

FINAL – AMENDED 24/5/16

PRESS RECOGNITION PANEL

**Minutes of the 17th meeting of the Press Recognition Panel Board
held on 22 March 2016 at Mappin House, 4 Winsley Street, London W1W 8HF**

Present: Dr David Wolfe QC (Chair), Harry Cayton, Emma Gilpin-Jacobs, Carolyn Regan, Harry Rich and Tim Suter

In attendance: Susie Uppal (Chief Executive), Holly Perry (Head of Governance), Paul Nezandonyi (Head of Communications and Stakeholder Management), Caroline Roberts (Head of Regulatory Affairs) (from paragraph 18), Simon Edward (Regulatory Affairs Manager) (from paragraph 18), Camilla Capotorto (Business and Research Officer) (from paragraph 18) and Megan Archer (JS2 Ltd)

BOARD MEETING – PUBLIC SESSION

Welcome

1. The Chair **welcomed** Members and attendees to the seventeenth meeting of the Press Recognition Panel Board.
2. The Chair also **welcomed** the members of the public who were in attendance, who confirmed that they were happy to be named as having been present:
 - James Connal, Capital PR; and
 - Dr Evan Harris, Hacked Off (paragraphs 16 to 18 only).

Declaration of members' interests

3. There were no other new declarations of interest to report. The Chair **reported** that the quarterly check of the register of relevant interests had just been completed, and updated interests had been recorded on the [website](#).

Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2016, outstanding actions and matters arising

4. The minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2016 were **approved**. The Chair would sign a copy of the minutes as a correct record.
5. The log of outstanding Board actions was **noted** and **agreed**. The following update to the log was noted: Action 2 – *transfer of £1m to new Barclays Bank account* – the Chief Executive confirmed that sum to make up the balance of £1m had been authorised on 16 March 2016 (Post meeting note: the transfer itself took place on 15 April 2016).
6. The Board **noted** that there were no other matters arising that were not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

Chief Executive's Report – March 2016 – Paper PRP10 (16)

7. The Board received a paper which provided an update to the Board on executive activity since the last Board meeting on 23 February 2016.
8. The following points were raised in discussion:
 - the Board **noted** that the webinar presented by the Chair on the consultation on cyclical and ad hoc reviews had been successful, and the presentation could now be accessed on the [website](#). The consultation would close on 11 April 2016;
 - in relation to the IMPRESS application for recognition, on 8 March, the Chief Executive had received a request from IMPRESS for an initial extension of 15 working days in order for them to give full consideration to the responses received through the Call for Information, and that the PRP had agreed this extension, meaning that IMPRESS now had until 20 April 2016 to revise their application;
 - the Chief Executive reported that IMPRESS had confirmed that they would be in a position to respond to the points raised in the call for information on or before the initial extension date of 20 April;
 - the Chief Executive reported that a number of stakeholders had asked how the PRP intended to treat the responses received as part of the IMPRESS call for information. The Board **noted** that responses received through the Call for Information dealt partly with the applicant's compliance with the criteria and partly with wider comments or "submissions". If IMPRESS's response amounted to a significant alteration or substitution to their application, it would be published on the website and a further Call for Information would be published. If IMPRESS chose to comment on the wider comments or "submissions", then these elements of their response would be published on the PRP website (together with the responses received under the Call for Information) at the end of the process (i.e. once a

decision had been made by the PRP Board on the IMPRESS application);

- the Board **noted** the update provided on the content of the State of Recognition Report, which was a summary of points which the Board had previously agreed in confidential discussions.

9. The Board **noted** the contents of the Chief Executive's report.

Finance Report March 2016 – Paper PRP11(16)

10. The Board received a paper which updated the Board on the financial position as at 29 February 2016.

11. The following points were raised in discussion:

- the Board **noted** that the net surplus after costs currently stood at £1,298,649;
- the Board **noted** the continuing underspend for the year to date – which as at 29 February 2016 was £62,825, (expenditure of £803,648 against a budget of £866,473), and the reasons for the underspend as set out in the narrative at Annex A;
- the Board **noted** that the balance of £1m for transfer to the second bank account had been authorised on 16 March 2016 (see paragraph 5) and was expected to reach the bank on 22 March;
- in his capacity as Board Member with responsibility on behalf of the Board for financial matters, Harry Rich **reported** that he had met JS2 Ltd and the Chief Executive on 7 March 2016 for their scheduled quarterly meeting. There were no matters of note to report.

12. The Board **noted** the latest financial position as at 29 February 2016.

Audit and Risk Committee update – Verbal report

13. The Chair of the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC), Harry Rich, provided a verbal report on the main outputs of the meeting of the ARC which had taken place earlier on 22 March 2016.

14. The following points were raised in discussion:

Annual Report and Accounts

- the ARC had reviewed the plan, timetable, content and structure of the PRP's Annual Report and Accounts (ARA) for the financial year 2015/16. The timing was constrained by the fact that the National Audit Office (NAO) team responsible for conducting the PRP's audit was

also responsible for auditing the whole of the Ministry of Justice and Home Office ahead of the summer recess;

- the Board **noted** that the NAO had committed, in subsequent years, to aiming to undertake the PRP audit ahead of the Ministry of Justice and Home Office as soon as possible after the end of March, subject to the numbers and narrative being available;
- the Board **noted** that the NAO's proposed fee level of £15,000 for the audit felt instinctively high - NAO had agreed to reconsider the cost, taking into account whether there were any matters which JS2 Ltd could assist with which might reduce the NAO's commitment;
- in relation to changes to the *Financial Reporting Manual* which impacted on the 2015/16 ARA, the PRP would apply these where it was appropriate and proportionate to do so;

Approach to related party transactions

- the independent member of the Committee, Kathryn Cearns, had prepared a paper on the issue which had been shared with the NAO's technical team;
- the Board **noted** that the NAO had accepted the PRP's approach, given that there was an element of subjectivity in interpreting the standard and the PRP's commitment to transparency;
- given that the PRP's disclosure would, as last year, be based on full transparency, the matter remained an issue of principle rather than practicality, and would only be revisited in future if issues of practical application arose;

Risk register review

- the ARC had considered the risk register in full, and had suggested amendments which would be reflected in the version of the register to be submitted to the Board's 28 April 2016 meeting.

15. The Board **noted** the update, and **noted** that the full minutes of the meeting would be circulated to the Board in due course.

Closing discussion

16. The Chair invited the members of the public who were in attendance to make any observations and to raise any questions. Questions were raised in relation to the IMPRESS application for recognition:
- in relation to exchanges of correspondence with IMPRESS about the responses to the call for information, it was queried when and how these would be published – as previously mentioned, the Chief Executive confirmed that responses received through the Call for

Information dealt partly with the applicant's compliance with the criteria and partly with other, wider comments or "submissions". If IMPRESS's response amounted to a significant alteration or substitution to their application, it would be published on the website and a further Call for Information would be published. If IMPRESS chose to comment on the wider comments or "submissions" then these elements of their response would be published on the PRP website (together with the responses received under the Call for Information) at the end of the process (i.e. once a decision had been made by the PRP Board on the IMPRESS application).

Any other business

17. There was no other business.

Date and time of next meeting

18. The Board **noted** that the next scheduled meeting of the Board would take place on Thursday 28 April 2016, starting at 09:00.