

---

**Committee Stage: Thursday 7 March 2024**

---

## **Investigatory Powers (Amendment) Bill [HL]** **(Committee Stage Decisions)**

This document sets out the fate of each clause, schedule, amendment and new clause considered at committee stage.

A glossary with key terms can be found at the end of this document.

First and Second Sitings

---

First and Second Sitings

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to**

That—

1. the Committee shall (in addition to its first meeting at 11.30 am on Thursday 7 March) meet—
  - (a) at 2.00 pm on Thursday 7 March;
  - (b) at 9.25 am and 2.00 pm on Tuesday 12 March;
2. the proceedings shall be taken in the following order: Clauses 1 to 14; the Schedule; Clauses 15 to 33; new Clauses; new Schedules; remaining proceedings on the Bill;
3. the proceedings shall (so far as not previously concluded) be brought to a conclusion at 5.00 pm on Tuesday 12 March.

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to**

That, subject to the discretion of the Chair, any written evidence received by the Committee shall be reported to the House for publication.

---

**Clause 1 agreed to.**

---

**.Dan Jarvis**

**Withdrawn after debate 14**

Clause 2, page 3, line 18 at end insert—

“(1A) This section does not apply to a bulk personal dataset unless it has been published in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment would ensure bulk personal datasets with low or no expectation of privacy have been published lawfully and in accordance with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) set out in the Data Protection Act 2018.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 21**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 3, line 34, at end insert—

“(4) By way of example, bulk datasets of images obtained by CCTV and bulk datasets of Facebook posts are not to be considered datasets where the individuals to whom the data relates could have no, or only a low, reasonable expectation of privacy.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

Probing amendment regarding the scope of “low or no reasonable expectation of privacy”.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Withdrawn after debate 22**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 4, leave out lines 27 to 30

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 23**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 5, leave out lines 1 to 14

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment would remove proposed new section 226BA, thereby removing the ability to grant “category authorisations”.

---

**Dan Jarvis**

**Withdrawn after debate 15**

Clause 2, page 5, line 14, at end insert—

“(4) The head of an intelligence service, or a person acting on their behalf, must notify the Investigatory Powers Commissioner as soon as is reasonably practical after a decision has been taken to include a bulk personal dataset within a category authorisation in effect under this section.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment would require that the Investigatory Powers Commissioner is notified when a new bulk personal dataset is added by an intelligence agency to an existing category authorisation.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 24**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 5, line 17, leave out “or a category authorisation”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 25**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 5, leave out lines 23 to 25

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 26**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 5, line 34, leave out “or a category authorisation”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 27**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 5, line 39, leave out “or a category authorisation”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 28**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 7, line 3, leave out "or a category authorisation"

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 29**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 7, line 27, leave out "or a category authorisation"

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 30**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 8, leave out lines 6 to 15

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 31**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 8, leave out lines 19 to 23

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 32**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 8, line 37, leave out "or a category authorisation"

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 33**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 8, line 41, leave out from "authorisation" to "they" on page 9, line 1

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 34**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 9, leave out lines 14 to 16

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 35**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 9, leave out from the beginning of line 38 to the end of line 13 on page 10

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 36**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 11, leave out lines 17 to 29

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 38**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 11, line 21, at end insert—

“(1A) The report provided under subsection (1) must include an annex listing the bulk datasets retained or retained and examined under each category authorisation granted during the relevant period.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment would require information about the scale and nature of use of category authorisations to be provided to the Intelligence and Security Committee.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not called 37**

Owen Thompson

Clause 2, page 11, leave out lines 32 and 33

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on Amendment 23.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not selected 20**

Owen Thompson

Page 3, line 9, leave out Clause 2

---

**Clause agreed to.**

---

**Clauses 3 and 4 agreed to.**

---

**Dan Jarvis**

**Withdrawn after debate 16**

Clause 5, page 14, line 34, at end insert—

“(4) A third party BPD warrant may not authorise the examination of a dataset consisting of the contents of the marked electoral register.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment would prevent a third-party bulk personal dataset consisting of the electoral register, which sets out whether people have voted, from being examined by the intelligence services.

---

**Clause agreed to.**

---

**Clauses 6 to 10 agreed to.**

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 1**

Clause 11, page 31, line 36, leave out “a court or tribunal” and insert “the Investigatory Powers Tribunal”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment is consequential on amendment 2.

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 2**

Clause 11, page 32, line 19, at end insert—

“(1A) In section 65 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (the Tribunal)—

(a) in subsection (2), after paragraph (b) insert—

“(ba) to consider and determine any complaints made to them which, in accordance with subsection (4AA), are complaints for which the Tribunal is the appropriate forum;”;

(b) after subsection (4) insert—

“(4AA) The Tribunal is the appropriate forum for a complaint if it is a complaint by an individual about a relevant personal data breach.

(4AB) In subsection (4AA) “relevant personal data breach” means a personal data breach that the individual is informed of under section 235A(5) of the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 (serious personal data breaches).”

(1B) In section 67 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (exercise of the Tribunal’s jurisdiction)—

(a) in subsection (1)(b), after “65(2)(b)” insert “, (ba)”;

(b) in subsection (5)—

(i) the words from “section” to the end become paragraph (a), and

(ii) after that paragraph insert “, or

(b) section 65(2)(ba) if it is made more than one year after the personal data breach to which it relates.”;

(c) in subsection (6), for “reference” substitute “complaint or reference has been”.

(1C) In section 68 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (Tribunal procedure), for subsection (8) substitute—

“(8) In this section “relevant Commissioner” means—

- (a) the Investigatory Powers Commissioner or any other Judicial Commissioner,
- (b) the Investigatory Powers Commissioner for Northern Ireland, or
- (c) the Information Commissioner.””

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment provides for the Investigatory Powers Tribunal to be the appropriate forum for complaints by individuals about certain personal data breaches reported to the Investigatory Powers Commissioner under section 235A of the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 (personal data breaches).

\_\_\_\_\_

**Clause, as amended, agreed to.**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Stuart C McDonald**

Owen Thompson

**Withdrawn after debate 39**

Clause 12, page 33, leave out lines 16 and 17

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment would remove one of the examples cases where a relevant person has lawful authority to obtain communications data from a telecommunications operator or postal operator, being where the data has been “published”.

\_\_\_\_\_

**Clause agreed to.**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Clauses 13 and 14 agreed to.**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Stuart C McDonald**

Owen Thompson

**Not selected 40**

Page 35, line 10, leave out Clause 15

\_\_\_\_\_

**Clause agreed to.**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Clauses 16 and 17 agreed to.**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Stuart C McDonald**

Owen Thompson

**Not selected 41**



Page 37, line 16, leave out Clause 18

---

**Clause agreed to.**

---

**Clauses 19 and 20 agreed to.**

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 6**

Clause 21, page 45, line 7, leave out first “person” and insert “relevant operator”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment and amendments 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 and 13 provide that the expression “relevant operator” is used consistently in inserted sections 258A and 258B of the Investigatory Powers Act 2016.

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 7**

Clause 21, page 45, line 8, leave out “person’s” and insert “relevant operator’s”

**Member's explanatory statement**

See amendment 6.

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 8**

Clause 21, page 45, line 29, at end insert—

““relevant operator” has the same meaning as in that section.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

See amendment 6.

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 9**

Clause 21, page 45, line 35, leave out “notice, as varied,” and insert “variation”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment provides that references to the variation of a notice are used consistently in Chapter 1 of Part 9 of the Investigatory Powers Act 2016.

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 10**

Clause 21, page 46, line 2, leave out first “person” and insert “relevant operator”

**Member's explanatory statement**

See amendment 6.

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 11**

Clause 21, page 46, line 2, leave out second "person" and insert "relevant operator"

**Member's explanatory statement**

See amendment 6.

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 12**

Clause 21, page 46, line 5, leave out "person" and insert "relevant operator"

**Member's explanatory statement**

See amendment 6.

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 13**

Clause 21, page 46, line 6, leave out "person" and insert "relevant operator"

**Member's explanatory statement**

See amendment 6.

---

**Stuart C McDonald**

**Not selected 42**

Owen Thompson

Page 44, line 4, leave out Clause 21

---

**Clause, as amended, agreed to.**

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 3**

Clause 22, page 47, line 17, leave out from "and" to end of line 19 and insert—

“(b) has the necessary operational awareness to decide whether to give approvals under subsection (2).”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment replaces the reference to an individual being required in their routine duties to issue warrants under the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 with a reference to an individual being

required to have the necessary operational awareness to decide whether to give approvals under section 26 of that Act.

---

**Dan Jarvis**

**Withdrawn after debate 17**

Clause 22, page 47, line 26, at end insert—

“(2G) If a warrant is issued by an individual designated by the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister must be informed of that decision as soon as it is reasonably practical to do so.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment would require the Prime Minister to be notified of a decision of a designated Secretary of State to authorise the interception of certain elected representatives' communications as soon as is reasonably practicable.

---

**Clause, as amended, agreed to.**

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 4**

Clause 23, page 48, line 15, leave out from “and” to end of line 17 and insert—

“(b) has the necessary operational awareness to decide whether to give approvals under subsection (3) or (6).”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment replaces the reference to an individual being required in their routine duties to issue warrants under the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 with a reference to an individual being required to have the necessary operational awareness to decide whether to give approvals under section 111 of that Act.

---

**Dan Jarvis**

**Not called 18**

Clause 23, page 48, line 21, at end insert—

“(7F) If a warrant is issued by an individual designated by the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister must be informed of that decision as soon as it is reasonably practical to do so.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment would require the Prime Minister to be notified of a decision of a designated Secretary of State to authorise a targeted equipment interference warrant relating to one of certain elected representatives as soon as is reasonably practicable.

---

**Clause, as amended, agreed to.**

---

**Clauses 24 to 26 agreed to.**

---

**Dan Jarvis**

**Withdrawn after debate 19**

Clause 27, page 50, line 9, at end insert—

“(2A) Where a senior official acts on behalf of the Secretary of State under subsection (2), they must inform the Investigatory Powers Commissioner of the selection for examination of BEI material as soon as reasonably practicable.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment would require a senior official acting on behalf of the Secretary of State who has selected BEI material for examination when there has been an urgent need to do so to inform the Investigatory Powers Commissioner as soon as reasonably practicable.

---

**Clause agreed to.**

---

**Clauses 28 to 32 agreed to.**

---

**Tom Tugendhat**

**Agreed to Gov 5**

Clause 33, page 56, line 1, leave out subsection (2)

**Member's explanatory statement**

This amendment removes the privilege amendment inserted by the Lords.

---

**Clause, as amended, agreed to.**

---

**Dan Jarvis**

**Not called NC1**

To move the following Clause—

**“Requirement for the Prime Minister to appear before the Intelligence and Security Committee**

After section 26 of the Investigatory Powers Act 2016, insert—

**“26A Requirement for the Prime Minister to appear before the Intelligence and Security Committee**

- (1) The Prime Minister must appear before the Intelligence and Security Committee of Parliament to provide oral evidence on the matter set out in subsection (2).

- (2) The matter is decisions made by the Prime Minister or an individual designated under section 26 to—
  - (a) give approval to issue warrants to intercept and examine communications of Members of Parliament;
  - (b) interfere with equipment belonging to Members of Parliament;
  - (c) other relevant decisions relating to Members of Parliament in the interests of national security
- (3) The duty in subsection (1) applies once every session of Parliament.
- (4) Subsection (1) does not apply if the Intelligence and Security Committee does not require the Prime Minister to attend.””

**Member's explanatory statement**

This new clause would require the Prime Minister to appear before the Intelligence and Security Committee to provide oral evidence on decisions made to approve warrants to intercept and examine communications of MPs or to interfere with equipment belonging to MPs, and other relevant decisions relating to MPs.

---

Dan Jarvis

Not moved NC2

To move the following Clause—

**“Report on the Prime Minister’s engagement with the Intelligence and Security Committee**

After section 240 of the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 insert—

**“240A Report on the Prime Minister’s engagement with the Intelligence and Security Committee**

- (1) The Secretary of State must publish a report about the Prime Minister’s engagement with the Intelligence and Security Committee in relation to the investigatory powers regime and lay the report before Parliament.
- (2) The report must be published within six months of the passage of the Investigatory Powers (Amendment) Act 2024, and annually thereafter.””

**Member's explanatory statement**

This new clause would ensure the Secretary of State publishes a report on the engagement, including any meeting held, between the Prime Minister and the Intelligence and Security Committee in relation to the investigatory powers regime.

---

Dan Jarvis

Withdrawn after debate NC3

To move the following Clause—

**“Impact of Act on EU data adequacy decisions**

Within six months of the passage of this Act, the Secretary of State must publish a report assessing the potential impact of this Act on EU data adequacy decisions relating to the United Kingdom.”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This new clause would require the Secretary of State to publish a report on potential impact of the provisions within this Bill on the requirements necessary to maintain a data adequacy decision by the EU.

---

Stuart C McDonald

Not called NC4

Owen Thompson

To move the following Clause—

**“Interception notification for Members of Parliament etc.**

After section 26 of the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 (Members of Parliament etc.) insert—

**“26A Interception notification for Members of Parliament etc.**

- (1) Upon completion of conduct authorised by a warrant under section 26, or the cancellation of a warrant issued under that section, a Judicial Commissioner must notify the subject of the warrant, in writing, of—
  - (a) the conduct that has taken place, and
  - (b) the provisions under which the conduct has taken place.
- (2) The notification under subsection (1) must be sent within thirty days of the completion of the conduct or cancellation of the warrant.
- (3) A Judicial Commissioner may postpone the notification under subsection (1) beyond the time limit under subsection (2) if the Judicial Commissioner assesses that notification may defeat the purposes of an ongoing serious crime or national security investigation relating to the subject of the warrant.
- (4) A Judicial Commissioner must consult the person who applied for the warrant in order to fulfil an assessment under subsection (3).”

**Member's explanatory statement**

This new clause would require members of a relevant legislation who are targets of interception to be notified after the fact, as long as it does not compromise any ongoing investigation.

Bill, as amended, to be reported.

## Glossary

**Added:** New Clause agreed without a vote and added to the Bill.

**Agreed to:** agreed without a vote.

**Agreed to on division:** agreed following a vote.

**Negated:** rejected without a vote.

**Negated on division:** rejected following a vote.

**Not called:** debated in a group of amendments, but not put to a decision.

**Not moved:** not debated or put to a decision.

**Question proposed:** debate underway but not concluded.

**Withdrawn after debate:** moved and debated but then withdrawn, so not put to a decision.

**Not selected:** not chosen for debate by the Chair.