this document, including:

- a description of the **special circumstances** that warrant the application
- a description of the **danger** you are facing which requires use of the requested product
- why the proposed use is **necessary** because of that danger
- a description of the **alternative options** you have considered and why you feel these are not suitable
- how you intend to ensure the product applied for is used in a **limited and controlled** way
- the potential adverse effects if the emergency authorisation is granted and the PPP is used, and how you plan to mitigate those effects
- how you intend to avoid the need to apply for the same use again, through developing alternative longer-term solutions

HSE will assess each application against these requirements. HSE will draw on the available data to balance the potential risks and benefits of the proposed use, to assess whether the benefits of granting an authorisation to address the danger outweigh the potential adverse effects on human and/or animal health or the environment. Each application is considered on a case-by-case basis. There is no obligation to grant an Article 53 authorisation.

Please see Annex 1 for an explanation of roles and responsibilities in the application process.

2. Applying for an emergency authorisation

Use form CRD9 to apply for an emergency authorisation. Download the form from the HSE website at www.hse.gov.uk/pesticides/applicant-guide/application-forms.htm.

Applications should be submitted via email to pppapplications@hse.gov.uk.

To help the process, please engage with HSE directly as early as possible in your application process to discuss your application and to raise any queries. You can contact HSE at ppp.enquiries@hse.gov.uk, including in the subject line 'Emergency authorisation application for use of [product] on [situation] to control [danger]'.

Supporting data

You should avoid any unexplained gaps in data to ensure your application can be processed in a timely manner. Providing thorough evidence, including for any informed assumptions, will help reduce delays caused by HSE having to ask for further information.

Due to data protection rules, HSE may need permission to access the data supporting your application. This is granted through a 'letter of access' which is supplied to HSE by the relevant data owner(s). Prior to submitting your application, you must ask the relevant owner of any supporting data for such a letter. You should also discuss and agree with them any role they may play in your proposed stewardship and provide confirmation of their full co-operation (see section 7 below on limited and controlled use).

Repeat applications

Repeat applications for seasonal crops should be submitted early, for example in September or October before proposed use in spring/summer of the following year. You should read section 9 of this guidance and, in addition to the completed application form, supporting evidence and letters of access, you will need to provide any data and information required by the previous authorisation and covering letter.

Timelines for applications

You should aim to submit your fully completed application a minimum of 21 weeks (23 weeks if submitted over Christmas or Easter) before the proposed use of the product.

Time-sensitive emergency authorisation applications which arise as a result of unforeseen circumstances and create a significant new danger will be given priority wherever possible. In applications where real-time data about the extent of the pest problem is required to justify the emergency use, you should submit your application in advance but mention that real-time data is needed and when it will be available. You should update your allocated HSE Assessment Manager on any changes in circumstances which impact on the need or priority of the application, for example, due to a rapid build-up of pest pressure. This might require bringing forward the period of use, which will have implications for the risk assessment. Equally, if pest pressure is declining, the emergency authorisation may no longer be needed for that season.

Fees

HSE must charge fees to recover the full cost of processing emergency applications. In line with other types of applications, the modular fee charging system is now used.

At the validation stage we will check the completeness of the application and consider the justification for need and urgency, for which we will charge a sift and reasoned case fee.

When accepted, we will also charge the relevant data or case fees as required, dependent on the information submitted.

For further details, check the [fees page](#).

3. Description of special circumstances

This section and the following numbered sections describe the information required to support an application.

In the application you will need to set out the special circumstances of your application. There is no legal definition of “special circumstances.” HSE will decide, on a case-by-case basis, whether the circumstances described justify a derogation under Article 53 from the standard approach to authorisation.

Scenarios that may constitute “special circumstances” include²:

- where, due to the nature of the emergency, a quick and effective response is required and there is **insufficient time** to assess and issue a standard authorisation - for example, a rapidly developing pest or mass migration event where there is no suitable alternative to mitigate the pest or its impact
- where the granting of an authorisation is required as a means of mitigating a **potentially catastrophic occurrence** such as the potential loss of a significant habitat
- where **atypical regional/national seasonal environmental or weather conditions** prevent the usual control measures being effective - for example, prolonged dry weather preventing a crop from taking up the seed treatment or increasing the significance of usually minor pests
- where there are unexpected **significant problems with the availability of relevant authorised products**, for example, problems at a major production plant

Factors which are unlikely to help support the existence of special circumstances include:

- **multiple repeat emergency applications**: the longer a situation persists without alternative strategies being introduced, the harder it may become to justify the existence of special circumstances - each case will be judged individually, including looking at what measures have been planned or put in place to mitigate the need for future applications
- where there has been a **repeated failure to put in place alternative controls** previously proposed by the applicant
- where a standard authorisation for the product or use has been **refused or withdrawn**

² It is not possible to give a definitive list of examples of special circumstances, however these scenarios are provided to give helpful indications of potential examples. It is important to remember that all cases are treated on their own merits, taking account of the particular circumstances. The scenarios in sections 4 and 7 have been provided on the same basis.

- where a case rests solely on the fact that available alternatives are more **expensive**
- where data to support an application for a standard authorisation or an extension of authorisation for minor use could be generated, **but there has been repeated failure to do this**

4. Description of the danger

You will need to give details of the problem you are facing and why this constitutes a danger. This should include the likelihood of the danger occurring and its impact.

There is no legal definition of a “danger,” however, scenarios may include:

- an outbreak, or predicted outbreak, of a pest or disease with the potential for significant impact on crops or other plants
- an invasive plant or high population of weeds with the potential for significant impact on crops or other plants (other than in the unlikely case that this is due to poor management practice)
- plants growing in situations where they may pose a danger to human health if left uncontrolled, for example, because they have potential to damage the integrity of public infrastructure and increase the risk of accidents, or to attract animals that could lead to accidents
- plants, pests or pathogens that are toxic to human and/or animal health and so need to be controlled - for example, crops infected with fungal diseases producing mycotoxins, for which there are statutory maximum levels in some crops
- threat to vulnerable habitats of specific biodiversity, ecological or botanical value (for example sites of special scientific interest) from invasive pests or diseases

Scenarios are unlikely to include a pest or disease that causes superficial or cosmetic inconvenience but has no impact on yield or quality, or on human and/or animal health.

Evidence to demonstrate that there is a ‘danger,’ including the nature and extent of that danger, will be individual to each application. Relevant factors may include the following:

- The biology of the pest and the nature and severity of the damage (or other impacts) caused. Provide as much evidence as possible on monitoring, population levels, the nature of the sustained danger through the growing season and its impact. Provision of this information is particularly important where the pest is emerging or novel and there is little published validated information (and in such cases providing reference to published research may be helpful).
- The situation in which use of the PPP is proposed, such as whether in a crop, natural environment, or other situation.
- Where a treatment threshold is relevant (for example in relation to yield losses, or quality aspects), information on this should be provided. This may be supported by economic information (see section 5 for more details).
- A clear description of risks to human and/or animal health or ecosystems.

- **Description of the expected benefit that the proposed emergency authorisation will provide in containing the danger.** The level of detail available will depend, for example, on whether the requested product is approved and authorised in UK, or if the use is against a new or emerging pest.

You should also provide an assessment of the expected economic impact of the danger and the economic costs of not using the requested PPP. Taking the most typical example of a danger to the yield of a commercial crop, this should, where relevant, cover the following factors:

- Area covered by the application (hectares).
- Price per unit output, based on farmgate value (for example, price per tonne).
- Yield per unit area (for example, tonnes per hectare).
- Revenue derived from treatment area.
- Overall economic contribution of the industry (gross value added).
- The economic impact of the emergency authorisation not being granted; this can include projected reductions in total yield and also impacts on marketable yield or quality. For horticultural crops, for example, we know that impacts on quality standards and associated factors are particularly important, particularly where they lead to financial impacts due to a rejected crop.
- Other wider economic costs and impacts as appropriate.

Where relevant, you should also set out the context of these impacts, for example, the percentage of industry that is impacted, variation in impacts across industry, and other factors likely to influence these impacts such as the farm's size and profitability. This could be based on averages from recent years' historic data or forecasts, where available. You must use typical scenarios, not worst-case scenarios or highest market value prices and include the source of these figures and the time period they relate to.

Impact should take account of the use of alternative measures (for example, cultural) which could be used to mitigate the danger.

5. Description of alternative options considered

Before making an application, you will need to consider **all** available alternatives (chemical, non-chemical and cultural) to manage the problem. This may include:

- manipulating sowing dates and other cultural control measures such as crop isolation
- plant hygiene such as weed control

- introducing natural (or commercial) predators
- physical control methods; for example, the use of barriers and borders
- use of resistant varieties
- use of biopesticides

You will need to **detail these potential alternatives** and explain why these, alone or in combination with (for example) any relevant authorised PPP, do not provide reasonable alternative means to address the problem.

Resistance

Where there is established, or recently confirmed, resistance to an authorised alternative product, this may be a valid argument that that product is not a reasonable alternative. However, this must be underpinned by evidence, including the extent of the problem.

Where a target pest is considered to be at high risk of developing resistance and there are insufficient available PPPs with different modes of action to provide robust, season-long resistance management, this may also constitute a valid supporting argument.

The UK-Resistance Action Groups are a key source of information and evidence on resistance avoidance and management strategies for use by UK farmers and growers.

Economic considerations

If it is relevant to your application, you should include additional economic information to support your argument (for example, if you are arguing that the cost of alternatives is such that their use is unreasonable). Specifically:

- the cost of using the product proposed for emergency authorisation and any alternative you have considered, which can include increased labour costs, increased rental cost (or equivalent) of any new equipment required, and increased fuel costs
- whether the cost is one-off or recurring
- whether the costs can be attributed to the use itself or only a portion of them (for example, if the equipment can be used for another purpose)

Data should be based on multiple sources and not on single worst-case scenarios, so that an average, aggregated view of the impact of not having the requested PPP can be established. The sources of these figures should be stated, as well as how recent they are.

HSE will assess each application on its own merits, taking account of the particular circumstances of each application. However, arguments that authorised products are not alternative reasonable options based solely on costs are very unlikely to be accepted.

6. Potential adverse effects and mitigations

Emergency authorisations may only be granted where use of the requested PPP is considered necessary. This means that the benefits of addressing the danger by using the PPP must outweigh the adverse effects of its use which include impacts on human and/or animal health and on the environment.

HSE will conduct a risk assessment of the use of the PPP to inform its decision. The risk assessment will (where data access is established) use the data and evidence that you supply and data which HSE already holds. This will not be the only factor that a decision will be based on (as set out above). HSE may also seek independent scientific advice from the ECP or elsewhere if there is uncertainty around any aspect of the risk assessment.

Therefore, in the application form you must do both of the following:

- Identify the nature and extent of any potential adverse effects should the authorisation be granted.
- Identify the proposed measures or conditions to mitigate or reduce those effects. This includes any measures to protect human and animal health and the environment, including wildlife. Examples of risk mitigation measures are also included in section 7.

Specifically, you must provide a safety assessment for each of the following areas:

- Operator, worker, bystander/resident exposure (predictive operator exposure models can be submitted).
- Residues and consumer exposure (supporting data or case must address UK specific requirements).
- Environmental fate and behaviour (supporting data or case must address UK specific requirements), and
- Ecotoxicology (supporting data or case must address UK specific requirements).

You should provide details regarding how each risk assessment area will be addressed, as well as providing supporting data and supporting evidence. This should include the assessment of potential impacts on non-target species at the population level. For example, if there is a risk to bees or other pollinators, you should describe this, along with any mitigation measures which may reduce the risk.

It is recognised that you may not have access to full information for the risk assessment, and if that is the case you should make that clear, providing the best information you have and highlighting potential areas of risk and associated mitigations.

It is advisable that your emergency authorisation application should avoid cross-referring to newly submitted applications for standard authorisation, as the timeframes for assessing those data packages vary significantly from emergency authorisation applications.

Deciding whether the proposed use appears necessary to address the identified danger entails weighing the benefits and risks of emergency authorisation. Often benefits will be socio-economic while impacts will be environmental. However, that will not always be the case. To give two examples, use of a plant protection product may be intended to produce environmental benefits or reduce environmental harms compared with other forms of control. Harm to pollinators may have both environmental and economic impacts.

In all cases, HSE will identify the potential benefits of using the PPP as proposed by the applicant and also the potential risks to human and animal health and the environment. HSE will next carry out an assessment of these benefits and risks based on the available evidence. HSE will then decide whether the necessity test is met and, if so, whether any emergency authorisation should be subject to restrictions or conditions to address risks or to ensure that benefits are realised.

7. Limited and controlled use of the requested product

An emergency authorisation can only be granted where measures are proposed that will ensure use of the PPP is limited and controlled. In the application form you should provide information to demonstrate both of the following:

- How the proposed product will be used only to deal with the specific identified danger.
- How the likelihood and magnitude of any adverse effects can be reduced to the lowest level reasonably possible whilst maintaining the ability to deal with the danger.

Conditions that may demonstrate limited use include:

- a maximum geographical area over which the product will be used, regional locations; percentage of crop to be treated; or maximum volume of seeds to be treated
- restricting use to circumstances in which a certain threshold is reached (for example, pest pressure, infection rates)
- timing of use, use at specified crop/plant growth stages, specified pest development stages
- maximum number of applications of the product

You should provide details to demonstrate that use of the product will be **controlled**. As a minimum, you are expected to define what stewardship measures are to be implemented for your proposed use.

A stewardship programme should:

- ensure the advice, practices and measures proposed **address potential adverse effects**
- ensure there is a **plan to communicate with all potential users** of the product, outlining the nature of the authorisation, and conditions of use, how these will be complied with, any monitoring requirements and other integrated measures to be used alongside the authorisation
- ensure the product is used as part of an **integrated approach**, following the general principles of integrated pest management as described in Directive 2009/128/EC on the sustainable use of pesticides
- contain any information on any relevant crop/use assurance schemes
- identify any measures to avoid any **unintended consequences** - for example, proposals to use buffer zones/no-spray zones may result in a risk of field margins or beetle banks being ploughed up
- ensure that where the stewardship proposals impact upon wider users/advisors/distributors or others they are fully informed of their obligation to fulfil

the stewardship requirements. It is expected that **any support required from the product owner is agreed prior to submission of the stewardship programme**. This may include, but is not limited to, data access, supplying data on sales of the product, and return of unused stock.

- **provide robust and clear monitoring of progress, against clear baselines.** Stewardship programmes must have access to the appropriate data to provide clear measures of progress. This can be either necessary agreement to access third party information and/or appropriately designed surveys.

You should also demonstrate how you will monitor the use of the product, with arrangements in place to collect information such as the geographic areas of use; total amounts of crops treated; data on pest pressure (where relevant) at treated sites; and/or information on the specific trigger to apply the product.

In such cases where a stewardship programme is accepted, its successful delivery will be included as a condition of authorisation. Where stewardship is required as a condition of authorisation, all relevant parties must ensure the programme is followed as proposed, and that appropriate records are maintained and are made available to HSE on request.

Those responsible for stewardship programmes must have clear contingency plans in place in case the initial measures to limit and control use of the product are not effective.

8. Development of longer-term solutions

Emergency authorisations are temporary solutions and **repeat applications should be avoided as far as possible**. Therefore, where appropriate, you should provide details of work being undertaken to develop long-term alternative solutions. This information should be included in the application form. It might include the:

- research and development of data identifying and supporting the authorisation(s) of alternative products, including biopesticides
- development of a full range of integrated crop management options, and other integrated measures as appropriate

In some circumstances, an emergency may have arisen so quickly that it will not have been possible to develop a plan for a longer-term alternative approach. In such cases, you may not be required to submit a plan with the first application but should do so if the emergency persists and necessitates further applications.

Failure to provide a realistic plan for the longer term, or to keep HSE updated on progress and outcomes relating to an existing plan, is likely to be a relevant factor for consideration by HSE in future applications for the same use, particularly as regards to whether special circumstances continue to exist.

9. Repeat emergency authorisation applications

While repeat applications should be avoided as far as possible, they may be necessary if the emergency continues over more than one growing season and longer-term solutions are not readily available.

There is no fixed limit to the number of repeat authorisations which may be issued, and each application will be considered on a case-by-case basis. The decision on whether to grant a repeat emergency authorisation will be influenced by how readily a longer-term solution can be developed and how far its development is within your control. Some solutions may, for example, depend upon the generation of data by authorisation holders for potential alternatives.

Where appropriate, HSE will allow time for the identification of potential alternatives, the generation of any necessary data, and, where needed, their evaluation for a standard authorisation. However, repeat emergency authorisations are unlikely to be permitted indefinitely.

HSE will normally consider that emergency authorisations should be needed for no more than 5 years to allow development of longer-term solutions. Some alternatives may not need so long. However, if you think longer is needed, HSE will consider whether the special circumstances still exist and may require more detailed evidence or justification to support further applications.

If you expect that the emergency authorisation may need to be repeated in future years, you will need to explain and evidence your plans to better limit and target use to areas of greatest need in future years. This could include research to develop more robust thresholds, or research into new technology to better identify or forecast pest/weed/disease issues.

Any application for repeat emergency use of a PPP must be supported by evidence to demonstrate compliance with conditions attached to previous authorisations. This information should be provided in the application form.

Should this required information be omitted from a repeat application, the omission will be considered in the context of your ability, as the applicant, to sufficiently control the use. This consideration may impact on the final decision, particularly where a stewardship programme is proposed without evidence of compliance with a prior programme.

Pre-application advice

You can update HSE on progress with developing alternatives and seek advice on how to progress options outside of an emergency application. HSE can discuss data

requirements and specific issues relevant to any future application. This can help to maximise your evidence base, focus research and aid both the search for longer-term solutions and reduce the need for repeat applications.

Where there is repeated failure to provide information demonstrating compliance with conditions attached to previous authorisations, it may impact on HSE's ability to conclude that a proposed repeat use will be appropriately controlled. This failure will be taken into account when the authorisation decision is taken.

10. If an emergency authorisation is granted

HSE may impose conditions (including stewardship and data requirements) on an emergency authorisation to mitigate potential adverse effects on people and the environment. These may be in addition to those proposed by the applicant. Significant weight is likely to be attached to any potential effects on human health.

Failure to comply with the conditions attached to the authorisation could result in the withdrawal or amendment of the emergency authorisation and may result in other enforcement action, including prosecution.

HSE will consider any failure to meet data requirement conditions in any future (repeat) applications for the same use, particularly in relation to whether the use applied for will be limited and controlled.

Emergency authorisations can be withdrawn or varied before their end date if the requirements of the authorisation are no longer met. This may include, but is not limited to, situations where relevant new information on the danger or effects of the relevant product become known, or where there is evidence of non-compliance with the authorisation conditions.

Data requirements

The emergency authorisation may include a requirement to provide HSE with evidence to demonstrate that measures or conditions have been implemented or met.

Often these requirements will relate to the monitoring of the use of the product, or evidence that thresholds have been met. However other requirements may include, but are not limited to:

- provision of data to address extant data gaps - for example, residues data to address consumer risks
- information relating to geographic areas of use
- total amounts of crops treated
- data on pest pressure at treated sites
- information on the specific trigger for grower decisions to treat the crop

Annex

How decisions on emergency authorisation applications are taken

In Great Britain, the Secretary of State (England), the Welsh Ministers, and the Scottish Ministers are responsible for deciding whether an emergency authorisation should be granted in their respective territories. In Northern Ireland, the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs is responsible for deciding whether an emergency authorisation should be granted.

In practice, HSE considers applications for emergency authorisations on behalf of all 4 countries of the UK under the terms of Agency Agreements. HSE may take the final decision on an application, or Ministers may decide on a case-by-case basis to take the decision.

Emergency authorisations: summary of roles and responsibilities

Applicant

The applicant is responsible for provision of all the information requested for emergency authorisations to the fullest of their ability and in the format requested by HSE, to enable thorough assessment of the application. The applicant must be prepared to provide additional information when requested by HSE. If Ministers are taking the decision, they may also request additional information. Where an emergency authorisation is granted, the applicant is responsible for ensuring that all conditions attached to the authorisation are met.

Health and Safety Executive

HSE is responsible for undertaking expert assessments of applications. This involves an assessment of whether the requirements for an emergency authorisation are considered to be met. Each application is considered on a case-by-case basis taking into account the merits and facts of the individual case.

Ministers are responsible for deciding whether an emergency authorisation should be granted in their respective countries. In practice, ministers generally delegate this responsibility to HSE who take decisions on applications on behalf of all 4 countries of the UK. Ministers may, however, choose to take a decision themselves on a case-by-case basis for use in their country.

Where ministers have notified HSE of their intention to take the decision, HSE provides its expert assessment of applications to inform ministerial decision-making.

Independent scientific advice

The decision-maker may seek independent advice on scientific aspects of applications for emergency authorisation and independent advisers may request further information from the applicant via HSE. A key source of advice is the UK Expert Committee on Pesticides (ECP), which is a non-statutory body established to provide independent scientific advice to Ministers on matters relating to the effective control of pests, including advice on approval and authorisation of pesticides.

Nature conservation bodies

The nature conservation bodies (Natural England, NatureScot, Natural Resources Wales and Northern Ireland Environment Agency) may be consulted on the potential impacts of emergency authorisations on protected areas³.

Chief Scientific Advisors (CSA)

Chief Scientific Advisors provide independent scientific advice to ministers and officials on plant protection product authorisations. Defra's CSA also has oversight of the UK Expert Committee on Pesticides.

Government ministers

Ministers may notify HSE under the respective agency agreements that they will take the decision on an emergency authorisation application for use of a PPP in their respective countries. The relevant ministers are:

- Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, for applications for use in England
- Minister for Agriculture and Connectivity, for applications for use in Scotland.
- Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary for Climate Change and Rural Affairs, for applications for use in Wales
- Minister of Agriculture, Environment, and Rural Affairs, for applications for use in Northern Ireland

Government officials

Officials in Defra, Scottish Government, Welsh Government and Northern Ireland's Department for Agriculture, Environment, and Rural Affairs liaise with HSE to ensure the smooth running of the emergency authorisation assessment process. Officials provide ministers with the necessary information on authorisation applications including HSE's assessment, the advice of the ECP where requested, and HSE advice on whether the emergency authorisation should be granted.

³ Including Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas

Officials may provide supplementary and additional information on an application where it is considered relevant.



Further information

For information about health and safety, or to report inconsistencies or inaccuracies in this guidance, visit the HSE website at www.hse.gov.uk.

This publication is available on the HSE website at www.hse.gov.uk/pesticides/application-guide/emergency-authorisations.htm

© Crown copyright If you wish to reuse this information visit the HSE website for details at www.hse.gov.uk.

First published 02/22.

Published by the Health and Safety Executive 01/26