

HOUSE OF LORDS

Secondary Legislation Scrutiny Committee

31st Report of Session 2017–19

**Immigration and
Nationality (Requirements
for Naturalisation and
Fees) (Amendment)
Regulations 2018**

Includes 7 Information Paragraphs on 7 Instruments

Ordered to be printed 5 June 2018 and published 7 June 2018

Published by the Authority of the House of Lords

Secondary Legislation Scrutiny Committee

The Committee was established on 17 December 2003 as the Merits of Statutory Instruments Committee. It was renamed in 2012 to reflect the widening of its responsibilities to include the scrutiny of Orders laid under the Public Bodies Act 2011.

The Committee's terms of reference are set out in full on the website but are, broadly, to scrutinise —

(a) every instrument (whether or not a statutory instrument), or draft of an instrument, which is laid before each House of Parliament and upon which proceedings may be, or might have been, taken in either House of Parliament under an Act of Parliament;

(b) every proposal which is in the form of a draft of such an instrument and is laid before each House of Parliament under an Act of Parliament,

with a view to determining whether or not the special attention of the House should be drawn to it on any of these specified grounds:

(a) that it is politically or legally important or gives rise to issues of public policy likely to be of interest to the House;

(b) that it may be inappropriate in view of changed circumstances since the enactment of the parent Act;

(c) that it may inappropriately implement European Union legislation;

(d) that it may imperfectly achieve its policy objectives;

(e) that the explanatory material laid in support provides insufficient information to gain a clear understanding about the instrument's policy objective and intended implementation;

(f) that there appear to be inadequacies in the consultation process which relates to the instrument.

The Committee may also consider such other general matters relating to the effective scrutiny of secondary legislation as the Committee considers appropriate, except matters within the orders of reference of the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments.

Members

Lord Cunningham of Felling	Lord Goddard of Stockport	Baroness O'Loan
Lord Chartres	Lord Haskel	Lord Sherbourne of Didsbury
Lord Faulkner of Worcester	Rt Hon. Lord Janvrin	Rt Hon. Lord Trefgarne (Chairman)
Baroness Finn	Lord Kirkwood of Kirkhope	

Registered interests

Information about interests of Committee Members can be found in the last Appendix to this report.

Publications

The Committee's Reports are published on the internet at www.parliament.uk/seclegpublications

The National Archives publish statutory instruments with a plain English explanatory memorandum on the internet at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi>

Information and Contacts

Any query about the Committee or its work, or opinions on any new item of secondary legislation, should be directed to the Clerk to the Secondary Legislation Scrutiny Committee, Legislation Office, House of Lords, London SW1A 0PW. The telephone number is 020 7219 8821 and the email address is hseclegscrutiny@parliament.uk.

Thirty First Report

INSTRUMENTS DRAWN TO THE SPECIAL ATTENTION OF THE HOUSE

Immigration and Nationality (Requirements for Naturalisation and Fees) (Amendment) Regulations 2018 (SI 2018/618)

Date laid: 24 May 2018

Parliamentary procedure: negative

*Summary: To address the issues currently facing the “Windrush generation” in proving their immigration status the Home Office has set up a taskforce to administer a scheme. The Windrush Scheme has been introduced to enable anyone who settled in the UK prior to 1 January 1973, and their children, to obtain evidence of their immigration status, or apply for British citizenship free of charge. These Regulations enable the Home Office to waive the fee and the Knowledge of Life and Language in the UK test for applicants under the Windrush Scheme. The Schedule to the Regulations lists the countries of origin in the Commonwealth and British Overseas Territories included in the scheme. The number of likely applicants is uncertain. The Scheme came into effect on 30 May 2018. **We find it very regrettable that a Government Department should have put itself in this position and that people’s lives have been severely disrupted in consequence.***

These Regulations are drawn to the special attention of the House on the ground that they give rise to issues of public policy likely to be of interest to the House.

1. These Regulations have been laid by the Home Office along with an Explanatory Memorandum (EM). The Immigration Minister, the Rt Hon. Caroline Nokes MP, has written to the Committee to explain the need to bring these Regulations into effect more quickly than the standard 21 days. A more detailed description of the intention of the Scheme was given in a Written Statement on 24 May 2018¹ and a fuller description of the Windrush Scheme for applicants is available on the Gov.uk website.²

Background

2. The Government have introduced the Windrush Scheme, with effect from 30 May, to ensure that people who settled in the UK prior to 1 January 1973 (when the Immigration Act 1971 commenced), and their children, can obtain evidence of their immigration status, or apply for British citizenship free of charge. These people are, or have in the past been, lawfully present in the UK, but the law applying at the time of their arrival did not require them to have a formal grant of leave, and they may not have, since then, obtained evidence of their status. Due to recent changes to UK immigration policies, some of these people have been encountering difficulties in obtaining access to work, housing and public services because of their lack of documentation.

¹ [HLWS699](#), 24 May 2018 [Lords Written Statement].

² Home Office, *Guidance Windrush scheme and information*, 13 April 2018: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/undocumented-commonwealth-citizens-resident-in-the-uk> [accessed 5 June 2018].

3. The Windrush Scheme also allows certain persons of any nationality who settled in the UK before 31 December 1988, who are not British citizens, and no longer hold documentary evidence of their status, to make an application free of charge for a document to confirm their status (where their status remains lawful), and for any Commonwealth citizens who settled in the UK prior to 1 January 1973, but subsequently moved overseas, to apply free of charge for the necessary documents to enable them to return to the UK either permanently, or to visit friends and family.
4. The Immigration Act 1988 changed the status of Commonwealth citizens arriving in the UK, in particular by stating that they could lose their indefinite leave to remain if they subsequently left the UK for more than two years. Those people should have been informed of that condition, which is why the Windrush Scheme is limited to those arriving before that Act came into effect on 31 December 1988.

Impact

5. These Regulations enable the Home Office to waive the fee and the Knowledge of Life and Language in the UK test for applicants under the Windrush Scheme. The Schedule to the Regulations lists the countries of origin in the Commonwealth and British Overseas Territories included in the Scheme. In the Written Statement, the Home Office said that those applying under the Scheme will benefit from the services of the taskforce which will help people to navigate the immigration system and “will continue to take a sympathetic and proactive approach when assisting people in confirming their status”.
6. The EM does not indicate the numbers involved or the likely cost of the Scheme. Supplementary questions to the Home Office gained the following responses:

- *How many individuals is it anticipated will need to avail themselves of this scheme?*

“This is difficult to quantify as we do not know how many people came to the UK as part of the Windrush generation. However, we anticipate that most people will have already obtained documents which evidence their status, or become British Citizens. The Home Office is reaching out to the remaining few that have not, but given the scale of this issue, volumes of potential applications under the Windrush Scheme are uncertain.”

- *What are the expected costs to the Home Office of both the fee waiver and the taskforce?*

“There are several different solutions for Windrush applicants which are dependent on their individual circumstances, but again, as potential application volumes are uncertain it is difficult to assess the financial impact of both the fee waiver and the taskforce.”

- *Is the taskforce and/or Scheme open-ended or is there an intention to regularise the position of these people within a certain period?*

“There is no current end date for the Scheme, but we hope that people who wish to make an application will do as soon as possible.

The Home Secretary committed to providing monthly progress updates to the Home Affairs Select Committee.”

Other initiatives

7. The Written Statement mentions that there is, until 8 June 2018, a call for evidence to inform the setting up of a compensation scheme for those unfairly treated under the previous arrangements.³ It also states that a review will be conducted to identify “how members of the Windrush generation came to be entangled in measures designed for illegal immigrants, why that was not spotted sooner and whether the right corrective measures are now in place”. **We hope that this review is swift but thorough, so that poor administrative practice can be identified and addressed. We find it very regrettable that a Government Department should have put itself in this position and that people’s lives have been severely disrupted in consequence.**

3 Home Office, *Windrush compensation: call for evidence*, 10 May 2018: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/windrush-compensation-call-for-evidence> [accessed 5 June 2018].

INSTRUMENTS OF INTEREST

Draft European Union (Definition of Treaties) (Canada Trade Agreement) Order 2018

8. The Department for International Trade (DIT) has laid this Order with an Explanatory Memorandum (EM) and Impact Assessment. The Order relates to the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) between the European Union (EU) and its Member States and Canada. In the EM, DIT explains that the objective of CETA is to promote bilateral trade and increase economic growth by reducing tariff and non-tariff barriers that businesses face when trading goods and services and investing between the EU and Canada. CETA will enable firms to export and import at a lower cost and give more opportunity for businesses to bid for public procurement contracts in Canada, as well as providing reciprocal opportunities in the EU for Canadian businesses.
9. DIT says that the Order is intended to specify CETA as an EU Treaty by Order in Council in accordance with the European Communities Act 1972 (ECA).⁴ The principal effect of this specification is that section 2(2) of the ECA (which provides for the general implementation of EU Treaties) may be exercised in relation to CETA. This allows, for example, measures, such as statutory instruments, to be passed under section 2(2) if needed for the UK to implement CETA.
10. We obtained additional information from DIT, which we are publishing as Appendix 1. In particular, given DIT's statement in the EM that, at this stage, it appears that no new legislation or other implementation is required for the UK, we sought clarification of the reference to passing statutory instruments. DIT has told us that specification of CETA as an EU Treaty is important in relation to individuals' directly effective rights under EU law.
11. The CETA Treaty itself is likely to be laid before Parliament in the second half of June.

Draft Official Statistics Order 2018

12. This instrument updates the list of organisations that produce information which is classified as "official statistics". Official statistics are governed by the Statistics and Registration Service Act 2007 and are subject to certain requirements, for example, their production and publication must be overseen by the Statistics Board, comply with a Code of Practice if they are designated as "National Statistics", and adhere to relevant rules and principles relating to the granting of pre-release access to official statistics. The Committee noted the wide range of bodies covered which includes Sports England, Historic England and The Student Loans Company Limited as well all Government departments.

Draft Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (Codes of Practice) (Revision of Codes C, E, F and H) Order 2018

13. This Order will bring into force four revised Codes of Practice issued under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 ("PACE") to bring them into line with changes in legislation, policy, operational policing practice and case law. The main revisions to Codes C and H, (which, respectively, deal with

⁴ Specifically, section 1(3) of the ECA.

detention and questioning under PACE and under terrorism legislation) concern:

- a new definition of ‘vulnerable’ to describe a person for whom an appropriate adult must be called and a strengthened requirement to do so, that takes into account of the work of the Home Office’s Working Group on Vulnerable People;
 - amending previous provisions to ensure that 17-year-olds are treated as children for all purposes under PACE;
 - increasing protection for those giving voluntary interviews, perhaps in their own homes, who may not realise how material discussed may be used; and
 - amendments to PACE introduced by the Policing and Crime Act 2017, in particular enabling senior officers and magistrates’ courts to use live link when considering the extension of detention without charge.
14. Revisions to Codes E and F (which deal, respectively, with the audio and visual recording of interviews of suspects) make substantial changes to the sort of systems that can be used for each purpose and extend these revised provisions to cover all interviews for all types of offence.

Common Agricultural Policy (Control and Enforcement, Cross-Compliance, Scrutiny of Transactions and Appeals) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2018 (SI 2018/591)

15. These Regulations extend the deadline for farmers and land managers to submit payment claims in relation to Countryside Stewardship agreements under the Rural Development Programme for England (RDPE). The RDPE covers a number of schemes in which farmers and land managers receive grants to improve the natural environment, increase the productivity of forestry and farming and promote rural economic growth. Countryside Stewardship agreements operate under the RDPE and provide farmers, woodland owners, foresters and land managers with grants to make environmental improvements. Grants can take the form of multi-annual payments, but recipients of such payments need to submit annual payment claims. The statutory deadline for claims under the RDPE is 15 May, but the European Commission decided to give Member States the option of extending the 2018 deadline for claims in relation to Countryside Stewardship agreements to 15 June because several EU Member States had experienced difficulties in implementing changes to their administrative systems.
16. We asked the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) whether such difficulties had occurred in England. Defra explained that the processing of applications for Countryside Stewardship agreements, due to start on 1 January 2018, had fallen behind this year because of stricter evidence requirements, updates to land data and a higher number of applications. Defra therefore decided to make use of the option to extend the original deadline to 15 June to help applicants avoid late claim penalties. This extension, however, only applies to payment claims relating to Countryside Stewardship agreements in England; claims made in relation to other schemes under the RDPE or the Basic Payments Scheme retain the original deadline of 15 May.

Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) (Amendment) Regulations 2018 (SI 2018/592)

17. In order to adapt the law to cope with developing technology, these Regulations create an exception to the provision which prohibits the use, while driving, of a hand-held mobile telephone or other hand-held interactive communication device, when the device is only being used to perform a remote control parking manoeuvre.

Enterprise Act 2002 (Turnover Test) (Amendment) Order 2018 (SI 2018/593)

18. This instrument will extend the powers of the Government to intervene in mergers or takeovers where the target company operates in one of three advanced sectors of the economy which are considered relevant to national security: military and dual use technologies, computing hardware and quantum technologies. The Order builds on another instrument, the Enterprise Act 2002 (Share of Supply Test) (Amendment) Order 2018, to which the Committee referred in its 24th Report,⁵ and which received parliamentary approval in the House of Lords and House of Commons on 1 and 2 May 2018 respectively. The previous instrument amended the “share of supply test” that allows a merger to be scrutinised, so that it is now met where a merger or takeover involves a target company with 25% or more share of supply in the UK, or where the deal leads to an increase in the share of supply to, or above, this threshold. The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) says that the new Order will lower the turnover threshold above which the Secretary of State will be able to intervene in a merger or takeover involving companies operating in advanced sectors of the economy that are considered relevant to national security.
19. Under the new rules, the Secretary of State will be able to intervene if the annual UK turnover of the target company is more than £1 million, compared to more than £70 million under the current rules. According to BEIS, the lower threshold reflects the fact that some of the most innovative companies are those with small turnovers. BEIS explains that while the majority of foreign investment into the UK raises no national security concerns, the Government need to be alert to the risk that foreign control of critical businesses or infrastructure could enable espionage, sabotage or inappropriate leverage. In the longer term, BEIS will publish a White Paper with proposals for more substantive changes to the way foreign investment is scrutinised in the light of national security concerns, and that this will be followed by primary legislation.

Trade Secrets (Enforcement, etc.) Regulations 2018 (SI 2018/597)

20. The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) has laid these Regulations with an Explanatory Memorandum (EM) on behalf of the Intellectual Property Office (IPO). The instrument implements the EU Trade Secrets Directive which aims to ensure an effective internal market by giving businesses access to comparable levels of redress in all Member States if their trade secrets are acquired, used or disclosed unlawfully. A trade secret is confidential information that can be used to gain a competitive advantage in the marketplace and may include, for example, business plans, market strategies or customer information. The IPO explains that the UK

⁵ [24th Report](#), Session 2017–19 (HL Paper 114).

already has a robust and well-established legal framework that protects trade secrets through the common law of confidence which can be enforced in the civil courts. According to the IPO, the Regulations therefore only address areas where there are gaps in UK law, and where implementation of the EU Directive will improve legal certainty by making the law more transparent and coherent across all of the UK's jurisdictions. Elements of the EU Directive that are being transposed into UK law through the Regulations include, for example, the definition of a trade secret and the time limits that apply for bringing claims to court.

21. The IPO says that it sought views on the proposed Regulations through meetings with relevant stakeholders and a four week technical consultation. We note that only 19 responses were received during the consultation, and that a number of civil society organisations expressed concerns about the potential impact of the proposed Regulations on whistle-blowers, public authorities, journalists, trade unionists and others. A key concern raised was that rather than producing greater clarity, the Regulations risked creating legal and practical ambiguities, especially with regard to the protection of whistle-blowers. There were also concerns about a lack of a public interest defence in the Regulations and about insufficient protections against abusive litigation, including for trade unionists who legitimately disclose information. The EM explains that while the Directive makes provisions for protection of whistle-blowers and others, these have not been implemented in the Regulations, as such protections are already available under UK law, including through the 1998 Public Interest Disclosure Act.
22. We have obtained additional information from the IPO on its approach to the Regulations and asked why only four weeks were allowed for consultation and how the concerns raised during the consultation have been addressed. This information is published at Appendix 2. In the light of the concerns expressed during consultation, the Committee is of the view that there may be a case for reviewing the complex arrangements that currently protect whistle-blowers in UK law through both case law and primary legislation.

INSTRUMENTS NOT DRAWN TO THE SPECIAL ATTENTION OF THE HOUSE

Draft instruments subject to affirmative approval

European Union (Definition of Treaties) (Canada Trade Agreement) Order 2018

Official Statistics Order 2018

Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (Codes of Practice) (Revision of Codes C, E, F, and H) Order 2018

Instruments subject to annulment

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Cm 9616 | Environment - Amendments to the 1999 Protocol to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone |
| SI 2018/591 | Common Agricultural Policy (Control and Enforcement, Cross-Compliance, Scrutiny of Transactions and Appeals) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2018 |
| SI 2018/592 | Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) (Amendment) Regulations 2018 |
| SI 2018/593 | Enterprise Act 2002 (Turnover Test) (Amendment) Order 2018 |
| SI 2018/597 | Trade Secrets (Enforcement, etc.) Regulations 2018 |
| SI 2018/598 | Passenger Name Record Data and Miscellaneous Amendments Regulations 2018 |
| SI 2018/599 | Education (Postgraduate Doctoral Degree Loans and the Education (Student Loans) (Repayment) (Amendment) (No. 2) etc.) Regulations 2018 |
| SI 2018/607 | Higher Education and Research Act 2017 (Cooperation and Information Sharing) Regulations 2018 |
| SI 2018/643 | Sea Fishing (Miscellaneous Amendments) Regulations 2018 |
| SR 2018/121 | Personal Independence Payment (Amendment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2018 |

APPENDIX 1: DRAFT EUROPEAN UNION (DEFINITION OF TREATIES) (CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT) ORDER 2018

Additional Information from the Department for International Trade

Q1: In the Explanatory Memorandum you say: “The Treaty will also be laid before Parliament under the provisions for treaty ratification within the Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010.” Can you confirm that the Treaty may be laid before Parliament in the second week of June?

A1: The aim is to lay the Treaty in Parliament under the CRaG Act during the second or third week of June although this timing is not definitively confirmed.

Q2: In the Explanatory Memorandum, you say: “7.1 The principal effect of declaring CETA to be an EU Treaty is that s 2(2) of the ECA (which provide for the general implementation of EU Treaties) may be exercised in relation to CETA. This allows, for example, measures, such as statutory instruments, to be passed under section 2(2) if needed for the UK to implement CETA.” However, you also say: “4.1... At this stage, it appears that no new legislation or other implementation is required for the UK.” So is this Order being made following the “precautionary principle”, even if no secondary legislation is anticipated? If, hypothetically, statutory instruments were to be needed, what would be their purpose and effect?

A2: The Order is not made following a precautionary principle but is a requirement for the UK to proceed to ratify CETA. At 7.1, we note that the principal effect of declaring CETA to be an EU Treaty is so that s 2(2) of the ECA may be exercised. We also note that s 2(2) allows for the general implementation of EU treaties and we provide one example as being statutory instruments that might need to be passed under s 2(2) to allow the UK to implement CETA. The effect of section 1(3) of the ECA is that in order for mixed agreements, such as CETA, to have effect in UK law, they need to be “specified” as EU Treaties in an Order in Council made under that provision. If the whole of a “mixed” agreement, such as CETA, has been specified as an “EU Treaty” under section 1(3) of the ECA, all of its obligations (including those that fall within the competence of the Member States) will be “EU obligations” for the purposes of section 2 of the ECA. Importantly, the parts of mixed agreements in respect of which the EU has exercised its competence form part of EU law, and may give directly effective rights to individuals. Therefore, mixed agreements containing directly effective provisions should be specified otherwise individuals will not be able to rely on the directly effective provisions in the UK courts, and the UK will not be complying with its obligations under EU law. This is an important reason why this Order is not simply precautionary.

Under current legislative procedures, as made clear in the EM, any trade agreements that have been signed and concluded by the EU as mixed agreements require ratification by each individual EU Member State. If any Member State (whether the UK or any other EU state) fails to ratify the agreement, then the whole agreement will not come into force.

We do not expect any further secondary legislation to be laid beyond this SI.

Q3: In the Explanatory Memorandum, you say: “7.7 The provisional application of CETA removed 98% of the duties UK companies currently have to pay at Canadian customs making it easier and cheaper for UK companies to trade in Canada.” Earlier, you say: “2.3 The Agreement has been provisionally applied since 21 September 2017.

Only those areas of the agreement falling under EU exclusive competence when the Council agreed signature and provisional application are being provisionally applied.” What difference will it make to the UK when CETA is definitively applied, and areas outside of EU exclusive competence are implemented?

A3: In answer to your question, as the EM makes clear there are a handful of areas within CETA that are of shared competence and are exempted from provisional application, including a large part of the chapter on investment (with those provisions being provisionally applied relating only to foreign direct investment). In particular, the majority of the section on investment protection is not being provisionally applied, including measures relating to dispute settlement and expropriation. Measures relating to investment protection and dispute settlement for financial services are also excluded. In addition, provisions relating to camcording are not being provisionally applied.

The main impact for the UK is that the areas that are not being provisionally applied would only come into force upon the agreement coming fully into force having been ratified by all EU Member States. In practice those areas that are not being provisionally applied are unlikely to come into force before Brexit, given the length of time it takes for trade agreements broadly to be ratified by all EU Member States.

24 May 2018

APPENDIX 2: TRADE SECRETS (ENFORCEMENT, ETC.) REGULATIONS 2018 (SI 2018/597)

Additional information obtained from the Intellectual Property Office

Q1: The Explanatory Memorandum states that EU Directive 2016/943 came into force in summer 2016 and that a consultation on the proposed regulations to implement the Directive in the UK was carried out between February and March 2018. Are there reasons for what seems to be quite a long delay between the Directive coming into force in summer 2016 and IPO consulting on the proposed policy in spring 2018?

A1: There were a number of factors that influenced the timing of the technical consultation. These included the outcome of the UK's referendum on membership of the European Union and the concomitant demands on resources at the Intellectual Property Office ("IPO").

Q2: Why was the consultation then run only for a short 4-week period?

Due to the technical nature of the consultation, and given that it related primarily to changes in the courts concerning the breach of confidence of a trade secret, the Government considered a 4 week period proportionate and reasonable. Furthermore, interested parties were consulted through other means—in July 2017 the IPO held an open meeting to discuss the implementation of the Directive and to gather views on the transposition. Throughout April 2018, the IPO held meetings with a number of stakeholders to discuss consultation responses in greater detail.

Q3: The EM mentions that some organisations raised concerns during the consultation about the potential impact of the proposed Regulations on whistle-blowers, journalists, trade unionists and others. The EM also states that while the Directive provides for measures and remedies for whistle-blowers and others, these provisions have not been implemented in the Regulations as they are available under UK law. Is there additional information that shows how the concerns raised in the consultation in relation to whistle-blowers, journalists and trade unionists are addressed and mitigated by existing UK law?

A3: In relation to concerns raised by some respondents about the potential impact of the proposed Regulation on whistle-blowers, journalists and trade unionists, in addition to the information in the Government Response, the transposition note refers to case law on breach of confidence and sets out details of statutory provisions that are available to these groups under existing UK law.⁶ For ease of reference, they include: the Human Rights Act 1988; Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992 (for Northern Ireland, The Trade Union and Labour Relations (Northern Ireland) Order 1995/1980); and the Employment Rights Act 1996 as amended by the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998 (for Northern Ireland, the Public Interest Disclosure (Northern Ireland) Order 1998/1793). A public interest exception also exists in case law e.g. *Attorney General v Guardian Newspapers (No.2)* (HL) 1989 1 AC 109. On freedom of expression the Government also notes section 12 of the Human Rights Act 1998 and *Campbell v MGN Ltd* (HL) [2004] 2 AC 457. As such, the Government felt that it was not necessary to implement additional measures in the Regulations to deal with whistle-blowing, journalism and trade unions.

29 May 2018

⁶ See <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/draft-regulations-concerning-trade-secrets> for the Government's response to the consultation and http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2018/597/pdfs/ukxstn_20180597_en.pdf for the Transposition Note laid alongside the Regulations.

APPENDIX 3: INTERESTS AND ATTENDANCE

Committee Members' registered interests may be examined in the online Register of Lords' Interests at <http://www.parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/standards-and-interests/register-of-lords-interests>. The Register may also be inspected in the Parliamentary Archives.

For the business taken at the meeting on 5 June 2018, Members declared no interests.

Attendance:

The meeting was attended by Lord Chartres, Lord Cunningham of Felling, Baroness Finn, Lord Goddard of Stockport, Lord Haskel, Lord Janvrin, Lord Kirkwood of Kirkhope, Baroness O'Loan, Lord Sherbourne of Didsbury and Lord Trefgarne.