

# Data Protection and Digital Information Bill

---

---

SECOND MARSHALLED  
LIST OF AMENDMENTS  
TO BE MOVED  
IN GRAND COMMITTEE

*The amendments have been marshalled in accordance with the Instruction of 19th December 2023, as follows –*

Clauses 1 to 5	Clauses 52 to 117
Schedule 1	Schedule 10
Clause 6	Clauses 118 to 128
Schedule 2	Schedule 11
Clauses 7 to 14	Clauses 129 to 137
Schedule 3	Schedule 12
Clauses 15 to 24	Clause 138
Schedule 4	Schedule 13
Clause 25	Clauses 139 to 142
Schedules 5 to 7	Schedule 14
Clauses 26 to 46	Clause 143
Schedule 8	Schedule 15
Clauses 47 to 51	Clauses 144 to 157
Schedule 9	Title

*[Amendments marked ★ are new or have been altered]*

**Amendment  
No.**

---

**Clause 5**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**11** Clause 5, page 6, line 15, at end insert –

“(za) After point (a) insert –

“(aa) the data subject has given consent for his or her personal data to enter the public domain via a public body;

(ab) processing is carried out by a public body pursuant to a legal or statutory obligation or right, and the public body is entitled to make such data available to the public;”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would add to the list of GDPR Article 6(1) on the lawfulness of processing.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 12 Clause 5, page 6, line 31, leave out from beginning to end of line 9 on page 7

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment removes a delegated power allowing the Secretary of State to amend the grounds for lawful processing of personal data. It is intended to implement a recommendation of the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

- 13 Clause 5, page 7, leave out lines 6 and 7 and insert—

“(b) the need to provide children with a higher standard of protection with regard to their personal data and to ensure the Data Protection and Digital Information Act 2024 does not reduce, minimise or undermine existing standards and protections of children’s data.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment prevents any diminution by the Secretary of State of standards established in the 2018 Act for the protection of children’s privacy and safety when exercising powers to amend a list of ‘recognised legitimate interests’ (RLI’s).*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 14 Clause 5, page 7, leave out lines 8 and 9 and insert—

- “8. The Secretary of State may not make regulations under paragraph 6 unless a draft of the regulations has been laid before both Houses of Parliament for the 60-day period.
- 8A. The Secretary of State must consider any representations made during the 60-day period in respect of anything in the draft regulations laid under paragraph 8.
- 8B. If, after the end of the 60-day period, the Secretary of State wishes to proceed to make the regulations, the Secretary of State must lay before Parliament a draft of the regulations (incorporating any changes the Secretary of State considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 8A).
- 8C. Draft regulations laid under paragraph 8B must, before the end of the 40-day period, have been approved by a resolution of each House of Parliament.

8D. In this Article—

“the 40-day period” means the period of 40 days beginning on the day on which the draft regulations mentioned in paragraph 8 are laid before Parliament (or, if it is not laid before each House of Parliament on the same day, the later of the days on which it is laid);

“the 60-day period” means the period of 60 days beginning on the day on which the draft regulations mentioned in paragraph 8B are laid before Parliament (or, if it is not laid before each House of Parliament on the same day, the later of the days on which it is laid).

8E. When calculating the 40-day period or the 60-day period for the purposes of paragraph 8D, ignore any period during which Parliament is dissolved or prorogued or during which both Houses are adjourned for more than 4 days.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would make regulations made in respect of a recognised legitimate interest subject to a super-affirmative Parliamentary procedure.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

15 Clause 5, page 7, line 13, at end insert “to adults”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*The Bill amends article 6 of GDPR (Lawfulness of Processing) to include direct marketing as a purpose for which controllers may be able to process data under the “legitimate interests” purpose. This amendment ensures that children continue to enjoy current protections and safeguards on direct marketing.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

16 Clause 5, page 7, line 13, at end insert “by the controller that first obtained the personal data”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would exclude the use of “legitimate interests” as the lawful basis for Third Party marketing, thereby preserving the use of consent for Third Party Marketing which has been the data protection standard for 40 years.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

17 Clause 5, page 7, line 19, at end insert—

““internal administrative purposes”, in relation to special category data, means the conditions set out for lawful processing in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of the Data Protection Act 2018.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment clarifies that the processing of special category data in employment must follow established principles for reasonable processing, as defined by paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of the Data Protection Act 2018.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 18 Clause 5, page 7, line 22, leave out “affiliated to a central body” and insert “or separate undertakings affiliated by contract”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment would allow businesses that are affiliated by contract to be treated in the same way as large businesses that have data from multiple companies in a group structure.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 5 stand part of the Bill.*

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment would remove a Clause that is arguably unnecessary as the legitimate interests tests is flexible and practical and already allows processing for emergencies.*

**Schedule 1**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 19 Schedule 1, page 192, line 21, leave out from beginning to end of line 6 on page 197

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment is consequential on an amendment in the name of Baroness Jones of Whitchurch to leave out Clause 114. These Schedule 1 provisions would become redundant if Clause 114 is removed from the Bill.*

**Clause 6**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 20 Clause 6, page 8, leave out lines 20 to 22 and insert—

“(c) the nature of the processing, including whether it is processing described in Article 9(1) (processing of special categories of personal data) or Article 10(1) (processing of personal data relating to criminal convictions etc);”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This technical amendment changes new Article 8A(2)(c) of the UK GDPR so that it refers to processing rather than personal data, reflecting the terms of Articles 9(1) and 10(1).*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

21 Clause 6, page 8, line 26, at end insert –

“(f) that under the 2018 Act, children are entitled to a higher standard of protection that requires a defined purpose for which their data is being collected and processed. Further processing of children’s data is highly unlikely to be compatible with the original purpose.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*As drafted, the Bill lowers the threshold for further processing that is deemed compatible with the original purpose, which this amendment aims to reverse in the case of children.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

22 Clause 6, page 9, leave out lines 10 to 23

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment removes a delegated power allowing the Secretary of State to amend conditions under which processing is treated as compatible with the original purpose. It is intended to implement a recommendation of the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

23 Clause 6, page 9, line 17, at end insert “, taking into account that under the 2018 Act, children are entitled to a higher standard of protection that requires a defined purpose for which their data is being collected and processed. Further processing of children’s data is highly unlikely to be compatible with the original purpose.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*As drafted, the Bill lowers the threshold for when further processing is deemed compatible with the original purpose (Annex 2). This amendment aims to ensure that, when exercising their powers, the Secretary of State must prevent any diminution in the level of protection children are currently entitled to in Data Protection Act 2018.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 6 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is a probing amendment to seek clarity from the Government on the intention behind these changes.*

**Clause 7**

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 7 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is a probing amendment to seek clarity from the Government on the intention behind these changes.*

**Clause 9**

## BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**24** Clause 9, page 17, leave out line 33

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would mean that the resources available to the controller could not be taken into account when determining whether a request by a data subject is vexatious or excessive.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

## BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

**25** Clause 9, page 18, line 6, at end insert –

“6. Where, in accordance with paragraph 2, a controller:

- (a) charges a fee for dealing with a request, or
- (b) refuses to act on a request

the controller must issue a notice to the data subject explaining the reasons why they are refusing to act on the request, or charging a fee for dealing with the request, including reasons as to why the controller considers the request to be vexatious or excessive and informing the subject of their right to make a complaint to the Commissioner.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment requires the data controller to inform the data subject whose request they refuse of the reasons for refusal and their right to seek a remedy.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

26 Clause 9, page 18, line 36, at end insert –

“(6A) When informing the data subject of the reasons for not taking action on the request in accordance with subsection (6), the controller must provide evidence of why the request has been treated as vexatious or excessive.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require the data controller to provide evidence of why a request has been considered vexatious or excessive if the controller is refusing to take action on the request.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
LORD SIKKA

*The above-named Lords give notice of their intention to oppose the Question that Clause 9 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would leave out Clause 9, on vexatious or excessive requests by data subjects, leaving in place the existing legislation, which refers to “manifestly unfounded” or excessive requests.*

**Clause 11**

BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD BLACK OF BRENTWOOD

27 Clause 11, page 23, line 10, leave out “to the extent that” and insert “when any one or more of the following is true”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would clarify that only one condition under paragraph 5 must be present for paragraphs 1 to 4 to not apply.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD BLACK OF BRENTWOOD

28 Clause 11, page 23, line 10, at end insert –

“(ia) after point (a), insert –

“(aa) the data is from the Open Electoral Register;”

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD BLACK OF BRENTWOOD

- 29 Clause 11, page 23, line 16, after “effort” insert “in particular where providing the information is not warranted by the impact on the individuals”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would change GDPR Article 14.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD BLACK OF BRENTWOOD

- 30 Clause 11, page 23, line 24, after “things,” insert “the effort and cost of compliance,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment adds to the list of what might constitute a disproportionate effort.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD BLACK OF BRENTWOOD

- 31 Clause 11, page 23, line 24, after “subjects,” insert “the damage and distress to the data subjects,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment adds to the list of what might constitute a disproportionate effort.*

BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD BLACK OF BRENTWOOD

- 32 Clause 11, page 23, line 24, after “subjects,” insert “the reasonable expectation of the data subjects,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment adds to the list of what might constitute a disproportionate effort.*



LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD BLACK OF BRENTWOOD

- 33 Clause 11, page 23, line 26, at end insert “and whether the information has been collected and made publicly available by a public body.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment adds to the list of what might constitute a disproportionate effort.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD BLACK OF BRENTWOOD

- 34 Clause 11, page 23, line 30, at end insert –
- “8. An appropriate safeguard might be a risk assessment, including limiting the extent and purpose of the processing for which the data might be used.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would change GDPR Article 14.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 11 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment keeps the current requirement under Article 13 UK GDPR to require controllers, where they intend to process data for a new purpose, to inform data subjects of various matters to the extent necessary to “ensure fair and transparent processing”.*

**Clause 12**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 12 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to prevent the weakening of the right of subject access and prevent confusion for organisations about what constitutes a reasonable and proportionate search in the particular circumstances.*

**After Clause 13**

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

35 After Clause 13, insert the following new Clause –

**“Right to assign data rights to a data community**

- (1) Data subjects shall have the right to mandate a data community to exercise their data rights as set out in Chapters III and VIII of the UK GDPR on their behalf.
- (2) The data subject has the right to specify which data and which rights over that data they assign to the data community for what purpose and for how long, with respect to which data controllers.
- (3) The subject has the right to amend or withdraw the assignment partially or in full at any time.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment creates a mechanism for data subjects to assign their data rights to be managed and asserted collectively. It seeks to address the asymmetry between the ability of data subjects and data controllers to understand and direct how data is used within data sets. It is one of a series of amendments that would establish the ability to assign data rights to a third party.*

**Clause 14**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

36 Clause 14, page 26, line 10, after “processing” insert “, including profiling,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, and another in the name of Baroness Jones of Whitchurch to the proposed new Article 22A of the UK GDPR, would make clear that protection is offered for profiling operations leading to decisions.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

37 Clause 14, page 26, line 13, after first “decision” insert “, including a decision based on profiling,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, and another in the name of Baroness Jones of Whitchurch to the proposed new Article 22A of the UK GDPR, would make clear that protection is offered for profiling operations leading to decisions.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

38 Clause 14, page 26, line 16, at end insert –

- “(c) a data subject is an identified or identifiable individual who is affected by a significant decision, irrespective of the direct presence of their personal data in the decision-making process.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to clarify that a “data subject” includes identifiable individuals who are subject to data-based and automated decision-making, whether or not their personal data is directly present in the decision-making process.*

## BARONESS BENNETT OF MANOR CASTLE

38A Clause 14, page 26, line 19, at end insert “, and

- (b) a human interpreted, assessed, and was able to intervene in the decision and any information on which it was based.”

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

39 Clause 14, page 26, line 19, at end insert –

- “3. For the purposes of Article 22C, a decision meaningfully involves automated processing where a different decision might have been reached had the output of an automated process not been a factor which was considered by the decision maker.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, introduces a new definition of decisions which “meaningfully involve” automated processing. It creates new additional obligations on public authorities to ensure safeguards for data subjects’ rights and freedoms, not only whenever a significant decision is based “solely” on automated processing, but also whenever automated processing was meaningfully used.*

## BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

40 Clause 14, page 26, line 19, at end insert –

- “3. To qualify as meaningful human involvement, the review must be performed by a person with the necessary competence, training, authority to alter the decision and analytical understanding of the data.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would make clear that in the context of new Article 22A of the UK GDPR, for human involvement to be considered as meaningful, the review must be carried out by a competent person.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 41 Clause 14, page 26, line 21, at end insert –  
“Al. The data subject may not be subject to any decision based on data processing which contravenes a requirement of the Equality Act 2010.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment to new Article 22B of the UK GDPR, aims to make clear that data processing which contravenes any part of the Equality Act 2010 is prohibited.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 42 Clause 14, page 26, line 22, leave out from “on” to “may” in line 23 and insert “processing described in Article 9(1) (processing of special categories of personal data)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This technical amendment adjusts the wording of new Article 22B(1) of the UK GDPR to reflect the terms of Article 9(1).*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 43 Clause 14, page 26, line 22, leave out from “on” to “may” in line 23 and insert “personal data”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment broadens the restriction on solely automated decision-making in new Article 22B so that it applies to decisions based on all categories of personal data, not just “special category” data.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 44 Clause 14, page 26, leave out lines 30 and 31

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment to new Article 22B of the UK GDPR would remove the condition relating to the entering into, or performing of, a contract between a data subject and a controller. This is to prevent data subjects from becoming trapped in unfair agreements and being unable to exercise their data rights.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 45 Clause 14, page 26, line 32, after “law” insert “which also lays down suitable measures to safeguard the data subject’s rights and freedoms and legitimate interests”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment to new Article 22B of the UK GDPR would change the second condition to make clear that it only applies to laws which contain safeguards for data subject's rights, freedoms and legitimate interests.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

46 Clause 14, page 26, line 37, at end insert –

“(b) the data subject is a child or may be a child unless the provider is satisfied that the decision is in, and compatible with, the best interests of a child, taking into account their rights and development stage.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment seeks to ensure that significant decisions that impact children cannot be made using automated processes unless they are in a child's best interest. This upholds data law introduced in 2018.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

47 Clause 14, page 27, leave out lines 3 to 9 and insert –

- “1. Where a significant decision, taken by or on behalf of a controller which is a public authority in relation to a data subject, is –
- (a) based entirely or partly on personal data, and
  - (b) meaningfully involves automated processing,
- the controller must ensure that safeguards for the data subject's rights, freedoms and legitimate interests are in place which comply with paragraph 2 and any regulations under Article 22D(4).
- 1A. Where a significant decision, taken by or on behalf of a controller which is not a public authority in relation to a data subject, is –
- (a) based entirely or partly on personal data, and
  - (b) based solely on automated processing,
- the controller must ensure that safeguards for the data subject's rights, freedoms and legitimate interests are in place which comply with paragraph 2 and any regulations under Article 22D(4).”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, would introduce a new definition of decisions which “meaningfully involve” automated processing. It creates new additional obligations on public authorities to ensure safeguards for data subjects' rights and freedoms, not only whenever a significant decision is based “solely” on automated processing, but also whenever automated processing was meaningfully used.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

48 Clause 14, page 27, line 6, leave out “solely” and insert “predominantly”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would mean safeguards for data subjects' rights, freedoms and legitimate interests would have to be in place in cases where a significant decision in relation to a data subject was taken based predominantly, rather than solely, on automated processing.*

## BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

49 Clause 14, page 27, line 6, after “solely” insert “or partly”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would mean that the protections provided for by the new Article 22C would apply where a decision is based either solely or partly on automated processing, not only where it is based solely on such processing.*

## BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

50 Clause 14, page 27, line 10, at beginning insert “In addition to the transparency obligations in Articles 12 to 15,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would make clear that safeguards in new Article 22C of the UK GDPR are to operate alongside, rather than instead of, transparency obligations contained in Articles 12 to 15 of that document.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

51 Clause 14, page 27, line 12, leave out “paragraph 1” and insert “paragraphs 1 and 1A”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, would introduce a new definition of decisions which “meaningfully involve” automated processing. It creates new additional obligations on public authorities to ensure safeguards for data subjects' rights and freedoms, not only whenever a significant decision is based “solely” on automated processing, but also whenever automated processing was meaningfully used.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

52 Clause 14, page 27, line 12, at end insert “including the reasons for the processing”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment would require data controllers to provide the data subject with the reasons for the processing of their data in cases where a significant decision in relation to a data subject was taken based on automated processing.*

LORD HOLMES OF RICHMOND

52A Clause 14, page 27, leave out lines 20 to 27 and insert—

- “1. The Information Commissioner’s Office must publish guidance on the implementation and interpretation of the safeguards in Article 22C within one year of the passing of this Act.
2. The Information Commissioner’s Office must publish guidance on the implementation and interpretation of what constitutes “similarly significant effect” and “meaningful human involvement” under Article 22A within one year of the passing of this Act.”

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

53 Clause 14, page 27, line 21, leave out “is, or”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, would retain the ability of the Secretary of State to introduce new safeguards but would prevent the removal or variation of safeguards under the new UK GDPR Article 22D and the new section 50D of the 2018 Act.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

54 Clause 14, page 27, line 25, leave out “, or is not,”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, would retain the ability of the Secretary of State to introduce new safeguards but would prevent the removal or variation of safeguards under the new UK GDPR Article 22D and the new section 50D of the 2018 Act.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

55 Clause 14, page 27, line 27 at end insert—

“(b) omit provisions added by regulations under those paragraphs.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, would retain the ability of the Secretary of State to introduce new safeguards but would prevent the removal or variation of safeguards under the new UK GDPR Article 22D and the new section 50D of the 2018 Act.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

56 Clause 14, page 27, line 31 after “22C(1)” insert “, (1A)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, introduces a new definition of decisions which “meaningfully involve” automated processing. It creates new additional obligations on public authorities to ensure safeguards for data subjects’ rights and freedoms, not only whenever a significant decision is based “solely” on automated processing, but also whenever automated processing was meaningfully used.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

57 Clause 14, page 27, line 34, at end insert –

“5A. The Secretary of State may only amend Article 22A, 22B or 22C provided such amendments do not reduce, minimise or undermine existing standards and protections of children’s data.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment ensures that, when exercising their powers, the Secretary of State must uphold the level of protection children are entitled to in DPA 2018.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

58 Clause 14, page 27, line 34, at end insert –

“5A. Regulations under paragraph 4 may not be made where the effect of the regulations would be to reduce the protections afforded by Article 22C to a data subject who is subject to automated decision-making.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is one of two changes to delegated powers allowing the Secretary of State to vary safeguards applying to automated decision-making. It is intended to implement a recommendation of the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee.*



BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

59 Clause 14, page 27, line 36, at end insert –

“7. When exercising the power to make regulations under this Article, the Secretary of State must have regard to the following principles.

**Digital information principles at work**

1. People should have access to a fair, inclusive and trustworthy digital environment at work.
2. Algorithmic systems should be designed and used to achieve better outcomes (to make work better, and not for surveillance), and workers and their representatives should be involved in this process.
3. People should be protected from unsafe, unaccountable and ineffective algorithmic systems at work. Impacts on individuals and groups must be assessed in advance and monitored, with reasonable and proportionate steps taken.
4. Algorithmic systems should not harm workers’ mental or physical health, or integrity.
5. Workers and their representatives should always know when an algorithmic system is being used, how and why it is being used, and what impacts it may have on them or their work.
6. Workers and their representatives should be involved in meaningful consultation before and during use of an algorithmic system that may significantly impact work or people.
7. Workers should have control over their own data and digital information collected about them at work.
8. Workers and their representatives should always have an opportunity for human contact, review and redress when an algorithmic system is used at work where it may significantly impact work or people, including a right to a written explanation when a decision is made.
9. Workers and their representatives should be able to use their data and digital technologies for contact and association to improve work quality and conditions.
10. Workers should be supported to build the information, literacy and skills needed to fulfil their capabilities through work transitions.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would insert into new Article 22D of the UK GDPR a requirement for the Secretary of State to have regard to the statement of digital information principles at work when making regulations about automated decision-making.*

## LORD HOLMES OF RICHMOND

59A Clause 14, page 27, line 36, at end insert –

“7. Not less than every two years from the commencement of this Act, the Secretary of State must consult the Information Commissioner’s Office and any of the following as the Secretary of State considers appropriate –

(a) data subjects; and

(b) persons and organisations who appear to the Secretary of State to represent the interests of data subjects such as trade unions, civil society organisations or other representative bodies

about the guidance on the implementation and interpretation of the safeguards in Article 22C under paragraph 1.”

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

60 Clause 14, page 28, line 13, at end insert –

“(c) a decision meaningfully involves automated processing where a different decision might have been reached had the output of an automated process not been a factor which was considered by the decision maker.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, would introduce a new definition of decisions which “meaningfully involve” automated processing. It creates new additional obligations on public authorities to ensure safeguards for data subjects’ rights and freedoms, not only whenever a significant decision is based “solely” on automated processing, but also whenever automated processing was meaningfully used.*

## VISCOUNT CAMROSE

61 Clause 14, page 28, line 17, leave out “using sensitive personal data” and insert “based on sensitive processing”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment of a heading is consequential on the amendment in my name to clause 14, page 28, line 19.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

62 Clause 14, page 28, line 19, leave out “sensitive”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to broaden the restriction on solely automated decision-making in new Article 22B so that it applies to decisions based on all categories of personal data, not just sensitive personal data.*

## VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 63 Clause 14, page 28, line 19, leave out “sensitive personal data” and insert “sensitive processing (as defined in section 35(8))”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This technical amendment adjusts the wording of new section 50B(1) of the Data Protection Act 2018 to refer to “sensitive processing”, rather than “sensitive personal data”, to reflect the terms of section 35(8) of that Act.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 64 Clause 14, page 28, line 28, after “controller” insert “which is a public authority”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, would introduce a new definition of decisions which “meaningfully involve” automated processing. It creates new additional obligations on public authorities to ensure safeguards for data subjects’ rights and freedoms, not only whenever a significant decision is based “solely” on automated processing, but also whenever automated processing was meaningfully used.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 65 Clause 14, page 28, line 30, leave out “based solely on” and insert “meaningfully involves”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, would introduce a new definition of decisions which “meaningfully involve” automated processing. It creates new additional obligations on public authorities to ensure safeguards for data subjects’ rights and freedoms, not only whenever a significant decision is based “solely” on automated processing, but also whenever automated processing was meaningfully used.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 66 Clause 14, page 28, line 33, at end insert –

- “(1A) Subject to subsection (3), where a significant decision taken by or on behalf of a controller who is not a public authority in relation to a data subject is –
- (a) based entirely or partly on personal data, and
  - (b) based solely on automated processing,
- the controller must ensure that safeguards for the data subject’s rights, freedoms and legitimate interests are in place which comply with subsection (2) and any regulations under section 50D(4).”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, would introduce a new definition of decisions which “meaningfully involve” automated processing. It creates new additional obligations on public authorities to ensure safeguards for data subjects’ rights and*

*freedoms, not only whenever a significant decision is based “solely” on automated processing, but also whenever automated processing was meaningfully used.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

67 Clause 14, page 28, line 36, after “(1)” insert “and (1A)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, would introduce a new definition of decisions which “meaningfully involve” automated processing. It creates new additional obligations on public authorities to ensure safeguards for data subjects’ rights and freedoms, not only whenever a significant decision is based “solely” on automated processing, but also whenever automated processing was meaningfully used.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

68 Clause 14, page 29, line 2, after “(1)” insert “, (1A)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, would introduce a new definition of decisions which “meaningfully involve” automated processing. It creates new additional obligations on public authorities to ensure safeguards for data subjects’ rights and freedoms, not only whenever a significant decision is based “solely” on automated processing, but also whenever automated processing was meaningfully used.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

69 Clause 14, page 29, line 25, leave out “, or is not,” and insert “not”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, seeks to retain the ability of the Secretary of State to introduce new safeguards but would prevent the removal or variation of safeguards under the new UK GDPR Article 22D and the new section 50D of the 2018 Act.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

70 Clause 14, page 29, line 29, leave out “, or is not,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, seeks to retain the ability of the Secretary of State to introduce new safeguards but would prevent the removal or variation of safeguards under the new UK GDPR Article 22D and the new section 50D of the 2018 Act.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

71 Clause 14, page 29, line 35, leave out “, or is not,” and insert “not”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, seeks to retain the ability of the Secretary of State to introduce new safeguards but would prevent the removal or variation of safeguards under the new UK GDPR Article 22D and the new section 50D of the 2018 Act.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

72 Clause 14, page 29, line 38, leave out “or varying”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, seeks to retain the ability of the Secretary of State to introduce new safeguards but would prevent the removal or variation of safeguards under the new UK GDPR Article 22D and the new section 50D of the 2018 Act.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

73 Clause 14, page 29, line 40, at end insert –

“5A. Regulations under subsection (4) may not be made where the effect of the regulations would be to reduce the protections afforded by section 50C.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment is one of two changes to delegated powers allowing the Secretary of State to vary safeguards applying to automated decision-making. It is intended to implement a recommendation of the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
LORD KAMALL

*The above-named Lords give notice of their intention to oppose the Question that Clause 14 stand part of the Bill.*

**Member's explanatory statement**

*Removing Clause 14 would retain existing safeguards in the context of automated decision-making.*

**After Clause 14**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

74 After Clause 14, insert the following new Clause –

**“Use of the Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard**

- (1) The Secretary of State must by regulations make provision requiring Government departments, public authorities and all persons exercising a public function using

algorithmic tools to process personal data to use the Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard (“the Standard”).

- (2) The Standard is that published by the Central Digital and Data Office and Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation as part of the Government’s National Data Strategy.
- (3) Regulations under subsection (1) must require the submission and publication of algorithmic transparency reports as required by the Standard.
- (4) Regulations under subsection (1) may provide for exemptions to the requirement for publication where necessary –
  - (a) to avoid obstructing an official or legal inquiry, investigation or procedure,
  - (b) to avoid prejudicing the prevention, detection, investigation or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties,
  - (c) to protect public security, or
  - (d) to safeguard national security.
- (5) Regulations under subsection (1) are subject to the affirmative resolution procedure.”

***Member’s explanatory statement***

*This new Clause puts a legislative obligation on public bodies using algorithmic tools that have a significant influence on a decision-making process with direct or indirect public effect, or directly interact with the general public, to publish reports under the Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

75

After Clause 14, insert the following new Clause –

**“Transparency in public use of algorithmic tools**

- (1) Subject to subsection (2), the Secretary of State must, by regulations, introduce a compulsory transparency reporting requirement on the use of algorithms in decision-making by –
  - (a) public authorities,
  - (b) government departments, and
  - (c) government contractors using public data.
- (2) The Secretary of State is not required to introduce regulations under subsection (1) while the following conditions are met –
  - (a) the Secretary of State does not consider it appropriate to do so, and
  - (b) within the preceding six months, the Secretary of State has, in either House of Parliament, made a statement explaining their reasons for not considering it appropriate to do so, including –
    - (i) what efforts the Secretary of State has taken to make appropriate regulations which would satisfy the duty in subsection (1) since their previous statement,
    - (ii) when the Secretary of State expects to be able to introduce regulations under subsection (1), and

- (iii) the results of any pilot schemes undertaken since their previous statement.
- (3) Until regulations under subsection (1) are introduced, the Secretary of State must keep the consideration in subsection (2)(a) under continual review.
- (4) Regulations under subsection (1) must require the publication of the information required by the UK Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard, the standard published by the Central Digital and Data Office and Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation as part of the Government’s National Data Strategy.
- (5) Regulations under subsection (1) may provide for exemptions to the requirement for publication where necessary –
  - (a) to avoid obstructing an official or legal inquiry, investigation or procedure,
  - (b) to avoid prejudicing the prevention, detection, investigation or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties,
  - (c) to protect public security, or
  - (d) to safeguard national security.
- (6) Regulations under subsection (1) are subject to the affirmative resolution procedure.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment requires the Secretary of State to introduce a compulsory transparency reporting requirement (such as the Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard (ATRS)) provided that they consider it appropriate to do so. If the Secretary of State does not consider it appropriate, then they must provide reasons to Parliament at six-month intervals (which is the current frequency with which the ATRS is being reviewed).*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

76 After Clause 14, insert the following new Clause –

**“Safe and responsible automated decision systems: public sector duty and algorithmic impact assessments**

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to ensure any automated decision systems it uses, procures, or otherwise exercises control over, are responsible and minimise harm to individuals and society at large.
- (2) The duty in subsection (1) involves, in particular, the need for the systems –
  - (a) to be safe, secure and robust, including compliance with data protection law,
  - (b) to be transparent and adequately explainable,
  - (c) to be fair, including being non-discriminatory within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010,
  - (d) to be accountable and subject to sufficient governance,
  - (e) to be contestable and enable individuals to seek and obtain redress,
  - (f) to be proportionate,
  - (g) to give effect to individuals' human rights and freedoms, and

- (h) to safeguard democracy and the rule of law.
- (3) Compliance by public authorities with subsections (1) and (2) must include, but is not limited to, completion of an algorithmic impact assessment, which must be –
- (a) completed prior to use or procurement of an automated decision system,
  - (b) reviewed and updated on a scheduled basis, including when the functionality or scope of the automated decision system changes, and
  - (c) released in an accessible format.
- (4) The Secretary of State must by regulations prescribe the form of an algorithmic impact assessment framework with the aims of ensuring public authorities –
- (a) procure and develop automated decision systems in conformity with subsections (1) and (2),
  - (b) better understand and reduce the risks associated with automated decision systems,
  - (c) introduce the appropriate governance, oversight, reporting and auditing requirements that best match the risks associated with the application envisaged, and
  - (d) communicate the risks, mitigations, benefits, governance mechanisms and impact assessment in a transparent and accessible way to affected individuals and to the wider public.
- (5) Such framework as prescribed by regulations made under subsection (4) must include the requirement for –
- (a) a detailed description of the automated decision system,
  - (b) an assessment of the relative benefits and risks of the system including the risks to the particular requirements in subsection (2),
  - (c) an explanation of the steps taken to minimise those risks,
  - (d) independent external scrutiny of the efficacy and accuracy of the system, and
  - (e) independent external scrutiny of the impact assessments and their compliance with subsections (1) and (2).
- (6) In this section, “automated decision system” –
- (a) means any tool, model, software, system, process, function, program, method and/or formula designed with or using computation to automate, analyse, aid, augment, and/or replace human decisions that impact the welfare, rights and freedoms of individuals, and
  - (b) includes systems which are partly automated, and systems which incorporate multiple automated tools and models.
- (7) A person who is not a public authority must comply with this section and any regulations made under it –
- (a) when exercising public functions, or
  - (b) when using data collected or held by a public authority.”



## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

77 After Clause 14, insert the following new Clause –

**“Obligation to use the Algorithmic Transparency Reporting Standard**

- (1) The Secretary of State must, by regulations, make provision requiring Government departments using algorithmic tools to process personal data to use the Algorithmic Transparency Reporting Standard (“the Standard”).
- (2) The Standard is that published by the Central Digital and Data Office and Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation.
- (3) Subject to subsection (4), the Secretary of State must, by regulations, make provision requiring public authorities that are not Government departments using algorithmic tools to process personal data, and all persons using algorithmic tools to process personal data in the exercise of a public function, to use the Standard.
- (4) The Secretary of State is not required to introduce regulations under subsection (3) while the following conditions are met –
  - (a) the Secretary of State does not consider it appropriate to do so, and
  - (b) within the preceding six months, the Secretary of State has, in either House of Parliament, made a statement explaining their reasons for not considering it appropriate to do so, including –
    - (i) what efforts the Secretary of State has taken to make appropriate regulations which would satisfy the duty in subsection (3) since their previous statement,
    - (ii) when the Secretary of State expects to be able to introduce regulations under subsection (3), and
    - (iii) the results of any pilot schemes undertaken since their previous statement.
- (5) Until regulations under subsection (3) are introduced, the Secretary of State must keep the consideration in subsection (4)(a) under continual review.
- (6) Regulations under subsections (1) and (3) must require the publication of the information required by the Standard.
- (7) Regulations under subsection (1) and (3) may provide for exemptions to the requirement for publication where necessary –
  - (a) to avoid obstructing an official or legal inquiry, investigation or procedure,
  - (b) to avoid prejudicing the prevention, detection, investigation or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties,
  - (c) to protect public security, or
  - (d) to safeguard national security.
- (8) Regulations under subsections (1) and (3) are subject to the affirmative resolution procedure.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This new clause puts a legislative obligation on government departments using algorithmic tools that have a significant influence on a decision-making process with direct or indirect public effect, or directly interact with the general public, to publish reports under the Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard. This new clause would put the position set out by Government in its response to the AI Regulation White Paper consultation response on a legislative basis.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

78

After Clause 14, insert the following new Clause –

**“Reporting framework for transparency in the public use of algorithmic tools**

- (1) The Secretary of State must by regulations require Government departments, public authorities and all persons in the exercise of a public function in using algorithmic tools to complete and publish algorithmic transparency reports.
- (2) The report shall contain at least –
  - (a) a detailed description of the algorithmic tool, what it does, how it works and how it fits into the wider decision-making process or wider public service and rationale for using it;
  - (b) information about the owner and responsibility;
  - (c) information on the wider decision-making process and human oversight;
  - (d) information on the technical specifications and datasets to both train the model and which the model is or will be deployed on; and
  - (e) information on impact assessments conducted, identified risks and mitigation efforts.
- (3) Regulations under subsection (1) may provide for exemptions to the requirement for publication and the requirement for all information under subsection (2) where necessary –
  - (a) to avoid obstructing an official or legal inquiry, investigation or procedure,
  - (b) to avoid prejudicing the prevention, detection, investigation or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties,
  - (c) to protect public security, or
  - (d) to safeguard national security.
- (4) Regulations under subsection (1) are subject to the affirmative resolution procedure.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment requires the Secretary of State to introduce regulations that place an obligation on government departments, public authorities and all persons in the exercise of a public function to complete and publish algorithmic transparency reports that contain a base level of information about algorithmic tools in use.*

**Clause 15**

BARONESS KIDRON  
 LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
 BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
 BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

79 Clause 15, page 30, line 37, at end insert –

“(ba) in paragraph 3(c) for “Article 32” substitute “Articles 25 and 32””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would add data protection by design as an additional measure for processors, to ensure that they are accountable for the design of their systems and services, noting the challenge that controllers often face when engaging processors for services such as AI and cloud computing and what influence they can have on the design.*

**Clause 16**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

80 Leave out Clause 16, and insert the following new Clause –

**“Representatives of controllers etc outside the UK**

- (1) The UK GDPR is amended in accordance with subsections (2) to (6).
- (2) In Article 27 (Representatives of controllers or processors not established in the United Kingdom) –
  - (a) substitute the title of Article 27 “Representatives of controllers or processors not established in the United Kingdom” with “Representatives of controllers not established in the United Kingdom,
  - (b) in paragraph 1, omit “or the processor”,
  - (c) omit paragraph 3,
  - (d) in paragraph 4, omit the words “or the processor” in both instances that they appear in paragraph 4, and
  - (e) in paragraph 5, omit the words “or the processor” in both instances that they appear in paragraph 5.
- (3) In Article 4(17) (definition of “representative”) omit the words “or processor” in both instances that they appear,
- (4) In Article 30 (records of processing activities) –
  - (a) in paragraph 2, in the words before point (a), omit “and, where applicable, the processor’s representative”,
  - (b) in paragraph 2(a), omit “or the processor’s”, and
  - (c) in paragraph 4 omit “or the processor’s”,

- (5) In Article 31 (cooperation with the Commissioner) substitute “and, where applicable, their representatives,” with the words “and where applicable, the controller’s representative, and
- (6) In Article 58(1)(a) (Commissioner’s powers) omit “or the processor’s representative”.
- (7) In consequence of that revocation, in the 2018 Act—
  - (a) in section 142 (information notices) subsection (9) omit “or processor” and omit “or processors” in each instance these words occur,
  - (b) in section 143 (information notices: restrictions) subsection (9) omit “or processor” in each instance these words occur, and
  - (c) in section 181 (interpretation of Part 6) omit “or processor” and omit “or processors” in each instance these words occur.”

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*The above-named Lords give notice of their intention to oppose the Question that Clause 16 stand part of the bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment to leave out Clause 16 is to probe why the Bill removes the requirement for non-UK entities to appoint a UK representative when such a requirement exists in the data protection law of many other jurisdictions.*

**Clause 17**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

- 81** Clause 17, page 32, line 37, at end insert “(including in the cases specified in sub-paragraphs (a) to (c) of paragraph 3 of Article 35)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, together with an amendment to Clause 18 in the name of Baroness Jones of Whitchurch, would provide a definition of what constitutes “high risk processing” for the purposes of applying Articles 27A, 27B and 27C, which require data controllers to designate, and specify the duties of, a “senior responsible individual” with responsibility for such processing.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 82** Clause 17, page 32, line 38, at the end insert “or where the controller or processor has designated a data protection officer under Article 37 of Regulation (EU) 2019/679 (protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data) and that data protection officer is responsible for processing under this Regulation”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment probes whether the roles of Senior Responsible Individual (“SRI”) in this Bill and data protection officer (“DPO”) under the EU GDPR are compatible.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

83 Clause 17, page 34, line 9, at end insert –

“4A. The senior responsible individual must ensure they understand the heightened risk associated with children's data and the fact that, under the 2018 Act, children are entitled to a higher standard of protection and they must give due regard to child data subjects in the performance of their tasks.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment ensures that senior responsible individuals' tasks include a specific requirement to consider children. This amendment ensures senior responsible individuals understand the risks and rights of children and are required to take both into account when performing their duties.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

84 Clause 17, page 34, line 41, at end insert –

“5. Where a Senior Responsible Individual submits an assessment for advice, the Commissioner must provide advice which must have the status of assured advice such that when followed and implemented in full, no subsequent prosecution or enforcement is possible unless it is rescinded prior to the action for which prosecution or enforcement is proposed.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment would introduce a system of assured advice.*

**Clause 18**

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

85 Clause 18, page 39, line 3, after “severity” insert “taking into account that under the 2018 Act, children are entitled to a higher standard of protection than adults with regard to their personal data”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment ensures that obligations upon data controllers and processors regarding record keeping reflect the amendment at Clause 20, page 41, line 15 (setting minimum standards for*

*children’s risk assessments) that processing is automatically deemed to be high risk where a service is likely to be accessed by children.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

- 86 Clause 18, page 40, line 11, after “severity” insert “taking into account that under the 2018 Act, children are entitled to a higher standard of protection than adults with regard to their personal data”

***Member’s explanatory statement***

*This amendment ensures that obligations upon data controllers and processors regarding record keeping reflect the amendment at Clause 20, page 41, line 15 (setting minimum standards for children’s risk assessments) that processing is automatically deemed to be high risk where a service is likely to be accessed by children.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 18 stand part of the Bill*

***Member’s explanatory statement***

*This amendment probes whether removing Clause 18 from the Bill make organisations more likely to be compliant with the main obligations in the UK GDPR.*

**Clause 19**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 19 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member’s explanatory statement***

*This amendment keeps the current requirement on police in the Data Protection Act 2018 to justify why they have accessed an individual’s personal data.*

**Clause 20**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 87 Clause 20, page 40, line 19, leave out subsection (2)

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones to Clause 20, maintains the current requirement to conduct a data protection impact assessment and introduces a new requirement on public authorities to publish data protection impact assessments.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

88 Clause 20, page 40, line 22, leave out paragraphs (a) to (h) and insert “, after paragraph 3 insert –

“3A. Where the controller is a public authority, the controller must publish the data protection impact assessment without prejudice to the protection of commercial interests or the protection of personal data.””

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones to Clause 20, maintains the current requirement to conduct a data protection impact assessment and introduces a new requirement on public authorities to publish data protection impact assessments.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

89 Clause 20, page 40, line 23, leave out paragraphs (b) to (d)

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, removes the provisions in Clause 20 which would arguably weaken the requirements for data protection impact assessments. The amendment maintains the other changes made by Clause 20.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

90 Clause 20, page 40, line 24, leave out paragraph (c) and insert –

- “(c) omit paragraph 2,
- (ca) in paragraph 3 –
  - (i) for “data protection” substitute “high risk processing”,
  - (ii) in sub-paragraph (a), for “natural persons” substitute “individuals”,
  - (iii) in sub-paragraph (a) for “natural person” substitute “individual” in both places where it occurs,
- (cb) omit paragraphs 4 and 5,”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment seeks to ensure that there is a definition of “high risk processing” on the face of the Regulation.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

91 Clause 20, page 40, line 24, leave out paragraph (c) and insert –

“(c) after paragraph 3, insert –

“3A. Where the controller is a public authority, the controller must publish the data protection impact assessment without prejudice to the protection of commercial interests or the protection of personal data.””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones to Clause 20, maintains the current requirement to conduct a data protection impact assessment and introduces a new requirement on public authorities to publish data protection impact assessments.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

92 Clause 20, page 40, line 25, leave out paragraph (d) and insert –

“(d) in paragraph 7 –

- (i) in point (c) for “data subjects referred to in paragraph 1” substitute “individuals and groups affected by the processing, and to the public interest”,
- (ii) in point (d) after “concerned” insert “and the public interest”, and
- (iii) after point (d) insert –

“(e) an equalities impact assessment”,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would ensure assessments capture group-level and societal-level impacts (public interest) and impacts to individuals who aren't data subjects.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS KIDRON  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

93 Clause 20, page 40, line 38, leave out paragraph (f)

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, removes the provisions in Clause 20 which would arguably weaken the requirements for data protection impact assessments. The amendment maintains the other changes made by Clause 20.*



LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

94 Clause 20, page 40, line 38, leave out paragraph (f) and insert –

- “(f) in paragraph 9 –  
(i) omit “Where appropriate,” and  
(ii) after “subjects” insert “, impacted communities,””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would strengthen the requirement for consultation and include the need to consult impacted communities.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

95 Clause 20, page 41, line 5, leave out paragraph (h) and insert –

- “(h) in paragraph 11, for “data protection impact assessment” substitute “assessment made pursuant to paragraph 1””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, removes the provisions in Clause 20 which would arguably weaken the requirements for data protection impact assessments. The amendment maintains the other changes made by Clause 20.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

96 Clause 20, page 41, line 15, at end insert –

“(4A) After Article 35(11) insert –

- “12. Where a service is likely to be accessed by children, processing is automatically considered high risk and a controller must carry out a children’s data protection impact assessment as prescribed in the Age-Appropriate Design Code by the Information Commissioner’s Office.
13. A children’s data protection impact assessment must include –
- (a) a systematic description of the envisaged processing operations and the purposes of the processing, including, where applicable, the legitimate interest pursued by the controller,
  - (b) an assessment of the necessity and proportionality of the processing operations in relation to the purposes,
  - (c) an assessment of the risks to the rights and freedoms of children, and

- (d) the measures envisaged to address the risks, including safeguards, security measures and mechanisms to ensure the protection of personal data and to demonstrate compliance with this Regulation taking into account the rights and legitimate interests of data subjects and other persons concerned.
14. A children’s data protection impact assessment must give due consideration to –
- (a) children’s interests and fundamental rights and freedoms as set out in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and General Comment 25 on Children’s Rights in relation to the Digital Environment,
- (b) the principle established in the 2018 Act, that children are entitled to a higher standard of protection than adults with regard to their personal data, and
- (c) the views of children or their representatives on the intended processing, without prejudice to the protection of commercial or public interests or the security of processing operations.
15. Where appropriate, when carrying out children’s data protection impact assessment, the controller may seek the views of data subjects or their representatives on the intended processing, without prejudice to the protection of commercial or public interests or the security of processing operations.””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment retains the current requirement to undertake a comprehensive data protection impact assessment for services likely to be accessed by children. It upholds existing standards established in Data Protection Act 2018 and seeks to maintain children’s privacy and safety.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

97

Clause 20, page 41, line 15, at end insert –

- “(4A) Public authorities subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 must publish risk assessments conducted under Article 35 GDPR, within one month of the risk assessment being completed, unless an exemption under that Act applies.
- (4B) Where an exemption applies, public authorities must consider whether the risk assessment can be published in part.
- (4C) The Cabinet Office must maintain a register of public sector risk assessments published, covering the previous two years.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This would require public bodies to publish risk assessments to create transparency and accountability. This would also place on statute a provision that is already contained in the Information Commissioner's FOIA publication scheme guidance. It would also require the Cabinet Office to create and maintain an accessible register to improve accountability.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

98 Clause 20, page 41, line 16, leave out subsections (5), (6), and (7)

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, maintains the current requirement to conduct a data protection impact assessment and introduces a new requirement on public authorities to publish data protection impact assessments.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

98A Clause 20, page 41, line 16, leave out "and (7)" and insert "to (8)"

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

99 Clause 20, page 41, line 20, at end insert –

“(aa) in subsection (1), after “individuals” insert “which includes all significant decisions within the meaning of Article 22A of the UK GDPR””

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, and others to Clause 20 in the name of Baroness Jones of Whitchurch, would create a broader risk assessment for significant decisions that includes consideration of equalities matters.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

100 Clause 20, page 41, line 23, after “data” insert “, the protections from unlawful discrimination contrary to the Equality Act 2010, and the rights and freedoms of individuals”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, and others to Clause 20 in the name of Baroness Jones of Whitchurch, would create a broader risk assessment for significant decisions that includes consideration of equalities matters.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

101 Clause 20, page 41, line 25, leave out paragraph (d)

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, along with others in the name of Lord Clement-Jones to this Clause, removes the provisions in Clause 20 which would arguably weaken the requirements for data protection impact assessments. The amendment maintains the other changes made by Clause 20.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

102 Clause 20, page 41, line 30, at end insert –

“(ba) an assessment of the extent to which there is meaningful human involvement in any significant decisions within the meaning of Article 22A of the UK GDPR including their competence, training, authority to alter the decision, and analytical understanding of the data,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, and others to Clause 20 in the name of Baroness Jones of Whitchurch, would create a broader risk assessment for significant decisions that includes consideration of equalities matters.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD BLACK OF BRENTWOOD  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

103★ Clause 20, page 41, line 34, at end insert –

“(e) a description of how the controller will enforce purpose limitation, and  
(f) evidence of how individual information rights are enabled at the point of collection and after processing (if subsection (3A) is not routinely applied)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*Large language models are accessing data that includes personal data. There are existing web protocols that can prevent this, but they are little known, difficult to navigate and require an opt out. This amendment and another in my name to Clause 20 would require either proof of legitimate interest, or prior permission from data subjects unless the company routinely give an easily accessible machine readable opt in.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD BLACK OF BRENTWOOD  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

**104★** Clause 20, page 41, line 34, at end insert –

“(e) after subsection (3) insert –

“(3A) Prior permission is deemed to have been made if the processing is subject to an opt in machine readable protocol that is accessible, effective and fully compliant with existing web protocols.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment and another in my name to Clause 20 would require either proof of legitimate interest or prior permission from data subjects, unless the company routinely give an easily accessible opportunity to opt in. This would reverse current practice in which web scraping is opt out and can be difficult to identify who is scraping and how to opt out.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD KNIGHT OF WEYMOUTH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**104A** Clause 20, page 41, line 34, at end insert –

“(8) After section 64 insert –

**“64A Algorithmic impact assessment at work**

- (1) This section applies if a data controller intends to undertake high risk processing –
  - (a) in, or in relation to, a workplace, and
  - (b) where the outcome of that processing is likely to produce impacts on –
    - (i) equality,
    - (ii) access to employment,
    - (iii) pay,
    - (iv) contractual status,
    - (v) terms and conditions of employment,
    - (vi) mental and physical health,
    - (vii) lawful association, or
    - (viii) training and development.
- (2) In addition to the requirements under section 64, the data controller must, prior to carrying out the processing, undertake an algorithmic risk and impact assessment which –
  - (a) identifies individuals and groups within the workplace who share a relevant right, freedom or interest, and who are likely to be affected by the outcomes of the processing,

- (b) establishes a process for carrying out the evaluation of risks and impacts on the areas listed in subsection (1)(b), and any comparable legal, material or similarly significant effects (see subsection (4)),
  - (c) documents the definitions, metrics and methods selected for the assessment, and
  - (d) makes provision for the consultation and review by the individuals and groups identified under paragraph (a), or any authorised representatives of those individuals.
- (3) Following completion of an assessment under subsection (2), the data controller must –
- (a) make reasonable and proportionate mitigations, or implement other safeguards or adjustments, as appropriate, in response to the assessment,
  - (b) disclose a summary report of –
    - (i) the algorithmic risk and impact assessment, and
    - (ii) provision made for ongoing assessment and review on request of the individuals and groups identified under subsection (2)(a) or any authorised representatives of those individuals, and
  - (c) make provision for workers and their representatives to seek additional documentation and information relevant to the assessment, where the controller has possession of that information or can reasonably request, inspect, or take possession of it.
- (4) The Information Commissioner may issue guidance in relation to the definitions, metrics, methods or other conduct of the assessment of positive and adverse impacts of high risk processing at work, or in response to any significant effects arising from that processing.””

### Clause 21

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

105 Clause 21, page 41, line 37, leave out “and (3)” and insert “(3) and (3A)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on the other amendment to this Clause in the name of Baroness Kidron*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

106 Clause 21, page 41, line 39, leave out paragraph (a)

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment would remove a proposed change to Article 36 of the UK GDPR, which would downgrade a data controller's duty to consult the Information Commissioner prior to undertaking processing with a high risk to individual rights and freedoms. It is to probe whether there are specific cases, such as the handling of health data, where prior consultation should remain mandatory.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

107 Clause 21, page 42, line 7, at end insert –

“(3A) After paragraph 3, insert –

“3A. In relation to children’s data protection impact assessments (CDPIA), the controller may consult the Commissioner on mitigation measures, prior to processing where the CDPIA (under section 20 of the Data Protection and Digital Information Act 2024) indicates that the processing would result in a high risk.

3B. When consulting the Commissioner pursuant to paragraph 1, the controller must provide the Commissioner with –

- (a) where applicable, the respective responsibilities of the controller, joint controllers and processors involved in the processing, in particular for processing within a group of undertakings,
- (b) the purposes and means of the intended processing,
- (c) the measures and safeguards provided to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects,
- (d) where applicable, the contact details of the senior responsible individual,
- (d) the data protection impact assessment provided for in section 18 of the Data Protection and Digital Information Act 2024, and
- (e) any other information requested by the Commissioner.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment retains the current requirement to consult with the Information Commissioner when high-risk processing of children’s data has been identified. It upholds existing standards established in Data Protection Act 2018 and seeks to maintain children’s privacy and safety.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

108 Clause 21, page 42, line 11, leave out paragraph (a)

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment would remove a proposed change to section 65 of the Data Protection Act 2018, which would downgrade a data controller's duty to consult the Information Commissioner prior to undertaking processing with a high risk to individual rights and freedoms. It is to probe whether there are specific cases, such as the handling of health data, where prior consultation should remain mandatory.*

**Schedule 4**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 109** Schedule 4, page 200, leave out line 34 and insert –
- “12 (1) Section 14 (automated decision-making authorised by law: safeguards) is amended as follows.
- (2) In subsection (1) –
- (a) for “22(2)(b)” substitute “22B(3)(a)”, and
- (b) for “22(1)” substitute “22A(1)”.
- (3) Omit subsection (3).
- (4) In subsection (4) –
- (a) after “takes a” omit “qualifying”, and
- (b) after “decision” insert “that falls within sub-paragraph (1)”.
- (5) In subsection (4)(a), after “processing” insert “and provide meaningful information about the logic involved, as well as the significance and the envisaged consequences of such processing for the data subject, and which includes a personalised explanation for the decision”.
- (6) In subsection (7) omit “qualifying”.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment would preserve and amend section 14 of the Data Protection Act 2018 to allow individuals to receive a personalised explanation of decisions reached following the automated processing of their data.*

**Clause 25**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 110** Clause 25, page 44, line 18, leave out subsection (3) and insert –
- “(3) In Schedule 7 –
- (a) Part 1 contains minor and consequential amendments, and
- (b) Part 2 contains transitional provision.”



**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment is consequential on the amendment in my name inserting amendments of section 119A of the Data Protection Act 2018 into Schedule 7 to the Bill.*

**Schedule 5**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**111** Schedule 5, page 206, leave out line 26 to end of line 2 on page 207 and insert –

- “(a) the rule of law, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, relevant legislation, both general and sectoral, including concerning public security, defence, national security and criminal law and the access of public authorities to personal data, as well as the implementation of such legislation, data protection rules, professional rules and security measures, including rules for the onward transfer of personal data to another third country or international organisation which are complied with in that country or international organisation, case-law, as well as effective and enforceable data subject rights and effective administrative and judicial redress for the data subjects whose personal data are being transferred;
- (b) the existence and effective functioning of one or more independent supervisory authorities in the third country or to which an international organisation is subject, with responsibility for ensuring and enforcing compliance with the data protection rules, including adequate enforcement powers, for assisting and advising the data subjects in exercising their rights and for cooperation with the Commissioner; and
- (c) the international commitments the third country or international organisation concerned has entered into, or other obligations arising from legally binding conventions or instruments as well as from its participation in multilateral or regional systems, in particular in relation to the protection of personal data.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment changes the list of things that the Secretary of State must consider when deciding whether a third country provides an adequate level of protection for data subjects.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**112** Schedule 5, page 207, line 2, at end insert –

- “(g) the views of the Commissioner on suitability of international transfer of data to the country or organisation.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment would require the Secretary of State to seek the views of the Commissioner on whether a country or organisation has met the data protection test for international data transfer.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

113 Schedule 5, page 207, line 25, at end insert –

- “5. In relation to special category data, the Commissioner must assess whether the data protection test is met for data transfer to a third country or international organisation.”

*Member's explanatory statement*

*This amendment would require the Commissioner to assess suitability for international transfer of special category data to a third country or international organisation.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

114 Schedule 5, page 207, line 30, leave out “ongoing” and insert “annual”

*Member's explanatory statement*

*This amendment would mandate that a country's suitability for international transfer of data is assessed on an annual basis.*

## LORD BETHELL

## LORD KIRKHOPE OF HARROGATE

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

115 Schedule 5, page 209, line 5, at end insert –

- “1B. A third country cannot be considered either adequate or capable of providing appropriate safeguards by any authority where there exists no credible means to enforce data subject rights or obtain legal remedies.
- 1C. For the purposes of paragraph 1A the Secretary of State must have due regard to the view of the Commissioner in determining whether credible means are available in a third country.”

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

116 Schedule 5, page 210, leave out lines 21 to 39

*Member's explanatory statement*

*This amendment seeks to remove the regulation-making power to designate new transfer mechanisms for personal data being sent to a third country in the absence of adequacy regulations.*

**Schedule 6**

## VISCOUNT CAMROSE

117 Schedule 6, page 212, line 27, leave out “In section 72 (overview and interpretation),” and insert –

- “(1) Section 72 (overview and interpretation) is amended as follows.

- (2) In subsection (1)(b) –
- (a) for “the special conditions that apply” substitute “additional conditions that apply in certain cases”, and
  - (b) after “organisation” insert “(see section 73(4)(b))”.
- (3)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on the amendment in my name inserting amendments of section 77 of the Data Protection Act 2018 into Schedule 6 to the Bill.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**118** Schedule 6, page 213, line 20, at end insert –

“(1A) Before subsection (1) insert –

“(A1) This section applies in relation to a transfer of personal data to a third country or international organisation for a law enforcement purpose.””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*See the explanatory statement to the amendment in my name to Schedule 6, page 213, line 22.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**119** Schedule 6, page 213, line 22, leave out paragraphs (a) and (b) and insert –

“(a) for the words before paragraph (a) substitute “The controller in relation to the transfer must secure that the transfer takes place only if –”,

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, and the amendment in my name to Schedule 6, page 213, line 20, make changes to reflect the fact that the duty to comply with the general principles in section 73 of the Data Protection Act 2018 falls on the controller by or on whose behalf the transfer is made.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**120** Schedule 6, page 213, line 37, at end insert –

“(3A) In subsection (4) –

(a) after paragraph (a) (but before the final “or”) insert –

“(aa) the intended recipient is a person in a third country who –

- (i) is not a person described in paragraph (a), but
- (ii) is a processor whose processing, on behalf of the controller, of the personal data transferred is governed by, or authorised in accordance with, a contract with the controller that complies with section 59,” and

- (b) in paragraph (b)(i), for “other than a relevant authority” substitute “who is not a person described in paragraph (a) or (aa)”.

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment inserts a further means of satisfying Condition 3 in section 73 of the Data Protection Act 2018 (conditions for international transfers of personal data by competent authorities for law enforcement purposes). Condition 3 relates to the intended recipient of the personal data.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 121** Schedule 6, page 215, line 36, at end insert –

“(g) the views of the Commissioner on suitability of international transfer of data to the country or organisation.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require the Secretary of State to seek the views of the Commissioner on whether a country or organisation has met the data protection test for international data transfers in relation to law enforcement processing.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 122** Schedule 6, page 217, line 27, before “this” insert “section 73(4)(a) or (b) and”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment provides that the controller’s duty to inform the Information Commissioner about international transfers of personal data made subject to appropriate safeguards does not apply where a transfer is made to a processor in reliance on paragraph (aa) of section 73(4) of the Data Protection Act 2018 (inserted by an amendment in my name).*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 123** Schedule 6, page 217, line 28, before “this” insert “section 73(4)(a) or (b) and”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment provides that the controller’s duty to document transfers that take place subject to appropriate safeguards does not apply where a transfer is made to a processor in reliance on paragraph (aa) of section 73(4) of the Data Protection Act 2018 (inserted by an amendment in my name).*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 124** Schedule 6, page 219, line 5, at end insert –

“7A For the italic heading before section 77 substitute “Additional conditions”.

7B (1) Section 77 (conditions for transfers of personal data to persons other than relevant authorities) is amended as follows.

- (2) For the heading substitute “Additional conditions for transfers in reliance on section 73(4)(b)”.
- (3) In subsection (6), for “other than a relevant authority” substitute “in reliance on section 73(4)(b)”.
- (4) In subsection (7)(a), for “other than a relevant authority” substitute “that takes place in reliance on section 73(4)(b)”.

***Member's explanatory statement***

*These amendments provide that section 77 of the Data Protection Act 2018 (conditions for certain transfers of personal data to overseas recipients other than relevant authorities) does not apply to transfers to overseas processors made in reliance on paragraph (aa) of section 73(4) of that Act (inserted by an amendment in my name).*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**125** Schedule 6, page 219, line 7, at end insert—

“(1A) Before subsection (1) insert—

“(A1) Subsections (1) to (6) apply where a transfer to which section 73 applies takes place other than in reliance on section 73(4)(aa).”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment provides that a condition described in subsections (1) to (6) of section 78 of the Data Protection Act 2018 (subsequent transfers) does not need to be imposed where a transfer is made to an overseas processor in reliance on paragraph (aa) of section 73(4) of that Act (inserted by an amendment in my name).*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**126** Schedule 6, page 219, line 8, at end insert—

“(za) omit “Where personal data is transferred in accordance with section 73,””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment of section 78(1) of the Data Protection Act 2018 (subsequent transfers) is consequential on the amendment in my name inserting subsection (A1) of that section.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**127** Schedule 6, page 220, line 13, at end insert—

“(9) At the end insert—

“(7) Where a transfer takes place in reliance on section 73(4)(aa), the transferring controller must make it a condition of the transfer that the data is only to be further transferred to a third country or international organisation where—

- (a) the terms of any relevant contract entered into, or authorisation given, by the transferring controller in accordance with section 59 are complied with, and
- (b) the further transfer satisfies the requirements in section 73(1).”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment describes a condition that must be imposed where a transfer is made to an overseas processor in reliance on paragraph (aa) of section 73(4) of that Act (inserted by an amendment in my name).*

**Schedule 7**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**128** Schedule 7, page 221, line 5, at end insert –

“6A In Article 46(2)(d) (transfers subject to appropriate safeguards: standard data protection clauses), after “Commissioner” insert “for the purposes of this Article”.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on the amendment in my name inserting amendments of section 119A of the Data Protection Act 2018 into Schedule 7 to the Bill.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**129** Schedule 7, page 221, line 30, leave out paragraph 17 and insert –

“16A In section 75 (transfers on the basis of appropriate safeguards), after subsection (7) (inserted by Schedule 6 to this Act) insert –

“(8) For provision about standard data protection clauses which the Commissioner considers are capable of securing that the data protection test in this section is met, see section 119A.”

16B In section 78A (law enforcement processing: national security exemption) (inserted by section 28 of this Act), in subsection (2)(e), after sub-paragraph (i) insert –

“(ia) section 119A (standard clauses for transfers to third countries);”.

17 (1) Section 119A (power of Information Commissioner to specify standard clauses for transfers to third countries etc providing appropriate safeguards) is amended as follows.

(2) In subsection (1), for the words from “provide” to the end substitute “are capable of securing that the data protection test set out in Article 46 of the UK GDPR or section 75 of this Act (or both) is met in relation to transfers of personal data”.

(3) In subsection (3), after paragraph (a) insert—

“(aa) may make provision generally or in relation to types of transfer described in the document.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment enables the Information Commissioner to exercise the power under section 119A of the Data Protection Act 2018 (power to issue standard data protection clauses) to issue clauses for use in making transfers of personal data in reliance on section 75 of that Act (transfers subject to appropriate safeguards). It also makes consequential changes.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

130 Schedule 7, page 222, leave out lines 28 to 32

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is a probing amendment to explore whether jurisdictions do in fact confer an adequate level of protection of personal data.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

131 Schedule 7, page 226, leave out lines 37 to 39 and insert “the requirement in section 75(1)(a) of the 2018 Act (binding legal instrument containing appropriate safeguards) would have been satisfied by virtue of that instrument.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment enables transitional provision in paragraph 30 of Schedule 7 to the Bill to be relied on in connection with transfers of personal data described in paragraph (aa) of section 73(4) of the Data Protection Act 2018 (inserted by an amendment in my name).*

**Clause 26**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

132 Clause 26, page 44, line 30, at end insert—

“where the data subject has been given the opportunity to express dissent.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is to make clear that when the purpose limitations are changed, a choice must be offered to data subjects.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

133 Clause 26, page 45, line 16, at end insert—

“4. Processing of personal data for RAS purposes must be carried out in a manner which does not permit the identification of a living individual.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is to ensure that processing of personal data for research, archives and statistics (RAS) purposes must be carried in a manner which does not permit the identification of a living individual.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**134** Clause 26, page 46, line 24, at end insert –

“6. The requirement is not satisfied unless applicable dissents by the data subject are respected.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is to ensure existing patient dissents are respected and cannot be ignored.*

**After Clause 27**

LORD BETHELL  
BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
LORD KNIGHT OF WEYMOUTH

**135** After Clause 27, insert the following new Clause –

**“Access to data for vetted researchers**

- (1) Upon a reasoned request from the Information Commissioner, a data controller or processor that meets the requirements in subsection (9) must, within a reasonable period, as specified in the request, provide access to data to vetted researchers who meet the requirements in subsection (7), for the sole purpose of conducting research that contributes to the detection, identification and understanding of systemic risks of non-compliance with United Kingdom law that is upheld by one or more of the regulatory bodies, the Information Commissioner, the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA), the Office of Communications (Ofcom) and the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA).
- (2) Within 15 days following receipt of a request as referred to in subsection (1), the data controller or processor may request the Information Commissioner amend the request, where they consider that they are unable to give access to the data requested because one of the following two reasons –
  - (a) they do not have access to the data;
  - (b) giving access to the data would lead to significant vulnerabilities in the security of their service or the protection of confidential information, in particular trade secrets.
- (3) Requests for amendment under subsection (2) must contain proposals for one or more alternative means through which access may be provided to the requested data or other data which are appropriate and sufficient for the purpose of the request.



- (4) The Information Commissioner must decide on the request for amendment within 15 days and communicate to the data controller or processor its decision and, where relevant, the amended request and the new period to comply with the request.
- (5) Where the research request relates to United Kingdom law that is upheld by a different regulator, the Information Commissioner will notify the relevant regulator.
- (6) The data controller or processor must facilitate and provide access to data pursuant to subsections (1) and (4) through appropriate interfaces specified in the request, including online databases or application programming interfaces.
- (7) Upon a duly substantiated application from researchers, the Information Commissioner will grant such researchers the status of “vetted researchers” for the specific research referred to in the application and issue a reasoned request for data access to the data controller or processor pursuant to subsection (4), where the researchers demonstrate that they meet all of the following conditions –
  - (a) they are affiliated to a research organisation;
  - (b) they are independent from commercial interests;
  - (c) their application discloses the funding of the research;
  - (d) the intended research has demonstrated public interest and benefit;
  - (e) they are capable of fulfilling the specific data security and confidentiality requirements corresponding to each request and to protect personal data, and they describe in their request the appropriate technical and organisational measures that they have put in place to this end;
  - (f) their application demonstrates that their access to the data and the time frames requested are necessary for, and proportionate to, the purposes of their research, and that the expected results of that research will contribute to the purposes laid down in subsection (1);
  - (g) the planned research activities will be carried out for the purposes laid down in subsection (1);
  - (h) they have committed themselves to making their research results publicly available free of charge, within reasonable period after the completion of the research.
- (8) Data controllers and processors must give access without undue delay to data, including, where technically possible, to real-time data, provided that the data is publicly accessible in their online interface by researchers, including those affiliated to not for profit bodies, organisations and associations, who comply with the conditions set out in subsection (7)(b), (c), (d) and (e), and who use the data solely for performing research to advance the purposes set out in subsection (1) above.
- (9) A data controller or processor falls within the scope of subsection (1) if it has over 1 million service users or customers in the United Kingdom, if there is a large concentration of children on the service or if the researchers provide compelling evidence that the service is high risk.
- (10) The Information Commissioner must publish the technical conditions under which a data controller or processor must share data pursuant to subsections (1) and (4),

including the application of data protection by design and default, and the purposes for which the data may be used.

- (11) The technical conditions under subsection (10) include the specific conditions under which such sharing of data with researchers may take place, as well as relevant objective indicators, procedures and, where necessary, independent advisory mechanisms in support of sharing of data, taking into account the rights and interests of the providers of data controllers and processors and the data subjects who use the service, including the protection of confidential information, in particular trade secrets, and maintaining the security of their service.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment mirrors the research provisions in the European Commission’s Digital Services Act and ensures that UK-based academic researchers are not put at a disadvantage when it comes to researching matters of public interest regarding whether the largest online services - including services most used by children - are safe, private and comply with UK law.*

**Clause 28**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 28 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to prevent the Home Secretary from potentially infringing upon data protection rights through the use of “national security certificates” and “designation notices”.*

**Clause 29**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 136 Clause 29, page 52, line 33, leave out “with the day on which it” and insert “when the notice”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment adjusts the language of new section 82B(2) of the Data Protection Act 2018 to ensure that Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 (rules of interpretation regarding periods of time etc) will apply to it.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 29 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to prevent the Home Secretary from potentially infringing upon data protection rights through the use of “national security certificates” and “designation notices”.*

**Clause 30**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 30 stand part of the Bill.*

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment seeks to prevent the Home Secretary from potentially infringing upon data protection rights through the use of "national security certificates" and "designation notices".*

**After Clause 30**

BARONESS MORGAN OF COTES

137

After Clause 30, insert the following new Clause –

**“Processing of data in relation to a case-file prepared by the police service for submission to the Crown Prosecution Service for a charging decision**

In the 2018 Act, after section 40 insert –

**“40A Processing of data in relation to a case-file prepared by the police service for submission to the Crown Prosecution Service for a charging decision**

- (1) This section applies to a set of processing operations consisting of the preparation of a case-file by the police service for submission to the Crown Prosecution Service for a charging decision, the making of a charging decision by the Crown Prosecution Service, and the return of the case-file by the Crown Prosecution Service to the police service after a charging decision has been made.
- (2) The police service is not obliged to comply with the first data protection principle except insofar as that principle requires processing to be fair, or the third data protection principle, in preparing a case-file for submission to the Crown Prosecution Service for a charging decision.
- (3) The Crown Prosecution Service is not obliged to comply with the first data protection principle except insofar as that principle requires processing to be fair, or the third data protection principle, in making a charging decision on a case-file submitted for that purpose by the police service.
- (4) If the Crown Prosecution Service decides that a charge will not be pursued when it makes a charging decision on a case-file submitted for that purpose by the police service it must take all steps reasonably required to destroy and delete all copies of the case-file in its possession.
- (5) If the Crown Prosecution Service decides that a charge will be pursued when it makes a charging decision on a case-file submitted for that purpose by the police service it must return the case-file to the police service and take all steps reasonably required to destroy and delete all copies of the case-file in its possession.

- (6) Where the Crown Prosecution Service decides that a charge will be pursued when it makes a charging decision on a case-file submitted for that purpose by the police service and returns the case-file to the police service under subsection (5), the police service must comply with the first data protection principle and the third data protection principle in relation to any subsequent processing of the data contained in the case-file.
- (7) For the purposes of this section –
- (a) The police service means –
    - (i) a constabulary maintained by virtue of an enactment; or
    - (ii) subject to section 126 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 (prison staff not to be regarded as in police service), any other service whose members have the powers or privileges of a constable.
  - (b) The preparation of, or preparing, a case-file by the police service for submission to the Crown Prosecution Service for a charging decision includes the submission of the file.
  - (c) A case-file includes all information obtained by the police service for the purpose of preparing a case-file for submission to the Crown Prosecution Service for a charging decision.””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This new Clause adjusts Section 40 of the Data Protection Act 2018 to exempt the police service and the Crown Prosecution Service from the first and third data protection principles contained within the 2018 Act so that they can share unredacted data with one another when making a charging decision.*

**Clause 31**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

138 Clause 31, page 56, leave out lines 10 to 14 and insert –

- “(a) to monitor the application of GDPR, the applied GDPR and this Act, and ensure they are fully enforced with all due diligence;
- (b) to act upon receiving a complaint, to investigate, to the extent appropriate, the subject matter of the complaint, and to take steps to clarify unsubstantiated issues before dismissing the complaint.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment clarifies the statutory objective of the Commissioner by removing secondary objectives introduced by the Bill and clarifying role and responsibility of the Commissioner.*

**Clause 32**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

139 Clause 32, page 58, line 24, leave out “with the day of the designation” and insert “when the Secretary of State designates the statement”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment adjusts the language of new section 120F(4) of the Data Protection Act 2018 to ensure that Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 (rules of interpretation regarding periods of time etc) will apply to it.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**140** Clause 32, page 58, line 34, at end insert –

- “(7) It is the duty of the Commissioner to provide on request advice to a Senior Responsible Individual of any entity in relation to its procedures for implementing specific requirements.
- (8) Such advice when provided must have the status of “assured advice” which cannot be the subject of any prosecution or enforcement provided it is followed in full and has not been rescinded prior to the action in question.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment places an obligation on the Commissioner to ensure that a business can request and receive advice on request.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**141** Clause 32, page 61, line 4, at end insert –

- “(3A) In section 205(2) (references to periods of time), after paragraph (za) insert –
- “(zb) section 120H(3) and (4);”.

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment provides that Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 (rules of interpretation regarding periods of time etc) does not apply to new section 120H(3) and (4) of the Data Protection Act 2018.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 32 stand part of the Bill.*

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfer the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from Government to Parliament.*

**Clause 33**

BARONESS KIDRON  
 LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
 BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
 BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

**142** Clause 33, page 61, line 28, at end insert –

- “(4A) When directed to prepare a code under this section or by regulations made by the Secretary of State –
- (a) the Commissioner must prepare the code as soon as reasonably practicable and must submit it to the Secretary of State before the end of the period of 18 months beginning when the Data Protection and Digital Information Act 2024 is passed, and
  - (b) the Secretary of State must lay it before Parliament as soon as reasonably practicable and in accordance with the provisions in section 124D of this Act.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to ensure that codes of practice deemed necessary for the protection of data subjects, including children, are produced in a timely manner and not subject to undue delay.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
 LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
 BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
 BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

**143** Clause 33, page 61, line 29, at end insert –

- “(5A) Any transitional provision or saving provision under subsection (5) must cease to have effect before the end of the period of 12 months beginning when the code comes into force.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment mirrors the wording in section 123 of the 2018 Act and extends it to all Codes of Practice. This seeks to ensure there is no undue delay in the requirement to comply with a Code of Practice.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 33 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to parliament.*

**Clause 34**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 34 stand part of the Bill.*

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to parliament.*

**Clause 35**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 35 stand part of the Bill.*

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to parliament.*

**After Clause 35**

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

**144** After Clause 35, insert the following new clause –

**“Code of Practice on Children and AI**

- (1) The Commissioner must prepare a code of practice in accordance with sections 33 and 34 of this Act which contains such guidance as the Commissioner considers appropriate on standards of fairness and ethical practice in the use of children’s data and personal information in the development of AI including general purpose AI and use of foundational models that impact children.
- (2) In preparing a code or amendments under this section, the Commissioner must –
  - (a) have regard to –
    - (i) children’s interests and fundamental rights and freedoms as set out in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and General Comment 25 on Children’s Rights in relation to the Digital Environment,

- (ii) the fact that children are entitled to a higher standard of protection than adults with regard to their personal data as established in the 2018 Act, and
    - (iii) the potential harm to future life chances, income, health and wellbeing,
  - (b) must also consult with—
    - (i) academics with expertise in the field, and
    - (ii) persons who appear to the Commissioner to represent the interests of children.
- (3) In this section—
- “fairness and ethical practice in the use of children’s data and personal information in the development of AI” means having regard to—
- (a) risk assessment;
  - (b) accountability;
  - (c) transparency;
  - (d) lawfulness;
  - (e) accuracy;
  - (f) fairness;
  - (g) ethical use;
- “impacts children” means AI technology that is—
- (a) based on data sets that include (or may include) children’s data;
  - (b) used to automate services likely to be accessed by children and access their data;
  - (c) used to make decisions that impact children;
  - (d) used to surface or deprioritise content, information, people, accounts, services or products to children;
  - (e) used to predict or inform children’s behaviour, opinions, opportunities and decision-making using personal data;
  - (f) used to imitate children’s physical likeness, movements, voice, behaviour and thoughts using personal data;
- “risk assessment” includes guidance on how controllers articulate and evaluate the following four stages—
- (a) the intention and goals in creating an AI model and how these have evolved over time;
  - (b) the inputs used to build, train and evolve an AI model;
  - (c) the assumptions and instructions that inform the AI model's decision-making;
  - (d) intended and actual outputs and outcomes of the AI model.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*Given the rapid acceleration in the development of AI technology, this Code of Practice ensures that data processors prioritise the interests and fundamental rights and freedoms of children and sets out what this means in practice.*



BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

145 After Clause 35, insert the following new Clause –

**“Code of practice on children’s data and scientific research**

- (1) The Commissioner must prepare a code of practice in accordance with sections 33 and 34 of this Act which contains –
  - (a) practical guidance in relation to the processing of children’s personal data for the purposes of scientific research and technological development whether as a commercial or non-commercial activity;
  - (b) such other guidance as the Commissioner considers appropriate to promote good practice in the processing of children’s personal data for the purposes of scientific research and technological development;
  - (c) practical guidance on how to prioritise the best interests of the child including the use of their data to pursue research for commercial objectives.
- (2) In preparing a code or amendments under this section, the Commissioner must –
  - (a) have regard to –
    - (i) children’s interests and fundamental rights and freedoms as set out in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and General Comment 25 on Children’s Rights in relation to the Digital Environment, and
    - (ii) the fact that children are entitled to a higher standard of protection than adults with regard to their personal data in DPA 2018.
  - (b) must consult with –
    - (i) academics;
    - (ii) data scientists with expertise in building and assessing the reliability and performance of APIs (application programming interfaces);
    - (iii) persons who appear to the Commissioner to represent the interests of data subjects including children.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*A code of practice would ensure a children's data has the highest level of protection whilst facilitating academic research.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

146 After Clause 35, insert the following new Clause –

**“Code of practice on EdTech**

- (1) The Commissioner must prepare a code of practice in consultation with the Department for Education and in accordance with sections 33 and 34 of this Act which contains such guidance as the Commissioner considers appropriate on the processing of children's data by providers of EdTech services and products.
- (2) In addition, in preparing a code or amendments under this section, the Commissioner must –
  - (a) have regard to –
    - (i) children’s interests and fundamental rights and freedoms as set out in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and General Comment 25 on Children’s Rights in relation to the Digital Environment, and
    - (ii) the fact that children are entitled to a higher standard of protection than adults with regard to their personal data as established in the 2018 Act;
  - (b) consult with –
    - (i) children,
    - (ii) educators,
    - (iii) parents,
    - (iv) EdTech providers, and
    - (v) persons who appear to the Commissioner to represent the interests of children.
- (3) EdTech Controllers or processors providing services or products to schools must comply with any such code and provide information on compliance to schools as part of the school’s procurement procedures.
- (4) Demonstrated adherence by an EdTech provider to the EdTech Code of Practice may be used by a school as a means of demonstrating compliance with their obligations as a data controller.
- (5) The Commissioner must prepare a report, in consultation with the EdTech industry, on the steps required to develop a certification scheme under Article 42 of the UK GDPR, to enable the industry to demonstrate the compliance of EdTech services and products with the UK GDPR, and conformity with the Age Appropriate Design Code of Practice and the EdTech Code of Practice.
- (6) In this section –

“EdTech” means a service or product that digitise education functions including administration and management information systems, learning and assessment and safeguarding. They include services or products used

within school settings and at home on the recommendation, advice or instruction of a school;

“school” means a school that falls within the definition of school in section 14, 15 or 16 of Part 4 of Schedule 3 of the 2018 Act.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment proposes a statutory Code of Practice to provide guidance to companies that provide EdTech services and products. It aims to ensure that such companies meet their legal obligations under existing data protection law, protect children and empower schools.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

147 After Clause 35, insert the following new Clause—

**“Code of practice on data communities**

- (1) The Commissioner must prepare a code of practice in accordance with sections 33 and 34 of this Act and which contains—
  - (a) practical guidance on establishing, operating and joining a data community,
  - (b) practical guidance for data controllers and data processors on responding to requests made by data communities, and
  - (c) such other guidance as the Commissioner considers appropriate to promote good practice in all aspects of data communities schemes.
- (2) The data subject has the right to specify which data and which rights over that data they assign to the data community for what purpose and for how long, with respect to which data controllers.
- (3) In this section—

“good practice in data community” means such practice in as appears to the Commissioner to be desirable having regard to the interests of data subjects whose data forms part of a data community, including compliance with the requirements mentioned in subsection (1).”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment requires the Commissioner to draw up a code of practice setting out the way in which data communities must operate and the requirements on data controllers and processors when engaging with data rights activation requests from data communities. In addition to the code of conduct, there would also be the full range of protections already in place with respect to any controller. It is one of a series of amendments that would establish the ability to assign data rights to a third party.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

148 After Clause 35, insert the following new Clause –

**“Register and oversight of data communities**

- (1) The Information Commissioner must maintain a register of data communities and make the register publicly available.
- (2) The criteria for suitability for inclusion in the register will be set out in the Code of Practice on Data Communities.
- (3) The Information Commissioner must create a complaints mechanism to receive, review and adjudicate complaints raised by data subjects about a data community controller.
- (4) Complaints under subsection (3) can only be based on a failure to meet the standards set out in the Code of Practice on Data Communities.
- (5) The Information Commissioner must create a complaints mechanism to receive, review and adjudicate complaints raised by a data community controller on behalf of its members about a data controller or processor.
- (6) Complaints under subsection (5) must be based on a failure to meet the standards set out in the Code of Practice on Data Communities.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment ensures that data communities operate transparently and are subject to regulatory oversight. It is one of a series of amendments that would establish the ability to assign data rights to a third party. A data community controller will have the responsibilities assigned to a controller as well as additional protections as set out the proposed code of conduct.*

**Clause 36**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 36 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would leave in place the existing regime, which refers to “manifestly unfounded” or excessive requests to the Information Commissioner, rather than the proposed change to “vexatious or excessive” requests.*

**Clause 42**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

149 Clause 42, page 76, line 14, leave out “with the day” and insert “when”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment adjusts the language of new paragraph 4(A2) of Schedule 16 to the Data Protection Act 2018 to ensure that Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 (rules of interpretation regarding periods of time etc) will apply to it.*

**Clause 43**

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

150 Clause 43, page 77, line 28, at end insert –

“(4A) The report must set out the information required under subsections (2) to (4) as it relates to children separately and provide details of all activities carried out by the Information Commissioner to support, strengthen and uphold the Age-Appropriate Design Code.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment seeks to ensure that the ICO's annual report includes information regarding the steps it has taken to uphold children's data rights and to protect their privacy and safety. This amendment aims to enhance understanding, transparency and accountability.*

**Clause 44**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

151 Clause 44, page 78, line 17, leave out “with the day on which it” and insert “when the complaint”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment adjusts the language of new section 164A(3) of the Data Protection Act 2018 to ensure that Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 (rules of interpretation regarding periods of time etc) will apply to it.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 44 stand part of the Bill.*

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment seeks to probe whether Clause 44 hinders data subjects' right to lodge complaints, and extends the scope of orders under Section 166 of the Data Protection Act to the appropriateness of the Commissioner's response to a complaint.*

**Clause 45**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

152 Clause 45, page 79, line 30, leave out “with the day” and insert “when”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment adjusts the language of new section 165A(3) of the Data Protection Act 2018 to ensure that Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 (rules of interpretation regarding periods of time etc) will apply to it.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

153 Leave out Clause 45, and insert the following new Clause –

**“Commissioner’s response to a complaint**

- (1) Section 166 of the Data Protection Act 2018 (orders to progress complaints) is amended as follows.
- (2) After subsection (1)(c) insert –
  - “(d) fails to investigate the complaint to the extent necessary, or to take appropriate action in order to remedy any findings of inadequacy.”
- (3) After subsection (2)(b) insert –
  - “(c) to use formal powers as appropriate to investigate the complaint and to remedy any findings of inadequacy, unless the request from the data subject is manifestly unfounded or excessive.””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment probes whether provisions in the Bill could be added to enhance data subjects’ right to lodge complaints, and extends the scope of orders under section 166 of the Data Protection Act 2018 to the appropriateness of the Commissioner’s response to a complaint.*

**After Clause 46**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

154 After Clause 46, insert the following new Clause –

**“Provision about representation of data subjects**

In subsection (1) of section 190 of the Data Protection Act 2018, for “After the report under section 189(1) is laid before Parliament, the Secretary of State may” substitute “The Secretary of State must, within three months of the passage of the Data Protection and Digital Information Act 2024,””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This new Clause would require the Secretary of State to exercise powers under section 190 of the Data Protection Act 2018 to allow organisations to raise data breach complaints on behalf of data*

*subjects generally, in the absence of a particular subject who wishes to bring forward a claim about misuse of their own personal data.*

**After Clause 48**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

155 After Clause 48, insert the following new Clause –

**“Modifications of courts and tribunals functions**

- (1) Schedule (“Modifications of courts and tribunals functions”) makes provision about the modification of the jurisdiction of the courts and tribunals in the Data Protection Act 2018; and for other connected purposes.
- (2) In that Schedule –
  - (a) Part 1 makes modifications to the Data Protection Act 2018 for the purpose of transferring the functions of courts to tribunals; and
  - (b) Part 2 makes transitional provision about Part 1 in relation to proceedings currently before courts under the Data Protection Act 2018, before that Schedule comes into force.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, and the Schedule to which it refers, seeks to address the potential jurisdictional confusion of remedies currently in the Data Protection Act 2018.*

**Clause 49**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

156 Clause 49, page 83, line 21, leave out “and (3)” and insert “to (3A)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on the amendments in my name inserting additional subsections into this clause.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

157 Clause 49, page 83, line 24, at end insert “: relevant enactments”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on the amendment in my name inserting section 183B of the Data Protection Act 2018.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

158 Clause 49, page 84, line 7, leave out “49” and insert “49(2)”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment changes a reference to the day on which clause 49 comes into force to a reference to the day on which subsection (2) of that clause comes into force.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

159 Clause 49, page 84, line 19, at end insert –

“(2A) Before section 184 (and the italic heading before it) insert –

**“183B Protection of prohibitions and restrictions etc on processing: other enactments**

- (1) This section is about the relationship between –
  - (a) a pre-commencement enactment which imposes a duty, or confers a power, to process personal data, and
  - (b) a provision of the main data protection legislation containing a requirement relating to the processing of personal data.
- (2) The relationship is not changed by section 5(A1) of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (removal of the principle of supremacy of EU law) (or the repeal of section 5(1) to (3) of that Act).
- (3) Where the provision described in subsection (1)(b) is a provision of, or made under, the UK GDPR, section 5(A2) of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (assimilated direct legislation subject to domestic enactments) does not apply to the relationship.
- (4) Nothing is to be implied about a relationship described in subsection (1) merely due to the fact that express provision with similar effect to section 183A(1) (or applying that provision) is made in connection with one such relationship but not another.
- (5) In this section –
  - (a) “the main data protection legislation” and “requirement” have the same meaning as in section 183A, and
  - (b) “pre-commencement enactment” means an enactment so far as passed or made before the day on which section 49(2) of the Data Protection and Digital Information Act 2024 comes into force.
- (6) Section 183A(5) applies for the purposes of subsection (1)(a) of this section as it applies for the purposes of section 183A(1).”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment provides that certain changes made to the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 by the Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023 do not alter the relationship between requirements in the data protection legislation and duties or powers to process personal data under other existing legislation.*



## VISCOUNT CAMROSE

160 Clause 49, page 84, line 27, leave out “falling within” and insert “listed in”

*Member's explanatory statement*

*This amendment makes a minor change to new subsection (2A) of section 186 of the Data Protection Act 2018 for consistency with the wording of the existing subsection (1) of that section.*

## VISCOUNT CAMROSE

161 Clause 49, page 84, line 30, leave out “falling within subsection (2).” and insert “listed in subsection (2),  
and see also section 186A.”

*Member's explanatory statement*

*This amendment makes a minor change to new subsection (2A) of section 186 of the Data Protection Act 2018 for consistency with the wording of the existing subsection (1) of that section and inserts a cross-reference to new section 186A of that Act (inserted by an amendment of Clause 49 in my name).*

## VISCOUNT CAMROSE

162 Clause 49, page 84, line 34, at end insert –

“(3A) After section 186 insert –

**“186A Protection of data subject’s rights: further provision**

- (1) This section is about the relationship between –
  - (a) a pre-commencement enactment which prohibits or restricts the disclosure of information or authorises the withholding of information, and
  - (b) a provision of the UK GDPR or this Act listed in section 186(2).
- (2) The relationship is not changed by section 5(A1) of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (removal of the principle of supremacy of EU law) (or the repeal of section 5(1) to (3) of that Act).
- (3) Subsection (1) of section 186 does not apply to the relationship so far as there is a contrary intention, whether express or implied (taking account of, among other things, subsection (2) of this section).
- (4) Nothing is to be implied about a relationship described in subsection (1) merely due to the fact that express provision stating that section 186(1) applies (or with similar effect) is made in connection with one such relationship but not another.
- (5) In this section, “pre-commencement enactment” means an enactment passed or made before the day on which section 49(3) of the Data Protection and Digital Information Act 2024 comes into force.””

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment provides that certain changes made to the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 by the Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023 do not alter the relationship between certain obligations and rights under the data protection legislation and restrictions on the disclosure of information under other existing legislation.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

163 Clause 49, page 84, line 40, at end insert “, and

(c) at the end insert “(and see also section 183B(3) of that Act)”.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment inserts a cross-reference to section 183B(3) of the Data Protection Act 2018 (inserted by an amendment of Clause 49 in my name) into section 5(A3) of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (exceptions from provision about the relationship between assimilated direct legislation and domestic enactments). Section 183B(3) creates such an exception.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

164 Clause 49, page 84, line 40, at end insert –

“(5) Subsections (2A), (3A) and (4)(c) are to be treated as having come into force on 1 January 2024.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment provides for provision about the relationship between the data protection legislation and existing legislation – in particular, provision about the effect of changes made by the Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023 – to be treated as having come into force when those changes came into force.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

165 Clause 49, page 84, line 40, at end insert –

“(5) In section 5 of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (exceptions to savings and incorporation), after subsection (A3)(b) insert “(c) subsection (A5)””

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment, along with another in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, restores the relationship between the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018 which existed before the relevant provisions of the Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023 came into force.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

166 Clause 49, page 84, line 40, at end insert –

“(5) In section 5 of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (exceptions to savings and incorporation), after subsection (A4) insert –

“(A5) Any provisions of the Data Protection Act 2018 –

- (a) must, so far as possible, be read and given effect in a way which is compatible with the UK GDPR, and
- (b) are subject to the UK GDPR, so far as they are incompatible with it.””

*Member's explanatory statement*

*This amendment, along with another in the name of Lord Clement-Jones, restores the relationship between the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018 which existed before the relevant provisions of the Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023 came into force.*

**After Clause 51**

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

167 After Clause 51, insert the following new Clause –

**“UK GDPR data compliance**

In Article 1 of UK GDPR, after paragraph 2, insert –

- “3. A controller or processor which complies with Commission Regulation (EU) 2019/679 (protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data) will be deemed to comply with this Regulation.””

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

168 After Clause 51, insert the following new Clause –

**“Confirmation of the continuing applicability of assimilated case law in the area of data protection which references the Charter of Fundamental Rights**

- (1) Section 5 of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 is amended as follows.
- (2) After subsection (4) insert the following –

“(5) Subsection (4) does not affect the retention in domestic law on or after exit day in accordance with this Act of any fundamental rights or principles in the area of data protection which exist irrespective of the Charter (and references to the Charter in any case law in the area of data protection are, so far as necessary for this purpose, to be read as if they were references to any corresponding assimilated fundamental rights or principles).””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*The effect of this amendment is that assimilated case law which refers to the Charter will still be relevant in interpreting the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018. This assists legal certainty in how to interpret the UK's data protection frameworks.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

169 After Clause 51, insert the following new Clause –

**“Confirmation of the continuing applicability of assimilated general principles of EU law**

- (1) The European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 is amended as follows.
- (2) In section 6(3)(a) after “assimilated case law” insert “and any assimilated general principles of EU law””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment ensures that the UK GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018 are interpreted as before, in accordance with the general principle of the protection of personal data.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

170 After Clause 51, insert the following new Clause –

**“Inclusion of a definition of assimilated general principles of EU law insofar as they apply to the fundamental right to the protection of personal data**

- (1) The European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 is amended as follow.
- (2) In section 6(7), at the appropriate place, insert –
  - ““assimilated general principles of EU law”” means the general principles of EU law, as they had effect in EU law immediately before IP completion day and so far as they –
    - (a) relate to anything to which section 2, 3 or 4 applies,
    - (b) are not excluded by section 5 or Schedule 1, and
    - (c) apply in the context of the fundamental right to the protection of personal data (as those principles are modified by or under this Act or by other domestic law from time to time).””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment creates the definition of “assimilated general principles of EU law” which refers to the general principle of the protection of personal data as it applied before the end of 2023. However, the amendment only applies in the context of the protection of personal data.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

171 After Clause 51, insert the following new Clause –

**“Application of safeguards as required under Article 23(2) of the UK GDPR**

- (1) In Schedule 2 to the Data Protection Act 2018, after Paragraph 1, insert –
  - “1A(1) Except where paragraph 4, 26 or 27 are engaged, an exemption in this Schedule will not be applicable unless the decision to apply that exemption has been made in accordance with this paragraph.
- (2) Where a controller wishes to rely on an exemption from a relevant listed GDPR provision, that decision must be made –
  - (a) on a case by case basis,
  - (b) separately in respect of each of the relevant listed GDPR provisions which are being restricted in accordance with the relevant provisions of this Schedule, and
  - (c) afresh on each occasion on which the Controller considers an exemption to any of the relevant listed GDPR provisions.
- (3) When making a decision to rely on an exemption, the controller must take into account all the circumstances of the case, including at least the following –
  - (a) any potential vulnerability of the data subject that is relevant to the decision,
  - (b) all the rights and freedoms of the data subject, and
  - (c) the need to ensure compliance with the UK GDPR.
- (4) Where compliance with a particular provision listed in Article 23(1) of the UK GDPR and the relevant provisions of this Schedule enable the application of an exemption to the extent that compliance with the UK GDPR would be likely to prejudice a particular matter or activity specified in this Schedule, a decision to apply the exemption may be made only if –
  - (a) the application of that provision or those provisions would give rise to a substantial risk of prejudice to any of the matters mentioned in the relevant provision of Schedule 2,
  - (b) that risk outweighs the risk of prejudice to the interests of the data subject concerned that would arise if the exemption were to apply in relation to that provision or those provisions, and
  - (c) the application of the exemption in relation to that provision or those provisions is necessary and proportionate to the risks in the particular case.
- (5) In this paragraph, “relevant listed GDPR provision” means the relevant listed GDPR provision in Parts I to 4 of this Schedule (other than paragraph 4).
- (6) In this paragraph 1A, “exemption” means a restriction within the meaning of Article 23(1) of the UK GDPR.

- 1B (1) Where a controller makes a decision mentioned in paragraph 1A(3) or (4), the controller must keep a record of it and the reasons for it.
- (2) Where an exemption from a relevant listed GDPR provision has been applied, the controller must also inform the data subject of the decision unless, in the particular circumstances of the case, the controller considers that doing so may be prejudicial to any of the matters mentioned in the relevant provision of Schedule 2.””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment ensures that the protections which have been applied to the immigration exemption in paragraph 4 of Schedule 2 to the Data Protection Act 2018 through the Data Protection Act 2018 (Amendment of Schedule 2 Exemptions) Regulations 2024 can apply across the board.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

172 After Clause 51, insert the following new Clause –

**“Application of safeguards as required under Article 23(2) of the UK GDPR in the context of health, social work, education and child abuse data**

- (1) In Schedule 3 to the Data Protection Act 2018, after paragraph 1, insert –
- “1A(1) An exemption from the relevant listed GDPR provisions in this Schedule will not be applicable unless the decision to apply that exemption has been made in accordance with this paragraph.
- (2) Where a controller wishes to rely on an exemption from a relevant listed GDPR provision, that decision must be made –
- (a) on a case by case basis,
  - (b) separately in respect of each of the relevant listed GDPR provisions which are being restricted in accordance with the relevant provisions of this Schedule, and
  - (c) afresh on each occasion on which the Controller considers an exemption to any of the relevant listed GDPR provisions.
- (3) When making a decision to rely on an exemption, the controller must take into account all the circumstances of the case, including at least the following –
- (a) any potential vulnerability of the data subject that is relevant to the decision,
  - (b) all the rights and freedoms of the data subject, and
  - (c) the need to ensure compliance with the UK GDPR.
- (4) Where compliance with a particular provision listed in Article 23(1) of the UK GDPR and the relevant provisions of this Schedule enable the application of an exemption to the extent that compliance with the UK GDPR would be likely to prejudice a particular matter or activity specified in this Schedule, a decision to apply the exemption may be made only if –

- (a) the application of that provision or those provisions would give rise to a substantial risk of prejudice to any of the matters mentioned in the relevant provision of Schedule 3,
  - (b) that risk outweighs the risk of prejudice to the interests of the data subject concerned that would arise if the exemption were to apply in relation to that provision or those provisions, and
  - (c) the application of the exemption in relation to that provision or those provisions is necessary and proportionate to the risks in the particular case.
- (5) In this paragraph, “relevant listed GDPR provision” means the relevant listed GDPR provision in this Schedule.
- (6) In this paragraph, “exemption” means a restriction within the meaning of Article 23(1) of the UK GDPR.
- 1B (1) Where a controller makes a decision mentioned in paragraph 1A(3) or(4), the controller must keep a record of it and the reasons for it.
- (2) Where an exemption from a relevant listed GDPR provision has been applied, the controller must also inform the data subject of the decision unless, in the particular circumstances of the case, the controller considers that doing so may be prejudicial to any of the matters mentioned in the relevant provision of Schedule 3.””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*Schedule 3 of DPA 2018 contains exemptions from listed GDPR provisions in the context of health, social work education and child abuse data. This amendment extends the protections which now apply in the context of immigration to these areas.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

173

After Clause 51, insert the following new Clause –

**“Application of safeguards as required under Article 23(2) of the UK GDPR where disclosure is prohibited or restricted by an enactment**

- (1) In Schedule 4 to the Data Protection Act 2018, after Paragraph 1 insert –
- “1A(1) An exemption from the relevant listed GDPR provisions in this Schedule will not be applicable unless the decision to apply that exemption has been made in accordance with this paragraph.
- (2) Where a controller wishes to rely on an exemption from a relevant listed GDPR provision, that decision must be made –
- (a) on a case by case basis,
  - (b) separately in respect of each of the relevant listed GDPR provisions which are being restricted in accordance with the relevant provisions of this Schedule, and
  - (c) afresh on each occasion on which the Controller considers an exemption to any of the relevant listed GDPR provisions.

- (3) When making a decision to rely on an exemption, the controller must take into account all the circumstances of the case, including at least the following—
    - (a) any potential vulnerability of the data subject that is relevant to the decision,
    - (b) all the rights and freedoms of the data subject, and
    - (c) the need to ensure compliance with the UK GDPR.
  - (4) In this paragraph, “relevant listed GDPR provision” means the relevant listed GDPR provision in Parts 1 to 4 of this Schedule (other than paragraph 4).
  - (5) In this paragraph, “exemption” means a restriction within the meaning of Article 23(1) of the UK GDPR
- 1B (1) Where a controller makes a decision mentioned in paragraph 1A(3), the controller must keep a record of it and the reasons for it.
- (2) Where an exemption from a relevant listed GDPR provision has been applied, the controller must also inform the data subject of the decision unless, in the particular circumstances of the case, the controller considers that doing so may be prejudicial to any of the matters mentioned in the relevant provision of Schedule 4.””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment extends the protections which now apply in the context of immigration to these areas. There are no safeguards relating to the prejudice test as for other relevant schedules as there is no exemption in Schedule 4 which requires the application of such a test.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**174** After Clause 51, insert the following new Clause—

**“Revival of the fundamental right to the protection of personal data**

- (1) The European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 is amended as follows.
- (2) After section 3 insert—

**“3A Saving for rights etc. under section 2(1) of the ECA insofar as they apply to the fundamental right to the protection of personal data**

Any rights, powers, liabilities, obligations, restrictions, remedies and procedures which, immediately before IP completion day—

- (a) were recognised and available in domestic law by virtue of section 2(1) of the European Communities Act 1972, and
  - (b) were enforced, allowed and followed accordingly,
- continue to be recognised and available in domestic law (and to be enforced, allowed and followed accordingly), insofar as they apply to the fundamental right to the protection of personal data.””



**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment (and other related consequential amendments) would restore the right to the protection of personal data by reviving section 4 of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018, insofar as it applied to the protection of personal data, as well as restoring Article 4(28) of the UK GDPR to its previous form.*

**Before Schedule 9**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

175 Before Schedule 9, insert the following new Schedule –

## “SCHEDULE

## MODIFICATIONS OF COURTS AND TRIBUNALS FUNCTIONS

**PART 1**

## TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

- 1 The 2018 Act is amended as follows.
- 2 In section 44(5)(e) (information: controller’s general duties), for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 3 In section 45(5)(e) (right of access by the data subject), for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 4 In section 48 (rights under sections 46 or 47: supplementary) –
  - (a) in subsection (1)(b)(iv) for “court” substitute “tribunal”; and
  - (b) in subsection (4)(d) for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 5 In section 51(5) (exercise of rights through the Commissioner), for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 6 In section 94 (right of access) –
  - (a) in subsection (11), in both instances, for “court” substitute “tribunal”;
  - (b) in subsection (12), for “court” substitute “tribunal”;
  - (c) in subsection (13), for first “court” substitute “tribunal”; and
  - (d) in subsection (13), for “the High Court or, in Scotland, by the Court of Session” substitute “the Upper Tribunal”.
- 7 In section 99 (right to object to processing) –
  - (a) in subsection (5), in every instance, for “court” substitute “tribunal”;
  - (b) in subsection (6), for “court” substitute “tribunal”;
  - (c) in subsection (7), for first “court” substitute “tribunal”; and
  - (d) in subsection (7), for “the High Court or, in Scotland, by the Court of Session” substitute “the Upper Tribunal”.
- 8 In section 100 (rights to rectification and erasure) –
  - (a) in subsection (1), in both instances, for “court” substitute “tribunal”;

- (b) in subsection (2), in both instances, for “court” substitute “tribunal”;
  - (c) in subsection (3), for “court” substitute “tribunal”;
  - (d) in subsection (4), in both instances, for “court” substitute “tribunal”;
  - (e) in subsection (5), in both instances, for “court” substitute “tribunal”;
  - (f) in subsection (6), for first “court” substitute “tribunal”; and
  - (g) in subsection (6), for “the High Court or, in Scotland, by the Court of Session” substitute “the Upper Tribunal”.
- 9 In section 145 (information orders) –
- (a) in subsection (1), for “court” substitute “tribunal”; and
  - (b) in subsection (2), in both instances, for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 10 In section 152 (enforcement notices: restrictions) –
- (a) in subsection (1)(b), for “court” substitute “tribunal”; and
  - (b) in subsection (2), in both instances, for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 11 In section 156 (penalty notices: restrictions) –
- (a) in subsection (1)(b), for “court” substitute “tribunal”; and
  - (b) in subsection (2), in both instances, leave out “court” and insert “tribunal”.
- 12 In section 164 (applications in respect of urgent notices) –
- (a) in subsection (2), for “court” substitute “tribunal”;
  - (b) in subsection (3), for “court” substitute “tribunal”; and
  - (c) in subsection (4), for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 13 In the italic heading before section 165 (complaints by data subjects), after “Complaints” insert “and remedies in the tribunal”.
- 14 Omit the italic heading before section 167 (compliance orders).
- 15 In section 167 (compliance orders) –
- (a) in subsection (1), for “court” substitute “tribunal”;
  - (b) in subsection (2), for “court” substitute “tribunal”; and
  - (c) in subsection (5), for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 16 In section 168 (compensation for contravention of the UK GDPR) –
- (a) in subsection (2) in both instances, for “court” substitute “tribunal”; and
  - (b) in subsection (3), in both instances, for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 17 In section 175 (provision of assistance in special purposes proceedings) –
- (a) in subsection (7), for “rules of court” substitute “Tribunal Procedure Rules”;
  - (b) in subsection (7)(a), for “court” substitute “tribunal”;
  - (c) in subsection (8), for “rules of court” substitute “Tribunal Procedure Rules”; and
  - (d) in subsection (8)(a), for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 18 In section 176 (staying special purposes proceedings) –
- (a) in subsection (1), in all instances, for “court” substitute “tribunal”; and
  - (b) in subsection (3), for “court” substitute “tribunal”.

- 19 In section 177(5)(b) (guidance about how to seek redress against media organisations) for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 20 In the italic cross heading before section 180 (jurisdiction) for “court” substitute “tribunal”.
- 21 In section 180 (jurisdiction) omit subsection (1) and insert –
- “(1) The jurisdiction conferred on a tribunal by the provisions listed in subsection (2) are exercisable by the First-tier tribunal, subject to subsections (3), (4) and (5).”
- 22 In section 180 (jurisdiction) –
- (a) in subsection (3), for “the High Court or, in Scotland, the Court of Session” substitute “the Upper Tribunal”;
- (b) in subsection (4), for “the High Court or, in Scotland, the Court of Session” substitute “the Upper Tribunal”; and
- (c) in subsection (5), for “the High Court or, in Scotland, the Court of Session” substitute “the Upper Tribunal”.
- 23 In section 202 (proceedings in the First-tier Tribunal: contempt), omit subsection (1)(a) and insert –
- “(a) person does something, or fails to do something, in relation to proceedings before the First-tier Tribunal under sections 27, 45, 46, 51, 79, 94, 99, 100, 111, 162, 166, 167, 168, 175, 176, 177, and”

## PART 2

### CURRENT CASES BEFORE THE COURTS

- 24 This Part applies to all proceedings currently before the courts.
- 25 All proceedings, including claims and appeals, or other proceedings as the case may be that are currently in the High Court or the county court or, in Scotland, the Court of Session or a sheriff, are transferred in pursuance of this Schedule, and the amendments made by this Schedule, to the relevant tribunal.
- 26 It is immaterial the stage of the proceedings in the court before the proceedings are transferred.
- 27 “The relevant tribunal” means –
- (a) if the proceedings are in the County Court, or before a sheriff, the First-tier Tribunal; or
- (b) if the proceedings are in the High Court, or the Court of Session, the Upper Tribunal.
- 28 The Upper Tribunal may by order transfer any proceedings automatically transferred to it from a court in pursuance of this paragraph to the First-tier Tribunal, if the Upper Tribunal considers it appropriate.
- 29 The Upper Tribunal may by order transfer any proceedings from the First-tier Tribunal to the Upper Tribunal which have been automatically transferred to the First-tier Tribunal from a court in pursuance of this paragraph, if the Upper Tribunal considers it appropriate.

30 The First-tier Tribunal may by order transfer any proceedings automatically transferred to it from a court in pursuance of this paragraph to the Upper Tribunal, if the First-tier Tribunal considers it appropriate.

31 The decision to transfer proceedings under this paragraph is final and is not liable to be questioned in any court or tribunal.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to address the potential jurisdictional confusion of remedies currently in the Data Protection Act 2018.*

**Schedule 9**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

176 Schedule 9, page 231, line 35, at end insert –

“2A After Article 4 insert –

“Article 4A

**Periods of time**

1. References in this Regulation to a period expressed in hours, days, weeks, months or years are to be interpreted in accordance with Article 3 of the Periods of Time Regulation, except in –
  - (a) Article 91A(8) and (9);
  - (b) paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 of Annex 1.
2. In this Article, “the Periods of Time Regulation” means Regulation (EEC, Euratom) No. 1182/71 of the Council of 3 June 1971 determining the rules applicable to periods, dates and time limits.””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment provides for the rules of interpretation in Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 (rules of interpretation regarding periods of time etc) to apply to the UK GDPR, subject to some listed exceptions.*

**Clause 53**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

177 Clause 53, page 88, line 16, at end insert –

“(13) The DVS trust framework and any revision to it must be made by regulations subject to the affirmative resolution procedure.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require the document setting rules for providers of digital verification services (or any revisions to it) to be laid before, and approved by, both Houses of Parliament. It*

is intended to implement a recommendation of the Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee.

**Clause 60**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**178** Clause 60, page 91, line 4, leave out “the determination” and insert “regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**179** Clause 60, page 91, line 5, leave out “A determination” and insert “Regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**180** Clause 60, page 91, line 9, leave out “the determination” and insert “regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**181** Clause 60, page 91, line 11, leave out “A determination” and insert “Regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

182 Clause 60, page 91, line 17, leave out “A determination” and insert “Regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

183 Clause 60, page 91, line 18, leave out subsections (7) to (9) and insert –

“(7) Regulations under this section are subject to the negative resolution procedure.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations, with the negative procedure offering the appropriate level of parliamentary scrutiny.*

**Clause 63**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

184 Clause 63, page 92, line 27, leave out “a determination” and insert “regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

**Clause 64**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

185 Clause 64, page 93, line 24, leave out “a determination” and insert “regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

**Clause 65**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

186 Clause 65, page 94, line 3, leave out “a determination” and insert “regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

**Clause 66**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

187 Clause 66, page 94, line 41, leave out “a determination” and insert “regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

**Clause 68**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

188 Clause 68, page 95, line 33, leave out “determination” and insert “regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

189 Clause 68, page 95, line 34, leave out “A determination” and insert “Regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 190 Clause 68, page 95, line 36, leave out “determine” and insert “by regulations require”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 191 Clause 68, page 95, line 37, leave out “determination” and insert “regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 192 Clause 68, page 95, line 38, leave out “determination” and insert “regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 193 Clause 68, page 96, line 1, leave out “A determination” and insert “Regulations”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 194 Clause 68, page 96, line 6, leave out “A determination” and insert “Regulations”



**Member's explanatory statement**

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**195** Clause 68, page 96, line 7, leave out subsections (7) to (9) and insert—

“(7) Regulations under this section are subject to the negative resolution procedure.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This is one of a series of amendments to make the Secretary of State's fee-setting powers subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The Delegated Powers and Regulatory Reform Committee found that certain Part 2 powers should only be exercisable by the Secretary of State by regulations, with the negative procedure offering the appropriate level of parliamentary scrutiny.*

**After Clause 73**

LORD KAMALL  
LORD VAUX OF HARROWDEN  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**195ZA** After Clause 73, insert the following new Clause—

**“Right to non-digital ID**

- (1) This section applies when an organisation—
  - (a) requires an individual to use a verification service, and
  - (b) uses a digital verification service for that purpose.
- (2) The organisation must—
  - (a) make a non-digital alternative method of verification available to any individual required to use a verification service, and
  - (b) provide information about digital and non-digital methods of verification to those individuals before verification is required.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This new clause, which is intended for insertion into Part 2 of the Bill (Digital verification services), creates the right for data subjects to use non-digital identity verification services as an alternative to digital verification services, thereby preventing digital verification from becoming mandatory in certain settings.*

**Clause 85**

BARONESS BENNETT OF MANOR CASTLE

195A Clause 85, page 108, line 38, at end insert –

“(v) the energy and carbon intensity of the goods, services or digital content),”

*Member's explanatory statement*

*This adds carbon and energy intensity to the information that can be required to be provided as “business data”*

**Clause 96**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

196 Clause 96, page 123, line 42, after “holders” insert “, authorised persons or third party recipients”

*Member's explanatory statement*

*This amendment provides that the restriction in clause 96(3) on the exercise of the regulation-making power in clause 96(1) (power to impose a levy) applies in connection with regulations imposing a levy on authorised persons or third party recipients as well as regulations imposing a levy on data holders.*

**Clause 103**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

197 Clause 103, page 131, line 7, at end insert –

“(9A) The requirement in subsection (9) may be satisfied by consultation undertaken before the coming into force of this section.”

*Member's explanatory statement*

*This amendment makes clear that the requirement under clause 103(9) to consult before making regulations described in clause 103(7) may be satisfied by consultation carried out before clause 103 comes into force.*

**After Clause 103**

LORD HOLMES OF RICHMOND

197A After Clause 103, insert the following new Clause –

**“Oversight of biometric technology use by the Information Commission**

(1) The Information Commission must establish a Biometrics Office.

- (2) The Biometrics Office is to be constituted by a committee of three appointed commissioners with relevant expertise.
- (3) It is the function of the Biometrics Office to—
  - (a) establish and maintain a public register of relevant entities engaged in processing the biometric data of members of the public;
  - (b) oversee and review the biometrics use of relevant entities;
  - (c) produce a Code of Practice for the use of biometric technology by registered parties, which must include—
    - (i) compulsory standards of accuracy and reliability for biometric technologies;
    - (ii) a requirement for the proportionality of biometrics use to be assessed prior to use and annually thereafter, and a procedure for such assessment;
    - (iii) a procedure for individual complaints about the use of biometrics by registered parties;
  - (d) receive and publish annual reports from all relevant entities, which includes the relevant entity’s proportionality assessment of their biometrics use;
  - (e) enforce registration and reporting by the issuing of enforcement notices and, where necessary, the imposition of fines for non-compliance with the registration and reporting requirements;
  - (f) ensure lawfulness of biometrics use by relevant entities, including by issuing compliance and abatement notices where necessary.
- (4) The Secretary of State may by regulations add to the responsibilities of the Biometrics Office.
- (5) Regulations made under subsection (4) are subject to the affirmative resolution procedure.
- (6) For the purposes of this Part, “relevant entity” means any organisation or body corporate (whether public or private) which processes biometric data as defined in Article 9 GDPR, other than where the biometric processing undertaken by the organisation or body corporate is otherwise overseen by the Investigatory Powers Commissioner, because it is—
  - (a) for the purposes of making or renewing a national security determination as defined by section 20(2) of the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012, or
  - (b) for the purposes set out in section 20(6) of the Protection of Freedoms Act 2012.”

LORD HOLMES OF RICHMOND

**197B** After Clause 103, insert the following new Clause—

**“Requirement to register with the Information Commission**

- (1) Any relevant entity intending to process the biometric data of members of the public (including any sub-group of the public, such as employees of the private entity) for purposes other than those contained in section 20(2) and (6) of the

Protection of Freedoms Act 2012 must register with the Information Commission prior to the deployment of the biometric technology.

- (2) An application for registration must include an explanation of the intended biometrics use, including an assessment of its proportionality and its extent.
- (3) All relevant entities must provide an annual report to the Biometrics Office addressing their processing of biometric data in the preceding year and their intended processing of biometrics in the following year.
- (4) Each annual report must contain a proportionality assessment of the relevant entity's processing of biometric data in the preceding year and intended processing of biometric data in the following year.
- (5) Any relevant entity which processes biometric data without having registered with the Information Commission, or without providing annual reports to the Biometrics Office, is liable to an unlimited fine to be imposed by the Information Commission."

LORD HOLMES OF RICHMOND

197C After Clause 103, insert the following new Clause –

**“Private biometrics use prior to entry into force of this Act**

Any relevant entity engaged in processing the biometric data of members of the public prior to the commencement of this Act must register with the Information Commission within 6 months of the date of commencement of this Act.”

*Member's explanatory statement*

*This amendment creates a mechanism for the Information Commission to oversee biometric technology use by private parties. The Investigatory Powers Commissioner regime, as referred to in Clause 103, oversees the use by public bodies of biometric technology. With increasing use of biometric technology by private entities and corporations, this Clause introduces a scheme for oversight that extends to those real-world uses.*

**After Clause 108**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

198 After Clause 108, insert the following new Clause –

**“Interpretation of the PEC Regulations**

In regulation 2 of the PEC Regulations (interpretation) –

- (a) in paragraph (4) omit “, without prejudice to paragraph (3),” and
- (b) at the end insert –

“(5)References in these regulations to a period expressed in hours, days, weeks, months or years are to be interpreted in accordance with Article 3 of the Periods of Time Regulation, except that Article 3(4) of that Regulation

does not apply to the interpretation of a reference to a period in regulation 16A.

(6) In paragraph (5), “the Periods of Time Regulation” means Regulation (EEC, Euratom) No. 1182/71 of the Council of 3 June 1971 determining the rules applicable to periods, dates and time limits.””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment provides for the rules of interpretation in Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 (rules of interpretation regarding periods of time etc) to apply to the Privacy and Electronic Communications (EC Directive) Regulations 2003, with an exception for regulation 16A. It also removes a superfluous cross-reference.*

**Clause 109**

LORD LUCAS  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

199 Clause 109, page 133, line 21, leave out “(2D)” and insert “(2F)”

LORD LUCAS  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

200 Clause 109, page 135, line 19, at end insert –

- “(2E) Paragraph (1) does not prevent a person storing information, or gaining access to information stored, in the terminal equipment of a subscriber or user if –
- (a) the sole purpose of the storage or access is to enable the person to collect information for statistical purposes about the size and composition of the audience of the service with a view to generating audience measurement information,
  - (b) any information that the storage or access enables the person to collect is not shared with any other person except for the purpose of enabling that other person to assist with generating audience measurement information,
  - (c) the subscriber or user is provided with clear and comprehensive information about the purpose of the storage or access, and
  - (d) the subscriber or user is given a simple means of objecting (free of charge) to the storage or access and does not object.
- (2F) In this paragraph, “statistical purposes” means the production of statistical results in aggregate form.”

LORD LUCAS  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

201 Clause 109, page 136, line 17, at end insert –

“(f) to measure or verify the performance of advertising services delivered as part of the service requested to enable website owners to accurately charge for their advertising services.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to ensure that the technical storage of, or access to, information is considered strictly necessary if it would support the measurement or verification of the performance of advertising services to allow website owners to charge for their advertising services more accurately.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

202 Clause 109, page 137, line 9, leave out from beginning to end of line 16 on page 138

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would leave out the proposed new regulation 6B of the Privacy and Electronic Communications Regulations (PEC Regulations), which would enable consent to be given, or an objection to be made, to cookies automatically.*

LORD LUCAS  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

203 Clause 109, page 137, line 20 at end insert –

“(2A) Where a user gives their consent or objection directly to the website operator, that consent or objection must override any previous consent or objection given automatically under paragraph (2).”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to ensure that where someone has set a generalised choice (“yes” or “no”) via a centralised mechanism about websites’ use of cookies, as envisaged by this new Regulation, they can still express a specific and/or different choice for the particular site they are using. In that case, that specific choice is the one that will apply to their use of that site.*

LORD LUCAS  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

204 Clause 109, page 137, line 34, at end insert –

“(ba) representatives of persons likely to be affected, and”

LORD LUCAS  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

205 Clause 109, page 137, line 39, at end insert –

- “(7A) Before laying a draft statutory instrument under paragraph (7), the Secretary of State must carry out and publish –
- (a) an assessment of the likely impact of implementing the regulations that sets out, in the Secretary of State’s opinion –
    - (i) the impact of making the regulations on competition, and
    - (ii) the legal effect of making the regulations on the application of these Regulations and the UK GDPR.
  - (b) the requirements under paragraph (1) must include that –
    - (i) the technology can capture and automatically communicate a user’s consent or objection and is sufficiently available and ready for use by website operators, relevant third parties, and website users,
    - (ii) the available technology functions effectively, accurately and reliably and is interoperable with relevant existing technology, and
    - (iii) the available technology functions in accordance with the relevant requirements set out in these Regulations and the UK GDPR that apply to the technology provider, the website operator or any third party that will receive or use the information given by that technology.”

**Clause 112**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

206 Clause 112, page 139, line 13, at end insert –

- “(1A) In regulation 5C of the PEC Regulations (personal data breach: enforcement) –
- (a) in paragraph (4)(f), for “from the service of the notice of intent” substitute “beginning when the notice of intent is served”, and
  - (b) in paragraph (5), for “21 days of receipt of the notice of intent” substitute “the period of 21 days beginning when the notice of intent is received”.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment adjusts the language of regulation 5C of the Privacy and Electronic Communications (EC Directive) Regulations 2003 so it is consistent with language used in new provisions inserted into those Regulations by clause 116 of the Bill.*

## VISCOUNT CAMROSE

207 Clause 112, page 139, line 24, at end insert –

“(iii) after the third subparagraph insert –

“This paragraph is to be interpreted in accordance with Article 3 of Regulation (EEC, Euratom) No. 1182/71 of the Council of 3 June 1971 determining the rules applicable to periods, dates and time limits.”, and”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment provides for the rules of interpretation in Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 (rules of interpretation regarding periods of time etc) to apply to Article 2(2) of Regulation (EU) No 611/2013 on the measures applicable to the notification of personal data breaches.*

**After Clause 112**

## VISCOUNT CAMROSE

208 After Clause 112, insert the following new Clause –

**“Emergency alerts: interpretation of time periods**

In regulation 16A of the PEC Regulations (emergency alerts), in paragraph (6), for the words from “7 days” to “paragraph (3)(b)” substitute “the period of 7 days beginning with the day on which the time period specified by the relevant public authority pursuant to paragraph (3)(b) expires”.

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment adjusts a description of a period of time in regulation 16A(6) of the Privacy and Electronic Communications (EC Directive) Regulations 2003 to clarify that the day on which the time period specified under regulation 26A(3)(b) expires (which triggers the 7 day period mentioned in regulation 16A) is included in the 7 days.*

## BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

208A After Clause 112, insert the following new Clause –

**“Prohibition on unsolicited calls regarding personal injury claims**

- (1) The PEC Regulations are amended as follows.
- (2) In regulation 21 (calls for direct marketing purposes), in paragraph (6), leave out “or 21B” and insert “21B or 22A”.
- (3) In regulation 22 (use of electronic mail for direct marketing purposes), after paragraph (4) insert –
  - “(5) Paragraph (1) does not apply to a case falling within regulation 22A.”



(4) After regulation 22 insert –

**“22A Unsolicited calls and use of electronic mail by claims management companies for personal injury claims**

(1) A person must not –

- (a) use, nor instigate the use of, a public electronic communications service for the purpose of making unsolicited telephone calls for direct marketing, and
- (b) transmit, nor instigate the transmission of, unsolicited communications for the purpose of direct marketing by means of electronic mail or otherwise,

if the conditions in subsection (2) are met.

(2) The conditions are that –

- (a) the person making or instigating the call or transmitting or instigating the use of electronic mail –
  - (i) is acting on behalf of a claims management service, or
  - (ii) does so with a view to providing information to a claims management service, and
- (c) the purpose of the call or the electronic mail is to engage a consumer in commencing a claim for a personal injury.

(3) In this regulation –

“claims management service” has the meaning given by section 419A of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000;

“unsolicited” means an approach which has not been specifically requested, even if a person has consented to receive marketing information;

“claim for a personal injury” means proceedings in which there is a claim for damages in respect of personal injuries to the claimant or any other person or in respect of a person’s death, and

“personal injuries” includes any disease and any impairment of a person’s physical or mental condition.””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This new Clause seeks to implement an outright ban on cold calling and spam texts from claims management companies for personal injury claims. Claims management companies would only be allowed to contact people about personal injury claims if they have specifically requested to be contacted about a potential claim.*

**Clause 113**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment would remove the introduction of soft opt-in for political parties and campaigners, whose activity is governed by other regulation.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**210** Clause 113, page 140, line 10, at end insert –

“(3B) For the purposes of paragraph (3A)(a), “non-commercial objective” does not include political campaigning activity.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment is to make clear that while a previous amendment to Clause 113 would retain the ability for non-commercial entities to use soft opt-in, this cannot be used for those wishing to undertake political campaigning activity.*

**Clause 114**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*The above-named Lords give notice of their intention to oppose the Question that Clause 114 stand part of the Bill.*

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment would remove the Clause which would enable direct marketing for the purposes of democratic engagement.*

**Clause 115**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

*Baroness Jones of Whitchurch gives notice of her intention to oppose the Question that Clause 115 stand part of the Bill.*

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment is consequential on an amendment to leave out Clause 114. Clause 115 would become redundant if Clause 114 were removed from the Bill.*

**Clause 116**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**211** Clause 116, page 145, line 12, at end insert—

“(2A) A provider of a public electronic communications service or network is not required to intercept or examine the content of any communication in order to comply with their duty under this regulation.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to clarify that a public electronic communications service or network is not required to intercept or examine the content of any communication in order to comply with their duty to notify the Commissioner of unlawful direct marketing.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**212** Clause 116, page 145, line 14, leave out “with the day on which” and insert “when”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*The amendment in my name to insert a new clause after clause 108 will apply the rules of interpretation in Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 to the Privacy and Electronic Communications (EC Directive) Regulations 2003. This amendment adjusts the language of new regulation 26A(3) of those Regulations to ensure that Article 3 is able to apply.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**213** Clause 116, page 145, line 37, leave out “with the day” and insert “when”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*The amendment in my name to insert a new clause after clause 108 will apply the rules of interpretation in Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 to the Privacy and Electronic Communications (EC Directive) Regulations 2003. This amendment adjusts the language of new regulation 26B(4) of the 2003 Regulations to ensure that Article 3 is able to apply.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**214** Clause 116, page 145, line 40, leave out from “beginning” to end of line and insert “when the notice of intent is received”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment adjusts the language of new regulation 26B(5) of the Privacy and Electronic Communications (EC Directive) Regulations 2003 to ensure that Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 is able to apply to it and also makes a small change to when the 21 day period starts.*

## BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

215 Clause 116, page 147, line 23, at end insert –

“(2A) In regulation 1 –

(a) after “shall”, insert “save for regulation 26A”;

(b) at end, insert –

“(2) Regulation 26A comes into force six months after the Commissioner has published guidance under regulation 26C (Guidance in relation to regulation 26A).”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would provide for the new regulation 26A, Duty to notify Commissioner of unlawful direct marketing, not to come into force until six months after the Commissioner has published guidance in relation to that duty.*

**Clause 120**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

216 Clause 120, page 151, line 25, leave out “124” and insert “(Time periods: the eIDAS Regulation and the EITSET Regulations)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on the amendment in my name to insert a new clause after clause 124.*

**After Clause 124**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

217 After Clause 124, insert the following new Clause –

**“Time periods: the eIDAS Regulation and the EITSET Regulations**

(1) In Chapter 1 of the eIDAS Regulation (general provisions), after Article 3 insert –

“Article 3A

**Periods of time**

References in this Regulation to a period expressed in hours, days, months or years are to be interpreted in accordance with Article 3 of Regulation (EEC, Euratom) No. 1182/71 of the Council of 3 June 1971 determining the rules applicable to periods, dates and time limits.”

(2) The Electronic Identification and Trust Services for Electronic Transactions Regulations 2016 (S.I. 2016/696) are amended as follows.

- (3) In regulation 2 (interpretation), at the end insert –
- “(3)References in these regulations to a period expressed in days or years are to be interpreted in accordance with Article 3 of Regulation (EEC, Euratom) No. 1182/71 of the Council of 3 June 1971 determining the rules applicable to periods, dates and time limits.”
- (4) In Schedule 1 (monetary penalties) –
- (a) in paragraph 4(f), for the words from “a period” to the end substitute “the period of 21 days beginning when the notice of intent is served”,
  - (b) in paragraph 5, for the words from “a period” to the end substitute “the period of 21 days beginning when the notice of intent is received”, and
  - (c) in paragraph 6, for the words from “a period” to the end substitute “the period of 21 days beginning when the notice of intent is served”.

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment provides for the rules of interpretation in Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 (rules of interpretation regarding periods of time etc) to apply to Regulation (EU) No. 910/2014 on electronic identification and trust services and to the Electronic Identification and Trust Services for Electronic Transactions Regulations 2016.*

**After Clause 125**

BARONESS YOUNG OF OLD SCONE  
THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD  
BARONESS PARMINTER

**218** After Clause 125, insert the following new Clause –

**“Disclosure of climate and nature information to improve public service delivery**

After section 35 of the Digital Economy Act 2017, insert –

**“35A Disclosure of climate and nature information to improve public service delivery**

- (1) When making significant announcements, Ministers and public authorities must, in an accurate and timely manner and in a machine-readable form, publicly disclose the potential current and future impact on specified matters to improve public service delivery.
- (2) The Secretary of State must issue guidance in respect of the format of the information provided under subsection (1).
- (3) In this section –
 

“significant announcements” means –

  - (a) the laying of primary legislation before Parliament,
  - (b) announced changes to the timing, level and scope of Government targets, or
  - (c) announced Government contracts or spending on infrastructure with a value of more than £500m,

- (d) policies which may have, or have the potential to have, a significant impact on specified matters.
- “specified matters” means –
- (a) United Kingdom greenhouse gas emissions as defined in the Climate Change Act 2008,
  - (b) management of the risks of the current and predicted impacts of climate change in the United Kingdom identified in the most recent report under section 56 of the Climate Change Act 2008,
  - (c) environment targets set using the powers in sections 1 to 3 of the Environment Act 2021.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require Ministers and public authorities such as regulators to disclose analysis of the potential current and future impact of announcements, including legislation, changes in targets and large contracts on UK climate change mitigation targets, adaptation to climate impacts and nature targets.*

**Clause 128**

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD ANDERSON OF IPSWICH  
BARONESS CHAKRABARTI  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*The above-named Lords give notice of their intention to oppose the Question that Clause 128 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*Removing Clause 128 seeks to probe whether the extent to which UK citizens may have their bank accounts monitored irrespective of any wrongdoing, and the potential attendant risk of outcomes based on false conclusions reached by an automated system over their financial activity.*

**After Clause 128**

LORD SIKKA

**219** After Clause 128, insert the following new Clause –

**“Power to require information for fraud prevention**

The Secretary of State may by regulations subject to the affirmative resolution procedure obtain information about bank accounts receiving any money from the public purse for the purposes of fraud prevention.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This probing amendment seeks to expand the powers of the Secretary of State to obtain information from bank accounts for social security purposes to the bank accounts of any person receiving any money from the public purse for the purpose of fraud prevention.*

**Schedule 11**

BARONESS SHERLOCK

- 220** Schedule 11, page 245, line 1, leave out from “only” to “relevant” in line 3 and insert “in cases where there are grounds to suspect that”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, alongside others to paragraph 1 of Schedule 11 in the name of Baroness Sherlock, would reframe the Secretary of State's power to give account information notices, making clear that the power should only be used in cases where there is suspicion that benefits are not being paid in accordance with enactments and rules of law relating to those benefits.*

BARONESS SHERLOCK

- 221** Schedule 11, page 245, line 3, after “are” insert “not”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, alongside others to paragraph 1 of Schedule 11 in the name of Baroness Sherlock, would reframe the Secretary of State's power to give account information notices, making clear that the power should only be used in cases where there is suspicion that benefits are not being paid in accordance with enactments and rules of law relating to those benefits.*

BARONESS SHERLOCK

- 222** Schedule 11, page 245, line 4, after “have” insert “not”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment, alongside others to paragraph 1 of Schedule 11 in the name of Baroness Sherlock, would reframe the Secretary of State's power to give account information notices, making clear that the power should only be used in cases where there is suspicion that benefits are not being paid in accordance with enactments and rules of law relating to those benefits.*

BARONESS SHERLOCK

- 223** Schedule 11, page 246, leave out lines 14 to 18

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would remove from paragraph 3 of inserted Schedule 3B a provision which could require the recipient of an account information notice to provide legible and intelligible copies of information recorded otherwise than in a legible form.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

224 Schedule 11, page 247, leave out lines 13 to 18 and insert –

“5 Information provided to the Secretary of State in response to a notice may only be used to determine whether benefits have been paid in accordance with the enactments and rules of law relating to those benefits.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment replaces paragraph 5 of inserted Schedule 3B and makes clear that information provided to the Secretary of State may only be used for the narrow purpose of determining whether benefits have been paid in accordance with enactments and rules of law relating to those benefits.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

225 Schedule 11, page 247, line 22, leave out “may” and insert “must”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would make it a requirement for the Secretary of State to issue a code of practice in connection with the use of account information notices.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

226 Schedule 11, page 247, line 24, leave out “may” and insert “must”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would ensure that a code of practice contains all of the provisions outlined in paragraph 6(2) of Schedule 11.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

227 Schedule 11, page 247, line 26, at end insert “, including the criteria by which the Secretary of State will determine whether it is reasonable and proportionate to specify accounts in a notice”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would ensure that a code of practice includes the criteria to be used by the Secretary of State in determining whether to issue account information notices.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

228 Schedule 11, page 247, line 32, leave out “If the Secretary of State decides to issue a code of practice,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on another in the name of Baroness Sherlock which makes the publication of a code of practice compulsory.*



## BARONESS SHERLOCK

229 Schedule 11, page 247, line 33, leave out “first”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on another in the name of Baroness Sherlock which makes the publication of a code of practice compulsory.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

230 Schedule 11, page 247, line 34, at end insert “for consultation by –

- (a) the Social Security Advisory Committee,
- (b) organisations that will have to comply with notices, and
- (c) any other persons that the Secretary of State considers appropriate.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require consultation on the draft code of conduct, with consultees to include the Social Security Advisory Committee and organisations that would have to comply with account information notices.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

231 Schedule 11, page 248, leave out lines 2 and 3 and insert –

- “(5) The code of practice, or any revision to it, may not come into force until a draft been laid before, and approved by a resolution of, each House of Parliament.
- (6) The Secretary of State may withdraw a code of practice but, unless a code of practice is in force, may not issue any new notices.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require the code of practice (and any revisions to it) to be approved by a resolution of both Houses of Parliament. It would also retain the Secretary of State’s ability to withdraw a code of practice, while making clear that the ability to issue notices would lapse if no code is in force.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

232 Schedule 11, page 248, leave out lines 4 to 15

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would remove current provisions around revisions to the code of practice, as this is now dealt with in an earlier amendment in the name of Baroness Sherlock to Schedule 11.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

233 Schedule 11, page 248, line 24, at end insert –

## “PART 2A

## ANNUAL REPORTING

- 8A (1) As soon as reasonably practicable after the end of each financial year, the Secretary of State must prepare and lay before Parliament a report regarding the use of account information notices under paragraph 1 of this Schedule.
- (2) A report under sub-paragraph (1) must outline, for the whole financial year –
- (a) the number of account information notices issued,
  - (b) the number of account holders whose information was obtained as a result of the use of account information notices,
  - (c) the number of cases in which relevant benefits were identified as being paid otherwise than in accordance with the enactments and rules of law relating to those benefits, and
  - (d) the number of cases in which individuals’ personal data was obtained but no fraud or error was identified.
- (3) A report under sub-paragraph (1) must also outline whether, in the view of the Secretary of State –
- (a) the breadth and scope of account information notices issued during the financial year was proportionate,
  - (b) the extent to which account information notices provided an effective means of ensuring that relevant benefits are paid in accordance with the enactments and rules of law relating to those benefits, and
  - (c) whether the use of account information notices will continue into the next financial year.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would insert a new Part into inserted Schedule 3B, to provide for annual reporting to Parliament on the use of account information notices. As well as requiring the provision of statistics around the use of such notices during the previous financial year, the amendment would also compel the Secretary of State to outline their views on the proportionality and effectiveness of notices.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

234 Schedule 11, page 252, line 22, leave out from “relevant” to end of line 23 and insert “working-age social security benefit to be specified by the Secretary of State in regulations;”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment alters the definition of “relevant benefit” for the purposes of Schedule 11 and aims to remove pensions from the scope of the Bill’s social security powers.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

235 Schedule 11, page 252, line 28, at end insert –

“16A A statutory instrument containing regulations under paragraph 16(a) may not be made unless a draft of the instrument has been laid before and approved by a resolution of each House of Parliament.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require regulations specifying the working-age benefits covered by the Bill's social security powers to be approved by Parliament.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
BARONESS CHAKRABARTI  
LORD ANDERSON OF IPSWICH  
LORD SIKKA

*The above-named Lords give notice of their intention to oppose the Question that Schedule 11 be the Eleventh Schedule to the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This is consequential to removing Clause 128.*

**Clause 129**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

236 Clause 129, page 158, line 27, leave out “, or are due to conduct an investigation,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment makes a technical change to wording about investigations by a coroner or procurator fiscal. The omitted words are not required because there is no stage at which a coroner or procurator fiscal would be “due to” conduct an investigation into a death (as opposed to conducting an investigation into it).*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE  
BARONESS KIDRON

237 Clause 129, page 158, leave out lines 30 and 31

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment concerns OFCOM's power to issue a notice requiring an internet service provider to retain information about the use of the service by a child who has died, where a coroner or procurator fiscal is investigating the child's death. The amendment has the effect that the power is no longer limited to cases of suspected child suicide.*

**Before Clause 130**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

238 Before Clause 130, insert the following new Clause –

**“Definition of “biometric data”**

In paragraph 1 of Article 9 of the UK GDPR, omit “for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person”.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This new Clause would amend the UK General Data Protection Regulation to extend the protections currently in place for biometric data for identification to include biometric data for the purpose of classification.*

**Clause 130**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 130 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*Removing this Clause would prevent UK law enforcement agencies holding biometric data received from overseas law enforcement agencies in a pseudonymised format.*

**Clause 131**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 131 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*Removing this Clause would prevent UK law enforcement agencies holding biometric data received from overseas law enforcement agencies in a pseudonymised format.*

**Clause 132**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

*Lord Clement-Jones gives notice of his intention to oppose the Question that Clause 132 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*Removing this Clause would prevent UK law enforcement agencies holding biometric data received from overseas law enforcement agencies in a pseudonymised format.*

**Clause 133**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

239 Clause 133, page 169, line 10, at end insert –

“(2A) After section 25, insert –

**“25A Review of form in which registers are to be kept**

- (1) The Secretary of State must commission a review of the provisions of this Act and of related legislation, with a view to the creation of a single digital register of births and deaths.
- (2) The review must consider and make recommendations on the effect of the creation of a single digital register on –
  - (a) fraud,
  - (b) data collection, and
  - (c) ease of registration.
- (3) The Secretary of State must lay the conclusions of their review before Parliament within six months of this section coming into force.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would insert a new section into the Births and Deaths Registration Act 1953 requiring a review of relevant legislation, with consideration of creating a single digital register for registered births and registered deaths and recommendations on the effects of such a change on reducing fraud, improving data collection and streamlining digital registration.*

**Clause 138**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

240 Clause 138, page 172, line 14, leave out “Part 3” and insert “this Act”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on the amendment to this clause in my name moving provision about the initial upload of information into the National Underground Asset Register into a new section to be inserted into Part 3A of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (inserted by this clause).*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

241 Clause 138, page 172, line 16, at end insert –

**“106AA Initial upload of information into NUAR**

- (1) Before the end of the initial upload period an undertaker having apparatus in a street must enter into NUAR –
  - (a) all information that is included in the undertaker’s records under section 79(1) on the archive upload date, and

- (b) any other information of a prescribed description that is held by the undertaker on that date.
- (2) The duty under subsection (1) does not apply in such cases as may be prescribed.
- (3) Information must be entered into NUAR under subsection (1) in such form and manner as may be prescribed.
- (4) For the purposes of subsection (1) the Secretary of State must by regulations –
  - (a) specify a date as “the archive upload date”, and
  - (b) specify a period beginning with that date as the “initial upload period”.
- (5) Regulations under this section are subject to the negative procedure.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment moves provision about the initial upload of information into the National Underground Asset Register into a new section to be inserted into Part 3A of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (inserted by this clause).*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**242** Clause 138, page 172, line 18, after “provision” insert “for or”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment makes clear that regulations under section 106B(1) of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (inserted by this clause) may make provision for, as well as provision in connection with, making information kept in the National Underground Asset Register available.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**243** Clause 138, page 172, line 19, leave out from “available” to end of line 21

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on the next amendment to this clause in my name.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

**244** Clause 138, page 173, line 2, at end insert –

- “(h) make provision for or in connection with the granting of licences by the Secretary of State in relation to any non-Crown IP rights that may exist in relation to information made available (including provision about the form of a licence and the terms and conditions of a licence);
- (i) make provision for information to be made available for free or for a fee;
- (j) make provision about the amounts of the fees, including provision for the amount of a fee to be an amount which is intended to exceed the cost of the things in respect of which the fee is charged;

- (k) make provision about how funds raised by means of fees must or may be used, including provision for funds to be paid to persons who are required, by a provision of this Act, to enter information into NUAR.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment moves provision about licensing and the charging of fees under regulations under section 106B of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (inserted by this clause) into subsection (2) of that section; and makes it clear that those regulations will only provide for licensing in relation to non-Crown rights.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 245 Clause 138, page 173, leave out lines 3 to 16

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on the previous amendment to this clause in my name.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 246 Clause 138, page 173, line 24, at end insert –

“(6) In this section –

“database right” has the same meaning as in Part 3 of the Copyright and Rights in Databases Regulations 1997 (S.I. 1997/3032);

“non-Crown IP right” means any copyright, database right or other intellectual property right which is not owned by the Crown.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment provides for definitions and is consequential on the amendment to this clause in my name making clear that regulations under section 106B of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (inserted by this clause) will only provide for licensing in relation to non-Crown rights.*

**Schedule 13**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 247 Schedule 13, page 271, leave out lines 22 and 23 and insert “the date specified in the warning notice in accordance with paragraph 2(2)(d).”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment ensures that language used in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Schedule 5A to the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (inserted by this Schedule) is consistent.*

**Clause 139**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

248 Clause 139, page 178, line 19, leave out paragraph (f) and insert –

“(f) after subsection (3A) insert –

“(3B) Except in such cases as may be prescribed, where an undertaker records information as required by subsection (1) or (1B), or updates such information, the undertaker must, within a prescribed period, enter the recorded or updated information into NUAR.

(3C) Information must be entered into NUAR under subsection (3B) in such form and manner as may be prescribed.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment and the next amendment to this clause in my name are consequential on the amendment to clause 138 in my name moving provision about the initial upload of information into the National Underground Asset Register into a new section to be inserted into Part 3A of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (inserted by clause 138).*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

249 Clause 139, page 178, line 39, leave out paragraph (h) and insert –

“(h) after subsection (6) insert –

“(7) For the meaning of “NUAR”, see section 106A.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment and the previous amendment to this clause in my name are consequential on the amendment to clause 138 in my name moving provision about the initial upload of information into the National Underground Asset Register into a new section to be inserted into Part 3A of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (inserted by clause 138).*

**After Clause 142**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

250 After Clause 142, insert the following new Clause –

**“Review of notification of changes of circumstances legislation**

- (1) The Secretary of State must commission a review of the operation of the Social Security (Notification of Changes of Circumstances) Regulations 2010 (S.I. 2010/444).
- (2) In conducting the review, the designated reviewer must –
  - (a) consider the current operation and effectiveness of the legislation;



- (b) identify any gaps in its operation and provisions;
  - (c) consider and publish recommendations as to how the scope of the legislation could be expanded to include non-public sector, voluntary and private sector holders of personal data.
- (3) In undertaking the review, the reviewer must consult –
- (a) specialists in data sharing;
  - (b) people and organisations who campaign for the interests of people affected by the legislation;
  - (c) people and organisations who use the legislation;
  - (d) any other persons and organisations the reviewer considers appropriate.
- (4) The Secretary of State must lay a report of the review before Parliament within six months of the day on which this Act is passed.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This new Clause would require a review of the operation of the “Tell Us Once” programme, which seeks to provide simpler mechanisms for citizens to pass information regarding births and deaths to government, and consideration of whether the progress of “Tell Us Once” could be extended to non-public sector holders of data.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD ARBUTHNOT OF EDROM  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

251 After Clause 142, insert the following new Clause –

**“Evidence from computer records**

- (1) In any proceedings, a statement containing information in a document produced by a computer is not to be admissible as evidence of any fact stated therein unless it is shown –
- (a) that there are no reasonable grounds for believing that the information contained in the statement is inaccurate because of improper use of the computer,
  - (b) that at all material times the computer was operating properly, or if not, that any respect in which it was not operating properly or was out of operation was not such as to materially affect the production of the document or the accuracy of the information it contains, and
  - (c) that any relevant conditions specified in rules of court under subsection (2) below are satisfied.
- (2) Provision may be made by rules of court requiring that in any proceedings where it is desired to give a statement in evidence by virtue of this section such information concerning the statement as may be required by the rules must be provided in such form and at such time as may be so required.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This probing amendment reinstates the substantive provisions of section 69 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984. In light of the Post Office Horizon scandal, this would revoke the current assumption that the information provided by computers is always accurate.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
 BARONESS BENNETT OF MANOR CASTLE  
 LORD WATSON OF WYRE FOREST  
 LORD MAUDE OF HORSHAM

252 After Clause 142, insert the following new Clause –

**“Open address file**

- (1) The Secretary of State must regularly publish a list of UK addresses as open data to an approved data standard.
- (2) “Regularly publish” means on at least a monthly basis.
- (3) “UK addresses” means an authoritative list of UK address data as maintained by local authorities including, but not limited to –
  - (a) building number, name and street address,
  - (b) geographic coordinates, and
  - (c) a unique identifier.
- (4) “Open data” means data under a licence whereby any person can freely access, use, modify, and share the data for any purpose, subject, at most, to requirements that preserve provenance and openness.
- (5) “Approved data standard” means such written standards, containing technical specifications or other requirements in relation to the data, or in relation to providing or processing the data, as may be published by an appropriate authority from time to time.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require a list of UK addresses to be made freely available for reuse.*

**Clause 143**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

253 Clause 143, page 181, line 14, at end insert –

- “(3A) In section 205(2) (references to periods of time) –
- (a) omit paragraph (l), and
  - (b) after that paragraph insert –
 

“(la) paragraph 22(6) of Schedule 12A;”.

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment provides that Article 3 of Regulation No 1182/71 (rules of interpretation regarding periods of time etc) does not apply to paragraph 22(6) of Schedule 12A to the Data Protection Act 2018 (inserted by Schedule 15 to the Bill).*

**Schedule 15**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 254 Schedule 15, page 278, line 17, leave out "Secretary of State" and insert "person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee"

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 255 Schedule 15, page 278, leave out lines 30 to 33 and insert –
- “(2) The non-executive members are appointed by His Majesty by Letters Patent on the recommendation of the person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee.
  - (2A) At least two non-executive members must be appointed for the specific task of overseeing regulatory complaints and the rights and freedoms of data subjects.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 256 Schedule 15, page 278, line 33, at end insert –
- “(2A) A person may not be appointed under sub-paragraph (2) unless the Science, Innovation and Technology Committee of the House of Commons has endorsed the proposed appointment.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

*This amendment would ensure that non-executive members of the Information Commission may not be appointed unless the Science, Innovation and Technology Committee of the House of Commons has endorsed the Secretary of State's proposed appointee.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 257 Schedule 15, page 279, line 5, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

258 Schedule 15, page 279, leave out lines 10 and 11 and insert—

- “(6) The non-executive members must exercise the powers conferred on the non-executive members by this paragraph so as to secure that the number of non-executive members of the Commission is, so far as practicable, at all times greater than the number of executive members.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

259 Schedule 15, page 279, line 13, at end insert—

- “(8) Members of the Information Commission shall be precluded, for a period of two years after leaving office, from—
- (a) accepting employment with a business that was subject to an enforcement action or civil action during the member’s tenure or during the five-year period preceding the member’s appointment, or
  - (b) acting for, compensation as a legal representative for, or otherwise represent, any other person in a matter pending before the agency if the purpose is to influence an action of the agency.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would prevent members of the Information Commission from seeking employment from the industries they regulated during their terms. It is to probe what steps the Government and ICO are taking to prevent the so-called ‘revolving door’ between regulators and the industries they regulate.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

260 Schedule 15, page 279, leave out lines 14 to 19

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 261** Schedule 15, page 279, line 21, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 262** Schedule 15, page 279, line 34, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 263** Schedule 15, page 279, line 36, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 264** Schedule 15, page 279, line 38, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 265** Schedule 15, page 280, line 5, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 266 Schedule 15, page 280, line 15, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 267 Schedule 15, page 280, line 24, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 268 Schedule 15, page 280, line 25, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 269 Schedule 15, page 281, line 3, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 270 Schedule 15, page 281, line 9, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 271 Schedule 15, page 281, line 12, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 272 Schedule 15, page 281, line 16, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 273 Schedule 15, page 281, line 17, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 274 Schedule 15, page 281, line 24, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 275 Schedule 15, page 281, line 26, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 276 Schedule 15, page 281, line 32, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 277 Schedule 15, page 283, line 33, at end insert—

- “(7) One member of the Commission must have a particular focus upon the specialities of—
- (a) closed circuit television and surveillance cameras;
  - (b) biometrics, DNA, genomics and proteomics.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require the new Information Commission to have a Commissioner particularly focussed on certain topics.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 278 Schedule 15, page 286, line 21, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*



## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 279 Schedule 15, page 286, line 26, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 280 Schedule 15, page 286, line 34, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 281 Schedule 15, page 286, line 37, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 282 Schedule 15, page 287, line 8, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

## VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 283 Schedule 15, page 287, line 26, at end insert—

*“Supplementary powers*

- 23A The Commission may do anything it thinks appropriate for the purposes of, or in connection with, its functions.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment makes clear that the Information Commission has power to do things to facilitate the exercise of its functions.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

- 284** Schedule 15, page 287, line 31, leave out “Secretary of State” and insert “person who chairs the relevant Parliamentary committee”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to remove the powers of the Secretary of State to intervene with the functioning of the Commissioner and transfers the responsibility to appoint the Commissioner from government to Parliament.*

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

- 285** Schedule 15, page 288, line 25, leave out sub-paragraph (3) and insert—

“(3) For the purposes of paragraph 7(3) of Schedule 12A to the 2018 Act (extension of chair’s term), the term of the person’s appointment as chair of the Information Commission is to be treated as a term beginning when the person began to hold the office of Information Commissioner.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment ensures that provision limiting the extension of a person’s term of appointment as chair of the Information Commission (in paragraph 7 of new Schedule 12A to the Data Protection Act 2018, read with section 205(2) of that Act) applies in the same manner to the transitional appointment of the current Information Commissioner as chair.*

**Clause 147**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
LORD VAUX OF HARROWDEN

*The above-named Lords give notice of their intention to oppose the Question that Clause 147 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*Removing this Clause would remove provisions in the Bill that abolish the office of the Biometrics and Surveillance Camera Commissioner.*

**Clause 148**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
LORD VAUX OF HARROWDEN

*The above-named Lords give notice of their intention to oppose the Question that Clause 148 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*Removing this Clause would remove provisions in the Bill that abolish the office of the Biometrics and Surveillance Camera Commissioner.*

**Clause 149**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

286 Clause 149, page 187, line 19, leave out “, which allows or confirms the unique identification of that individual,”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would amend the definition of “biometric data” for the purpose of the oversight of law enforcement biometrics databases so as to extend the protections currently in place for biometric data for identification to include biometric data for the purpose of classification.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
LORD VAUX OF HARROWDEN

*The above-named Lords give notice of their intention to oppose the Question that Clause 149 stand part of the Bill.*

***Member's explanatory statement***

*Removing this Clause would remove provisions in the Bill that abolish the office of the Biometrics and Surveillance Camera Commissioner.*

**After Clause 149**

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

287 After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“Provision about implementing article 80(2) of the UK GDPR**

In section 190(1) of the Data Protection Act 2018 leave out “After the report under section 189(1) is laid before Parliament, the Secretary of State may” and insert “The Secretary of State must, within three months of the passage of the Data Protection and Digital Information Act 2023,””

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This new Clause would require the Secretary of State to exercise powers under section 190 of the Data Protection Act 2018 to allow public interest organisations to raise data protection complaints on behalf of individuals generally, without the need to obtain the authorisation of each individual being represented.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

288 After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“Review of the impact of the Act on anonymisation and the identifiability of data subjects**

- (1) Within six months of the day on which this Act is passed, the Secretary of State must lay before Parliament the report of an assessment of the impact of the measures in the Act on anonymisation and the identifiability of data subjects in the United Kingdom.
- (2) The report must include a comparison between the rights afforded to data subjects under this Act with those afforded to data subjects by the Commission Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation).”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require the Secretary of State to conduct an impact assessment of the measures in the Act on anonymisation and identifiability of data subjects, including a comparison between the rights afforded to data subjects in this eventual Act and those in the EU General Data Protection Regulation.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

289 After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“Digital identity theft**

- (1) A person commits an offence of digital identity theft if the person –
  - (a) without permission obtains personal or sensitive information such as passwords, ID numbers, credit card numbers or national insurance numbers relating to an individual, or
  - (b) uses personal or sensitive information under paragraph (a) to impersonate that individual and act in their name to carry out any digital transaction.
- (2) A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale.”

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE

290 After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“Protection of children**

- (1) Nothing in this Act is to be construed as reducing, minimising or undermining existing standards and protections of children under the 2018 Act.
- (2) In exercising functions or applying or interpreting the provisions in this Act, the Secretary of State, the Information Commissioner and data controllers and processors must give due consideration to –
  - (a) children’s interests and fundamental rights and freedoms as set out in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and General Comment 25 on Children’s Rights in relation to the Digital Environment, and
  - (b) the fact established in the 2018 Act that children are entitled to a higher standard of protection than adults with regard to their personal data.”

*Member's explanatory statement*

*This amendment enshrines the Government commitment made by Ministers at second reading in the Commons to maintaining existing standards of data protection for children in the 2018 Act.*

BARONESS KIDRON  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
BARONESS HARDING OF WINSCOMBE  
BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

291 After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“Offence to use personal data or digital information to create digital models or files that facilitate the creation of AI or computer generated child sexual abuse material**

- (1) A person commits an offence if they –
  - (a) collect, scrape, possess, distribute or otherwise process personal data or digital information with the intention of using it, or attempting to use it, to create or train a digital model which enables the creation of AI or computer generated child sexual abuse material or priority illegal content;
  - (b) use personal data or digital information to create, train or distribute or attempt to create, train or distribute a digital file or model that has been trained on child sexual abuse material or priority illegal content, or which enables the creation of artificial intelligence or computer generated child sexual abuse material or priority illegal content;
  - (c) collate, or attempt to collate, digital files or models based on personal data or digital information that, when combined, enable the creation of AI or computer generated child sexual abuse material or priority illegal content;

- (d) possess, or attempt to possess, a digital file or model based on personal data or digital information with the intention of using it to produce or gain access to AI or computer generated child sexual abuse material or priority illegal content.
- (2) For the purposes of this section, “artificial intelligence or computer generated child sexual abuse material or primary priority illegal content” includes images, videos, audio including voice, chatbots, material generated by large language models, written text, computer file and avatars.
- (3) A person who commits an offence under subsection (1) is liable to the sentences set out in section 160 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 and section 6 of the Protection of Children Act 1978 for the equivalent offences.
- (4) For the purposes of this section, “priority illegal content” is content that meets the definition of “priority illegal content” set out in section 59 of the Online Safety Act 2023.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment seeks to make the files trained on or trained to create “Child Sex Abuse Material” illegal.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**292** After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“Review of the implications of abolishing the Office of the Biometrics and Surveillance Camera Commissioner**

- (1) The Secretary of State must commission and publish an independent review of the implications of abolishing the Office of the Biometrics and Surveillance Camera Commissioner.
- (2) The Secretary of State must lay a report of the review before Parliament within six months of the day on which this Act is passed.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require the Secretary of State to commission and publish an independent review of the implications of abolishing the Office of the Biometrics and Surveillance Camera Commissioner.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**293** After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“Deepfakes depicting sexual offences or activity without consent**

- (1) It is an offence for a person to intentionally create, alter, or otherwise generate a deepfake depicting –
  - (a) a Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (CSEA) offence; or
  - (b) an intimate act.

- (2) It is an offence for a person to intentionally create, alter, or otherwise generate a CSEA deepfake.
- (3) A person is not guilty of an offence by virtue of subsection (1)(b) if they show the person or persons, being over the age of 18, depicted in the deepfake provided consent for the creation, alteration or generation of the deepfake.
- (4) Offences under this section are punishable either on conviction on indictment or on summary conviction.
- (5) A person convicted on indictment of an offence under this section is liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than ten years, or to a fine not exceeding the prescribed sum for the purposes of this Act or to both.
- (6) A person convicted summarily of an offence under this section is liable—
  - (a) to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months; or
  - (b) to a fine not exceeding the prescribed sum for the purposes of this Act.
- (7) The Secretary of State must by regulations prescribe the sum for the purposes subsections (5) and (6).
- (8) Regulations made under subsection (7) are subject to the affirmative procedure.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would make it an offence to intentionally generate a deepfake depicting sexual offences or activity without consent.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**294** After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause —

**“Deepfakes for the purpose of committing fraud**

- (1) It is an offence for a person to create, alter or otherwise generate a deepfake where the person knows or suspects (or has reasonable grounds for knowing or suspecting) that the deepfake will, or is likely to, be used to carry out activity which would breach section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006 or otherwise constitute the common law offence of fraud.
- (2) Offences under this section are punishable either on conviction on indictment or on summary conviction.
- (3) A person convicted on indictment of an offence under this section is liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than five years, or to a fine not exceeding the prescribed sum for the purposes of this Act or to both.
- (4) A person convicted summarily of an offence under this section is liable—
  - (a) to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months; or
  - (b) to a fine not exceeding the prescribed sum for the purposes of this Act.
- (5) The Secretary of State must by regulations prescribe the sum for the purposes subsections (3) and (4).

- (6) Regulations made under subsection (5) are subject to the affirmative procedure.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would make it an offence for a person to generate a deepfake for the purpose of committing fraud.*

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES

295

After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“Offence of creating or sharing political deepfakes**

- (1) A person (A) commits an offence if –
  - (a) A sends a communication by electronic means which consists of content –
    - (i) generated by artificial intelligence, and
    - (ii) purporting to be a genuine statement from a political figure; and
  - (b) A’s act was intended to create the impression that the political figure has said or done something that is not based in fact.
- (2) In this section “political figure” means a person who –
  - (a) holds public office,
  - (b) is, during a regulated campaign period, a candidate for public office, or
  - (c) has, outside of a regulated campaign period, publicly stated their intention to stand for public office.
- (3) The Secretary of State may by regulations introduce exemptions to the offence under subsection (1).
- (4) In making regulations under subsection (3), the Secretary of State must have due regard to the public interest in balancing freedom of speech while preserving the integrity of elections in the United Kingdom.
- (5) Regulations under subsection (3) are subject to the affirmative procedure.
- (6) A person who commits an offence under subsection (1) is liable –
  - (a) on summary conviction in England and Wales, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding the general limit in a magistrates’ court or a fine (or both);
  - (b) on summary conviction in Northern Ireland, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 6 months or a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum (or both);
  - (c) on conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years or a fine (or both).
- (7) In Schedule 7 of the Online Safety Act 2023, after paragraph 39 insert –
 

*“Election interference*

40 An offence under section (*Offence of creating or sharing political deepfakes*) of the Data Protection and Digital Information Act 2024 (*offence of creating or sharing political deepfakes*).”



## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**295A★** After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“Duties on developers and persons providing cloud computing platforms**

- (1) A person developing software or a computer program capable of creating, altering or otherwise generating deepfakes must –
  - (a) ensure the software or computer program includes measures to prevent it being used to create, alter or otherwise generate deepfakes which would be an offence under this Act;
  - (b) take reasonable steps to monitor the use of that software or computer program by third parties; and
  - (c) where that person knows or suspects (or has reasonable grounds for knowing or suspecting) a third party is using that software or program to create, alter or otherwise generate deepfakes, to take reasonable steps to revoke access.
- (2) A person providing a cloud computing platform for the development of software or a computer program capable of creating, altering or otherwise generating deepfakes must –
  - (a) take measures to prevent that platform being used to create, alter or otherwise generate deepfakes which would be an offence under this Act;
  - (b) take reasonable steps to monitor the use of that platform by third parties; and
  - (c) where that person knows or suspects (or has reasonable grounds for knowing or suspecting) a third party is using that platform to create, alter or otherwise generate deepfakes, to take reasonable steps to revoke access.
- (3) The Secretary of State may issue guidance for the purposes of complying with this section.
- (4) A person developing software or a computer program capable of creating, altering or otherwise generating deepfakes must prepare an annual report setting out how they have complied with subsection (1) and had regard to any guidance issued under subsection (3).
- (5) A person providing a cloud computing platform for the development of software or a computer program capable of creating, altering or otherwise generating deepfakes must prepare an annual report setting out how they have complied with subsection (2) and had regard to any guidance issued under subsection (3).”

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**295B★** After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“Service Provider duties**

- (1) A person (P) who provides software or a computer program capable of creating, altering or otherwise generating deepfakes must –

- (a) establish and maintain policies, controls and procedures designed to ensure that the software or computer program is not used to create, alter or otherwise generate deepfakes which would be an offence under this Act;
  - (b) monitor the use of the software or computer program by third parties; and
  - (c) where P knows or suspects (or has reasonable grounds for knowing or suspecting) a third party is using the software or computer program to create, alter or otherwise generate deepfakes which would be an offence under this Act, to take steps to revoke access.
- (2) A person (P) who provides a digital platform service must –
- (a) establish and maintain policies, controls and procedures designed to ensure that the digital platform service is not used to disseminate deepfakes which would be an offence under this Act;
  - (b) establish and maintain policies, controls and procedures designed to ensure that the digital platform service is not used to disseminate software or computer programs capable of creating, altering or otherwise generating deepfakes which would be an offence under this Act;
  - (c) monitor the use of the software, digital platform service or computer program by third parties; and
  - (d) where P knows or suspects (or has reasonable grounds for knowing or suspecting) a third party is using the digital platform to disseminate –
    - (i) deepfakes which would be an offence under this Act; or
    - (ii) software or computer programs capable of creating, altering or otherwise generating deepfakes which would be an offence under this Act,
 to take steps to revoke access.
- (3) The Secretary of State may issue guidance for the purposes of complying with this section.
- (4) A person providing software or a computer program capable of creating, altering or otherwise generating deepfakes must prepare an annual report setting out how they have complied with subsection (1) and had regard to any guidance issued under subsection (3).
- (5) A person providing a digital platform service must prepare an annual report setting out how they have complied with subsection (2) and had regard to any guidance issued under subsection (3).”

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**295C★** After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“General duties of OFCOM under section 3 of the Communications Act 2003**

- (1) Section 3 of the Communications Act 2003 (general duties of OFCOM) is amended in accordance with subsections (2) and (3).

- (2) In subsection (2), after paragraph (g) insert—
  - “(h) the adequate protection of citizens from harm presented by deepfakes.”
- (3) In subsection (14), at the appropriate place insert—

““deepfake” has the meaning given by section (*Interpretation of Part 5*) of the Data Protection and Digital Information Act 2024.”

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**295D★** After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause—

**“Interpretation of Part 5**

- (1) In this Part—
  - “cloud computing platform” means a product or service made available to the public that provides processing, storage, networks, or other fundamental computing resources with which a consumer is able to deploy or run software
  - “create” means taking steps to produce or distribute but excludes mere possession;
  - “deepfake” means any image, video or audio recording generated or altered through the use of computer machine learning to depict a person who is identifiable or event which would falsely appear to another person to be an authentic or truthful imitation and, without limitation, includes any other image, video or audio recording pursuant to an order under subsection (2);
  - “person” includes (in addition to an individual and a body of persons corporate or unincorporate) any organisation or association of persons;
- (2) The Secretary of State may by regulations—
  - (a) amend the definition of deepfake to add a new type of image, video, or audio recording; and
  - (b) make further provision, or amend or repeal existing provision made under paragraph (a), in connection with that definition.
- (3) The Secretary of State may make regulations under this section only where it can be reasonably determined that such order does not affect or lower the protections against deepfakes on the date this Act comes into force.
- (4) A statutory instrument made under this section may not be made unless a draft of the instrument has been laid before and approved by a resolution of each House of Parliament.”

## LORD CLEMENT-JONES

**295E★** After Clause 149, insert the following new Clause –

**“Meaning of “digital platform service”**

- (1) In this Part “digital platform service” means a service or dissociable section of a service provided by means of an electronic communications network where –
  - (a) the purpose of the service or of the dissociable section of the service is the provision of text, images, videos, audio recordings, software or computer programs to members of the public;
  - (b) the person providing the service or of the dissociable section of the service –
    - (i) does not have general control over what text, images, videos, audio recordings, software or computer programs are available on it, but
    - (ii) does have general control over the manner in which the text, images, videos, audio recordings, software or computer programs are organised on it (and in this sub-paragraph “organised” includes being organised automatically or by way of algorithms, in particular by displaying, tagging and sequencing).”

**Before Clause 150**

BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH  
LORD CLEMENT-JONES  
LORD VAUX OF HARROWDEN

**296** Before Clause 150, insert the following new Clause –

**“Impact of Act on EU data adequacy decision**

- (1) Within six months of the day on which this Act is passed, the Secretary of State must carry out an assessment of the likely impact of this Act on the EU data adequacy decisions relating to the United Kingdom.
- (2) Upon completion of the assessment under subsection (1), a Minister of the Crown must lay before Parliament a report of the findings.
- (3) The assessment must include specific consideration of the impact of the Act on –
  - (a) data risk, and
  - (b) small and medium-sized businesses.
- (4) The report under subsection (2) must include an estimate of the impact of the Act in financial terms.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is to probe whether the Government anticipate the provisions of this Bill conflicting with the requirements that need to be met by the UK to maintain a data adequacy decision by the EU.*

**Clause 150**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

297 Clause 150, page 188, line 3, at end insert –

“(3A) Regulations under this section made in consequence of section 183A of the 2018 Act (inserted by section 49 of this Act) may amend, repeal or revoke provision which refers to the data protection legislation (as defined in section 3 of the 2018 Act) as they could if the provision referred instead to the main data protection legislation (as defined in section 183A of the 2018 Act).”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment makes clear that regulations making amendments consequential on new section 183A of the Data Protection Act 2018 (inserted by clause 49 of the Bill) can remove provision which duplicates the effect of that section but which refers to the “data protection legislation” generally, rather than the “main data protection legislation”.*

**Clause 154**

VISCOUNT CAMROSE

298 Clause 154, page 189, line 24, leave out “subsection (3)” and insert “subsections (2) and (3)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment provides that subsection (4) of this clause is subject to subsection (2) of this clause, as well as subsection (3).*

**Clause 155**

BARONESS SHERLOCK

299 Clause 155, page 189, line 27, leave out “and (3)” and insert “, (3) and (3A)”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment is consequential on a later change to commencement provisions and would ensure that the new social security powers granted by the Bill are only commenced when a number of steps have been taken.*

LORD CLEMENT-JONES

300 Clause 155, page 189, line 36, at end insert –

“(fa) section (*Digital identity theft*);”

## BARONESS JONES OF WHITCHURCH

301 Clause 155, page 190, line 4, at end insert –

“(za) section 1 (information relating to an identifiable individual);”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would delay the commencement of Clause 1 of the Bill until two months after Royal Assent. This is designed to give the Secretary of State two months to publish an assessment of the changes proposed by that Clause as required by an amendment to Clause 1.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

302 Clause 155, page 190, line 12, leave out paragraph (f)

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would remove the automatic entry into force of the new social security powers contained in the Bill. At present, these provisions would be commenced two months after Royal Assent.*

## BARONESS SHERLOCK

303 Clause 155, page 190, line 14, at end insert –

“(3A) The Secretary of State may not lay regulations to bring section 128 (power to require information for social security purposes) and Schedule 11 (power to require information for social security purposes) into force until the Secretary of State has –

- (a) issued a call for evidence to inform the creation of the first code of practice as required by Schedule 3B of the Social Security Administration Act 1992 (power of the Secretary of State to require account information),
- (b) consulted the Financial Conduct Authority and organisations that will have to comply with notices on the operation of the proposed powers, and
- (c) laid before Parliament one or more statements outlining –
  - (i) whether and how the Secretary of State proposes to use artificial intelligence tools as part of the exercising of their powers, and how these tools will take account of protected characteristics,
  - (ii) whether and how special provision will be made to ensure individuals who are subject to investigation do not experience financial hardship during that investigation, or any lasting detriment following its completion, and
  - (iii) whether the Secretary of State intends to outsource investigations to private contractors and, if so, what assurances the Secretary of State will seek in relation to the conduct of those investigations.”

***Member's explanatory statement***

*This amendment would require the Secretary of State to fulfil several requirements prior to laying regulations to commence the Bill's new social security powers.*



# Data Protection and Digital Information Bill

---

---

SECOND MARSHALLED  
LIST OF AMENDMENTS  
TO BE MOVED  
IN GRAND COMMITTEE

---

*21 March 2024*

---

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS