

HOUSE OF LORDS APPOINTMENTS COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE 27TH MEETING HELD ON 15TH SEPTEMBER 2004

Present: Lord Stevenson (Chairman)
Baroness Dean
Lord Dholakia
Dame Deirdre Hine
Lord Hurd
Mrs Angela Sarkis

Mr Jim Barron - Secretary
Ms Geraldine Alexander - Secretariat
Mr Ekpe Attah – Secretariat
Miss Jo Tobie - Secretariat

Apologies

1. Apologies were received from Mrs Felicity Huston.

Minutes of the twenty-sixth meeting of the Commission

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 9th June 2004 were agreed.

Chairman's update

3. Nicky Chapman was introduced to the House on 8th September. [REDACTED]

Vetting

4. The standard checks had been completed for the two party-political nominations of the retiring British Commissioners at the European Commission. The Commission agreed that it would have no objection to these nominations.

Consideration of holdovers

5. The Commission considered in detail the list of holdovers. It was agreed that 57 individuals be retained, and interviewed, and 95 be rejected. Those retained would be considered alongside any new nominations.

FOI

6. The Commission noted the contents of the paper on the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Review of the Honours process

7. The Commission considered the paper on the implications of taking on the task of vetting the PM's honours recommendations. The Commission recognised that there were three main issues it needed to consider: the need for a consent form for vetting; the need to disclose the names of those it vetted in the annual report; and the need for secrecy in the operations of a sub-committee.
8. Regarding the first two issues, the Commission agreed that it would be comfortable operating a system for the honours that did not require personal consent to vetting or the names to be published. It was agreed that there was a clear distinction between the public appointment of Lords – to carry out a job – and the granting of honours to individuals for personal achievement. The Commission concluded that it would be open about the different practices and ensure that there was public clarity about its dual role.
9. The Commission agreed it would not be appropriate for a sub-committee of the Commission to not disclose the names of the individuals it vetted for honours. The Commission would develop its own internal arrangements for the sharing of information between the sub-committee and itself.

Commission Secretariat
September 2004