HOUSE OF LORDS APPOINTMENTS COMMISSION

Room G/38, 1 Horse Guards Road, London SW1A 2HQ General Enquiries: 07355 021 584

Internet: http://lordsappointments.independent.gov.uk
E-mail: enquiry@lordsappointments.gov.uk

Ref: HOLAC FOI 2024/11

22 July 2024

By email:		
Dear		

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST

I am replying to your Freedom of Information request, which the House of Lords Appointments Commission (The Commission) received on 5 July 2024.

You asked for information on:

"The Nomination to the House of Lords of Guglielmo Verdirame (now Lord Verdirame, KC) by then-Prime Minister, Boris Johnson.

- 1. What were the grounds for his Nomination?
- 2. Was the Nomination opposed?
- 3. Were any concerns raised?"

In regards to 1), I should explain that Lord Verdirame was awarded his peerage on the Political Peerage List 2022, which referenced his work as a barrister and Professor of International Law at King's College London. The decision to produce lists of this type, which are often cross-political-party, are entirely within the gift of the Prime Minister. The Commission does not have any input into when a list is produced, who is proposed for such a list, nor have any role in assessing the suitability of any such individuals. Its remit is strictly limited to vetting proposed individuals on the grounds of propriety. The reasons for nominating an individual are solely a matter for the Prime Minister or the Party leader of the nominating Party.

In regards to 2) and 3), I confirm that we hold information in scope of your request. This information falls within section 37(1)(b) of the Freedom of Information Act, which relates to the conferral of honours and dignities, as a peerage is a dignity for the purposes of the Act. As Section 37 is a qualified exemption we have carried out a public interest test in determining whether this can be disclosed. In favour of disclosing information, there is a strong public interest in knowing that the appointments process is accountable and transparent, and in maintaining public confidence in the peerage appointments system. There is also an interest in

understanding the factors considered by the Commission when assessing the propriety of individuals. In favour of maintaining the exemption, there is a strong public interest in protecting the confidentiality of the consideration of individual nominees and ensuring the potentially sensitive vetting information can be candidly assessed. With particular regards to 2), the Commission has committed to writing to the Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee in any instances where the Commission is unable to support an individual and the Prime Minister subsequently decides to proceed with that appointment. To date, this has only happened once. Taking all of the relevant factors into consideration, I consider that the balance of the public interest lies in maintaining the section 37(1)(b) exemption in respect to providing this information about Lord Verdirame.

Some of this information is also withheld under Section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act. The names and other personally-identifying information about the nominees themselves constitute personal data. Section 40(2) of the Act allows public authorities to withhold personal data if disclosure would contravene any of the data protection principles listed in the Data Protection Act 1998. It is for the Commission to make a judgement in relation to whether the data protection principles would be contravened and the fairness of releasing data.

If it would not be fair to the data subject to disclose their personal data, an absolute exemption from disclosure applies. Even if the disclosure of personal data might be fair in some individual; cases, further consideration is then given to Schedule 2 and 3 of the Data Protection Act, including whether processing might be necessary for the purposes of legitimate interests. The Commission undertakes to treat nominations in confidence, thereby creating a reasonable expectation that their names or similarly personally-identifying information, will not be released publicly. To release personally-identifying information (including an individual's name) would therefore, in the Commission's view, be unfair and would therefore contravene the first data protection principle. Personally-identifying information about nominees has therefore been withheld under section 40(2).

Some of this information is also withheld under Section 41(1)(b), information provided in confidence, which allows public authorities to withhold information, the disclosure of which would give rise to an actionable breach of confidence. At the start of the vetting process the Commission informs nominees that any information provided by them and any information the Commission obtains in the course of its further enquiries of other bodies will be treated as confidential. The information therefore has the necessary quality of confidence and there is no overriding public interest that would allow it to be disclosed in breach of that confidence. Section 41 is an absolute exemption, therefore there is no requirement to consider whether the public interest in disclosing it outweighs the public interest in maintaining the exemption.

If you are unhappy with this response to your request, you may write to the Secretary to the Commission, Clare Brunton, to ask for an internal review by another person not involved with this request. Please note that we will not normally accept an application for internal review if it is received more than two months after the date that the reply was issued.

If you are not content with the outcome of your internal review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision.

Generally, the Commissioner cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the Commission.

The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

The Information Commissioner's Office Wycliffe House Water Lane Wilmslow SK9 5AF

Yours sincerely,

Secretariat to the House of Lords Appointments Commission